CGC - Management Review
Vol. 2, Issue 1, January-June, 2013

Organisational Commitment and Citizenship Behaviour of Employees Across Different Psycho-Demographic Factors

-Dr. Luxmi
Sr. Lecturer
University Business School,
Panjab University, Chandigarh.

Abstract

The present study was designed to compare Organisational Commitment and Citizenship Behavior of the employees in Public and Private sector organizations in Food Processing Industry, to make out the association between Organisational Commitment and sub-scales of Organisational Citizenship Behavior and to compare Organisational Commitment and Citizenship Behavior vis-a- vis different psycho-demographic factors of the employees. The scope of the study was Public and Private Sector Organisations belonging to Punjab and Haryana. The sample comprised of 196 respondents drawn from three Public Sector organisations, and six Private Sector organizations. Comparisons made on the basis of hierarchical levels and other psycho-demographic factors make the study comprehensive. The results revealed positive and high significant relationship between Organisational Commitment and Citizenship Behaviour (OCB) of employees. Almost all other null hypotheses concerning level of Organisational Commitment and Citizenship Behaviour (OCB) of employees vis-a-vis failed to be rejected unlike previous similar studies.

Introduction

In the era of globalization, organisation of market economies face strong pressures to be both efficient and produce value added outputs. The goal of efficiency and competitiveness can be attained if organizations possess the right people with the right attitudes and skills. That is why organisation, across the business landscape, are being seen battling out for workforce share in a way they battle for market share.

Organizations have realized that their survival largely depends upon their ability to attract, motivate, and retain the key talent needed. While the factors, such as capital, equipment, and other resources are important for organizational success and thrive; the human factor appears to be the most important one since it is the people who have to use all other resources. Without the productive efforts and full-hearted engagement of workers, the material and other resources of the organisation would be of no use. Not even the latest technologies would be able to produce the targeted results. Committed workforce is a 'hallmark' of a successful organisation. Committed or dedicated employees are expected to be more productive and work with focus on quality to increase customer satisfaction and the profitability of their organisation. In other words, committed employees are the salient resources and the foundations of any organisation. Or the organisation without the right people with the right attitudes to utilize them.

Review of Literature

Organisational Commitment

Organizational Commitment or Member Identity is a value laden behaviorally anchored cultural variable of organisational environment. It is an attitudinal or emotive dimension of work motivation, manifesting itself in member's behaviour. Organisational Commitment is widely studied area in interest of individually and collectively with other vital organisational factors predicting the success of an organization in the true sense. Before getting into its nitty-gritty's, a more simple and comprehensive definition of Organisational Commitment is certainly needed to be mentioned.

Hall *et al.* (1970) define organizational commitment as the "process by which the goals of the organizations and those of the individual become increasingly integrated and congruent". **Buchanan (1974)** concluded that an acceptable definition of organizational commitment was still lacking. A more basic problem appears to be that there are at least two distinct approaches to defining commitment, the psychological approach and the exchange approach. **Kanter (1968) and Buchanan (1974)** also emphasize the affective attachment of the individual to the organization. A common deficiency in this approach is that commitment is treated as discrete from complementary work attitudes without specifying the nature or direction of links with these other orientations (e.g., loyalty, job involvement, motivation et cetera).

Porter *et al.* (1974), define organizational commitment as "the strength of an individual's identification with and involvement in a particular organization". **Salancik (1977)** defines organizational commitment as "a state of being in which an individual becomes bound by actions to beliefs that sustains activities and involvement". Salancik proposed two approaches-prospective and retrospective. In prospective view, commitment is conceived as an individual's psychological bond to the organisation/social system, as reflected in his involvement with, loyalty for and belief in the values of the organisation. In retrospective view, commitment results as individual becomes bound to the behavioral acts that are chosen voluntarily **(Raju and Srivastava, 1986)**

Meyer and Allen (1991) held that organizational commitment is a multidimensional construct comprising three components: affective, continuance and normative. **Affective commitment** has been defined as an employee's emotional attachment to identification with and involvement in the organization. Employees with a strong affective commitment will remain in the organization because they want to. **Continuance commitment** on the other hand has to do with one's awareness of the costs associated with leaving the present organization. Employees whose commitment is in the nature of continuance will remain in the organization because they have to. **Normative commitment** has to do with feeling of obligations to the organization based on one's personal norms and values. Employees whose commitment to the organization is said to be of the normative type remains in the organization simply because they believe they ought to.

Studies have also been conducted to find the association between the three subscales i.e.: Normative, Affective and Continuance components of Organisational Commitment. According to **Meyer and Allen**, these components of commitment are not mutually exclusive: an employee can simultaneously be committed to the organization in an affective, normative, and continuance sense, at varying levels of intensity. **Kassahun (2005)** found that employee age came

out as the most important predictors of the organisational commitment.

Gupta and Khandelwal (1988) have found a significant and positive relationship between role efficacy and organizational identification. **Pooja Purang (2008)** observed that the positive perception of HRD climate predict a better Commitment level.

Organisational Citizenship Behaviour

Barnard (1938) was among the first to explicitly address the need for behaviors that go beyond delineated roles. **Katz and Kahn (1978)** noted that not only must employees engage in role-prescribed behaviors, they also must be willing to engage in innovative and spontaneous behaviors that go beyond those role prescriptions in order to ensure organizational vitality and effectiveness. **Organ (1988)** originally coined the term organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) and defined them as "individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization." Also, the willingness of participants to go beyond the formal requirements of their positions has been recognized as an essential component of effective organization. Thus, Organizational citizenship behaviours's can be said to "lubricate the social machinery of the organization".

Organizational citizenship behaviours (OCBs) are employee work behaviours such as helping others, staying late, or working weekends, performing at levels that exceed enforceable standards, tolerating impositions or inconveniences on the job, and being actively involved in company affairs **(Podsakoff *et al.*, 2000)**.

A good citizen is an employee who offers support to the organization even when no such support is or can be expressly required. Organizational citizenship behaviours are similar to prosocial organizational behavior **(Brief and Motowidlo, 1986)** and organizational spontaneity **(George and Brief, 1992)**, but some important differences exist. Prosocial organizational behavior (POB) describes a broad spectrum of helping behaviors which include many OCBs. However, POB also includes behaviors which might be helpful to an individual in the organization, but would be dysfunctional to the organization (i.e. an employee might help someone cover up performance problems). Organizational spontaneity (OS) is like Organizational citizenship behaviours in that it only includes functional behaviors, but OCBs are not directly recognized by the organizational reward system, while OS could be part of such a reward system.

Organisational Commitment and Citizenship Behaviour of Employees

Chaitanya and Tripathi (2001) made an attempt to explore the dimensions of Organizational citizenship behaviours and its relationship with organizational commitment. Stepwise multiple regression analysis showed that altruism, sportsmanship and perception of organization towards Organizational citizenship behaviours significantly predicted organizational commitment. **Lagomarsino and Cardona (2003)** developed and tested a model that relates leadership behaviours, organizational commitment and Organizational citizenship behaviours. Their results showed that transactional leadership behaviours increase followers' continuance commitment and decrease their growth commitment, whereas transformational leadership behavior increase followers' growth commitment and also their normative commitment. Besides, organizational commitment mediates in the relationship between leadership and Organizational citizenship behaviours. In the study of **Gautam et al., (2004)** the

structural equation analysis showed a positive relationship between affective and normative commitment on one hand and both citizenship factors on the other.

Cohen (2006) examined the relation between multiple commitments (Organisational commitment, Occupational commitment, Job involvement, and Group commitment), ethnicity, and cultural values (Individualism/collectivism, Power distance, uncertainty avoidance, and masculinity/feminity) with Organizational citizenship behaviours and in-role performance. Ethnicity and the four cultural values related strongly to in-role performance and Organizational citizenship behaviours. The result showed 16 significant interactions of multiple commitments with ethinicity and with cultural dimensions in relation to Organizational citizenship behaviours and in-role performance. **Haigh and Pfau (2006)** examined that organizational identity, organizational commitment and certain Organizational citizenship behaviours can be strengthened through internal communication. **Foote and Tang (2008)** proposed a model in which team commitment in self directed teams moderate the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior. The findings indicated that the relationship was stronger when team commitment was high.

Research Methodology

Present study - The above mentioned and other similar studies made the plot for the present study. The authors attempt to study Organisational Commitment and Organisational Citizenship Behaviour in two strata of culturally diverse organisations. In all, nine organisations belonging to Punjab and Haryana region were studied comprising of three public sector organsiations and six private sector organizations in food processing industry. Description of the organisations is as follows:

EXHIBIT-1: Targeted Organizations	
Public Sector Organisations	Hafed, Panchkula (Haryana)
	Vita, Ambala (Haryana)
	Markfed, Patiala (Punjab)
Private Sector Organisations	LT Overseas Pvt. Ltd., Jind (Haryana)
	Bonn Nutrients Pvt. Ltd., Ludhiana (Punjab)
	Milk Plant, Jind (Haryana)
	Pepsi Food Pvt. Ltd., Patiala (Punjab)
	Alchemist, Kurali (Punjab)
	Nestle, Moga (Punjab)

Objectives

The paper studies Organisational Commitment and Organisational Citizenship Behaviour in Food Processing Industry (Both Public and Private Sector Organisations). The main objectives of the study are as follows:

* To find the correlation of Age and Total Work Experience of employees with Organisational Commitment and Organisational Citizenship Behaviour in the Organisations of Food Processing Industry.
* To examine the association of Marital Status, Qualification, and Hierarchy with organizational citizenship behavior and organizational commitment in the Organisations of Food Processing Industry.
* To find out the relationship between organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior of employees.
* To find out the relationship between organizational commitment and the three subscales of Organisational Citizenship Behaviour - Organisation Ownership, Sharing and Involvement and Professional Commitment.

Hypotheses

$H_{1a.}$ There is a correlation of Age of the employees with Organizational Commitment and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour Sharing.

$H_{2a.}$ There is a correlation of Total Work Experience of the employees with Organizational Commitment and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour.

$H_{3a.}$ There is a significant difference in the level of Organizational Commitment and Citizenship Behaviour of employees at different hierarchical levels.

$H_{4a.}$ There is a significant difference in the level of Organizational Commitment and Citizenship Behaviour of employees possessing different educational levels.

$H_{5a.}$ There is a significant difference in the level of Organizational Commitment and Citizenship Behaviour of employees for married and single employees.

$H_{6a.}$ There is a significant difference in the level of Organizational Commitment and Citizenship Behaviour of employees for male and female employees.

$H_{7a.}$ Organizational commitment has a significant correlation with Organisational Citizenship Behaviour.

$H_{8a.}$ Organizational commitment has a significant correlation with three sub-scales of Organisational Citizenship Behaviour - Organisation Ownership, Sharing and Involvement and Professional Commitment.

Research Design

The study is descriptive and empirical in nature. Nine organizations were chosen from Public and Private sector of Food Processing Industry using Quota Sampling. Then a sample of managers, supervisors and workers was chosen from a sample frame of nine companies using Stratified Random Sampling. Managers, Supervisors and Workers were taken in the ratio of 1:2:3, based on availability and feasibility of the study. Out of a total of 196 respondents:

* 80 respondents belong to Public Sector and 116 from Private Sector in the Food Processing Industry.
* 29 are managers, 76 are supervisors and 91 are workers.
* 171 are males and 25 are females.
* 164 are married and 32 are unmarried.

* 90 have professional qualifications and 106 have no professional qualifications.

The other demographics are mentioned in Exhibit 2.

Exhibit-2: Descriptive Statistics

Parameters	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Age in Years	196	22	68	39.52	11.560
Work Experience in Years	196	1	42	16.35	11.629

Measures

Primary data was collected through preliminary interviews and questionnaires ultimately. Organizational Citizenship Behaviour questionnaire **(Lynn Van Dyne, 1995)** adapted by Biswjeet Pattanyak, Rajnish Kumar Mishra and Phalgu Niranjan, 2003 and Organisational Commitment questionnaire (**Allen and Mayer, 1991**) adapted by Chinnappan (**TISS Bombay**) are used to undertake the study. These scales are multidimensional, suggesting three subscales on OCB i.e.; Organizational Ownership (14 items), Professional Commitment (10 items) and Sharing and Involvement (8 items) and three subscales on OC i.e.; Normative (9 items), Affective (11 items) and Continuance Commitment (6 items). **The cronbach alpha coefficient of the scales were found to be 0.87 and .085 respectively.** The questionnaire also sought demographic information of respondent's i.e. age, education, marital status, hierarchical level, and total work experience.

Data Analysis

Preliminary Analysis: Data were examined for outliers and possible errors prior analysis, and none were detected. The data also were screened for possible violations to assumptions of normality and linearity. No violations were found.

H1- **To test the 1st hypothesis,** ***Karl Pearson's Correlation*** **is used for** ***Correlation of Commitment and OCB with Age.***

Table. :1 Correlations

Dimensions		Sharing and Involvement	Organisation Ownership	Professional Commitment	Affective Commitment	Continuance Commitment	Normative Commitment	Organisational Citizenship Behaviour	Organisational Commitment	Age in Years	Experience in years
Sharing and Involvement	Pearson Correlation	1	.182(*)	.230(**)	.146(*)	.236(**)	.096	.653(**)	.200(**)	.010	-.034
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.010	.001	.043	.001	.185	.000	.006	.885	.637	
	N	196	196	192	192	193	192	192	185	196	196

Organisation Ownership	Pearson Correlation	.182(*)	1	-.033	-.155(*)	.153(*)	.039	.527(**)	-.014	.007	.020
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.010	.651	.032	.034	.590	.000	.846	.923	.780	
	N	196	196	192	192	193	192	192	185	196	196
Professional Commitment	Pearson Correlation	.230(**)	-.033	1	.437(**)	.035	.223(**)	.722(**)	.323(**)	.182(*)	.074
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.651	.000	.631	.002	.000	.000	.011	.309	
	N	196	192	192	188	189	188	192	181	192	192
Affective Commitment	Pearson Correlation	.146(*)	-.155(*)	.437(**)	1	.464(**)	.420(**)	.276(**)	.860(**)	.037	-.006
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.043	.032	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000	.606	.932
	N	196	192	188	192	189	188	188	185	192	192
Continuance Commitment	Pearson Correlation	.236(**)	.153(*)	.035	.464(**)	1	.367(**)	.198(**)	.738(**)	.068	.162(*)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.034	.631	.000		.000	.006	.000	.349	.024
	N	196	193	189	189	193	189	189	185	193	193
Normative Commitment	Pearson Correlation	.096	.039	.223(**)	.420(**)	.367(**)	1	.182(*)	.735(**)	-.014	-.049
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.185	.590	.002	.000	.000		.012	.000	.847	.503
	N	196	192	188	188	189	192	188	185	192	192
Organisational Citizenship Behaviour	Pearson Correlation	.653(**)	.527(**)	.722(**)	.276(**)	.198(**)	.182(*)	1	.281(**)	.121	.035
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.006	.012		.000	.094	.628
	N	196	192	192	188	189	188	192	181	192	192
Organisational Commitment	Pearson Correlation	.200(**)	-.014	.323(**)	.860(**)	.738(**)	.735(**)	.281(**)	1	.020	.008
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.006	.846	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.792	.917	
	N	196	185	181	185	185	185	181	185	185	185
Age in Years	Pearson	.010	.007	.182(*)	.037	.068	-.014	.121	.020	1	.772(**)
	Correlation										
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.885	.923	.011	.606	.349	.847	.094	.792		.000
	N	196	196	192	192	193	192	192	185	196	196
Experience in years	Pearson in years	-.034	.020	.074	-.006	.162(*)	-.049	.035	.008	.772(**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.637	.780	.309	.932	.024	.503	.628	.917	.000	
	N	196	196	192	192	193	192	192	185	196	196

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The results of Karl Pearson's Correlation (Table 1) suggested that there is no correlation between age of the employees and level of Normative Commitment (r = -.014, p = .8847), Affective Commitment (r = .037, p = .606) and Continuance Commitment (r = .068, p = .349). Therefore the null hypotheses, that there is no significant correlation between Normative, Affective and Continuance Commitment and Age of the employees, are not rejected or may be accepted. The results (Table 4) suggested that there is no correlation between the Age of the employees and Organizational Ownership (r = .007, p = .923), and Sharing and Involvement (r = .010, p = .885). Therefore the third null hypotheses that there is no significant correlation between Age and

Organizational Ownership and Sharing and Involvement are not rejected or may be accepted. But a significant correlation is found between the Age and the Professional Commitment (r = .172, p = .016). Hence the hypothesis that there is no correlation between Age and Professional Commitment is rejected.

H2- **To test the 2nd hypothesis, *K arl Pearson's Correlation* is used for *Correlation***

of commitment and OCB with Total Work Experience:

The results of Karl Pearson's Correlation (Table 1) suggested that there is no correlation between the total work experience of the employees and level of Normative Commitment (r = -.049, p = .503), Affective Commitment (r = .162, p = .024) and Continuance Commitment (r = -.006, p = .932). Therefore the null hypotheses that there is no significant correlation between Normative, Affective and Continuance Commitment and total work experience of the employees, are not rejected or may be accepted. The results (Table 4) suggested that there is no correlation between the total work experience of the employees and the level of Organizational Ownership (r = .002, p = .978) and Sharing and Involvement (r = - .032, p = .657). Therefore the fourth null hypotheses that there is no significant correlation between Organisational Ownership and Sharing and Involvement and total work experience, are not rejected or may be accepted. But a significant correlation between total work experience of the employees and the level Professional Commitment(r = .087, p = .224) is found. Therefore the null hypothesis that there is no significant correlation between Professional Commitment and Total Work Experience is rejected.

H7- **To test the 7th hypothesis, *Karl Pearson's Correlation* is used for *Correlation***

***Between commitment and OCB*:**

In table-1 the Pearson's correlation test suggests a positive and highly significant relationship between Organizational Commitment and Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (.281). Therefore the second null hypothesis that there is significant relationship between Organizational Commitment and Organisational Citizenship Behaviour is not rejected or may be accepted.

H8- **To test the 8th hypothesis, *Karl Pearson's Correlation* is used for *Correlation***

***Between commitment and sub-scales of OCB*:**

The results of Karl Pearson's Correlation (Table 1) suggested that there is a very significant weak correlation ($p < 0.05$) between Organisational Commitment and Professional Commitment and Sharing Involvement (p equals .006). A still positive correlation is found between Organisation Commitment and Organisation Ownership (p equals .846). Therefore the fifth null hypothesis is partially accepted.

H3- **To test the 3rd hypothesis, One-way ANOVA is used for multi-level comparisons.**

Table: 2 ANOVA (*Hierarchy-wise comparison)*

Variables		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Organisational Citizenship Behaviour	Between Groups	36.374	2	18.187	.379	.685
	Within Groups	9068.439	189	47.981		
	Total	9104.813	196			
Sharing and Involvement	Between Groups	12.942	2	6.471	.702	.497
	Within Groups	1778.339	193	9.214		
	Total	1791.281	196			
Organisation Ownership	Between Groups	67.779	2	33.889	2.948	.055
	Within Groups	2218.808	193	11.496		
	Total	2286.587	196			
Professional Commitment	Between Groups	187.338	2	93.669	5.043	.007
	Within Groups	3510.490	189	18.574		
	Total	3697.828	196			
Organisational Commitment	Between Groups	170.843	2	85.422	.988	.374
	Within Groups	15734.919	182	86.456		
	Total	15905.762	196			
Affective Commitment	Between Groups	49.139	2	24.570	.951	.388
	Within Groups	4885.231	189	25.848		
	Total	4934.370	196			
Continuance Commitment	Between Groups	43.925	2	21.963	2.065	.130
	Within Groups	2020.790	190	10.636		
	Total	2064.715	196			
Normative Commitment	Between Groups	7.174	2	3.587	.293	.747
	Within Groups	2316.404	189	12.256		
	Total	2323.578	196			

The results of one-way ANOVA (table 2) suggested no difference in the level of Affective, Continuance and Normative Commitment among different hierarchical levels (managers, supervisors and workers), getting p-value more than 0.05 (p equals .388, .130 and .747 respectively). Therefore the null hypotheses that there is no significant difference in the level of Normative, Affective and Continuance Commitment at different hierarchical levels, are not

rejected or may be accepted. The results suggested no difference in the level of Organizational Ownership and Sharing and Involvement among different hierarchical levels (managers, supervisors and workers), getting p-value more than 0.05 (p equals .055 and .497 respectively). Therefore in the sixth null hypotheses, that there is no significant difference in the level of Organizational Ownership and Sharing and Involvement at different hierarchical levels, are not rejected. But in case of Professional Commitment p-value is less than 0.05 (p equals .001). Hence the sixth null hypothesis that there is no significant difference in the level of Professional Commitment at different hierarchical levels is rejected.

H4- **To test the 4th hypothesis, One way ANOVA test is used for education-level comparisons.**

Table: 3 ANOVA *(Education-wise comparison)*

		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Sharing and Involvement	Between Groups	1.894	1	1.894	.205	.651
	Within Groups	1789.386	194	9.224		
	Total	1791.281	195			
Organisation Ownership	Between Groups	14.031	1	14.031	1.198	.275
	Within Groups	2272.556	194	11.714		
	Total	2286.587	195			
Professional Commitment	Between Groups	163.516	1	163.516	8.790	.003
	Within Groups	3534.312	190	18.602		
	Total	3697.828	191			
Organisational Commitment Behaviour	Between Groups	307.567	1	307.567	6.643	.011
	Within Groups	8797.246	190	46.301		
	Total	9104.813	191			
Affective Commitment	Between Groups	8.020	1	8.020	.309	.579
	Within Groups	4926.350	190	25.928		
	Total	4934.370	191			
Continuance Commitment	Between Groups	4.891	1	4.891	.454	.501
	Within Groups	2059.824	191	10.784		
	Total	2064.715	192			
Normative Commitment	Between Groups	91.731	1	91.731	7.809	.006
	Within Groups	2231.847	190	11.747		
	Total	2323.578	191			
Organisational Commitment	Between Groups	119.040	1	119.040	1.380	.242
	Within Groups	15786.722	183	86.266		
	Total	15905.762	184			

The result of one way –ANOVA (table 3) suggested no difference in the level of Organizational Ownership and Sharing and Involvement among different educational levels, getting p- value more than .05 (p equals .275 and .651). Therefore the null hypotheses that there is no significant difference in the level of Organizational Ownership and Sharing and Involvement among different educational levels are not rejected or may be accepted but in case of professional commitment p-value (.011) is less than .05. Hence the fourth null hypothesis that there is no difference in the level of Professional Commitment among different educational levels is rejected. The result (table-5) suggested no difference in the level of Affective and Continuance Commitment among different educational levels getting p-value more than 0.05 (p equals .579 and .501). Therefore the null hypotheses that there is no significant difference in the level of Affective and Continuance Commitment among different educational levels are not rejected or may be accepted but in case of Normative commitment p-value (.006) is less than .05. Hence the fourth null hypothesis that there is no difference in the level of Normative Commitment among different educational levels is rejected.

H5- **To test the 5th hypothesis, *Independent Sample t-test* is used for merital status comparisons.**

Table: 4 ***(Comparison vis-à-vis Marital Status)***

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means		
Dimensions		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Sharing and Involvement	Equal variances assumed	5.074	.025	.727	194	.468
	Equal variances not assumed			.564	36.808	.576
Organisation Ownership	Equal variances assumed	4.767	.030	1.217	194	.225
	Equal variances not assumed			1.466	54.572	.148
Professional Commitment	Equal variances assumed	.326	.569	-.505	190	.614
	Equal variances not assumed			-.541	47.542	.591
Organisational Citizenship Behaviour	Equal variances assumed	.072	.789	.644	190	.520
	Equal variances not assumed			.544	38.778	.590
Affective Commitment	Equal variances assumed	15.826	.000	-.488	190	.626
	Equal variances not assumed			-.393	37.678	.696
Continuance Commitment	Equal variances assumed	.156	.693	1.719	191	.087
	Equal variances not assumed			1.829	40.752	.075
Normative Commitment	Equal variances assumed	.192	.662	-1.859	190	.065
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.771	38.914	.084
Organisational Commitment	Equal variances assumed	3.377	.068	-.337	183	.736
	Equal variances not assumed			-.291	32.118	.773

In all the cases, we cannot assume equal variances for married and single employees as p- value of the F-test in the case of Affective commitment comes out to be less than 0.05 (p equals .000). But the results of Independent Sample t-test suggested no difference in the level of Affective, Continuance and Normative Commitment for married and single employees, getting p-value more than 0.05 (p equals .626, .087 and .065 respectively). Therefore the fifth null hypotheses, that there is no significant difference in the level of Normative, Affective and Continuance Commitment for married and single employees, are not rejected or may be accepted. In case of OCB also we can not assume equal variances as p-value of the F test in the cases of Organisational Ownership and Sharing and Involvement comes out to be less than 0.05 (p equals .030 and .025). The result in table 4 suggested no significant difference in the level of Professional Commitment for married and single employees, getting p-value more than 0.05 (p equals .569). Therefore the fifth null hypotheses that there is no significant difference between the level of Organisational Ownership and Sharing and Involvement for married and single employees are rejected and in case of level of Professional Commitment for married and single employees are not rejected or may be accepted.

H6- **To test the 6th hypothesis, *Independent Sample t-test* is used for gender comparisons.**

Table : 5 ***(Comparison vis-à-vis Gender)***

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means		
Dimensions Sharing and Involvement	Equal variances assumed	F .993	Sig. .320	t -.110	df 194	Sig. (2-tailed) .913
	Equal variances not assumed			-.139	38.747	.890
Organisation Ownership	Equal variances assumed	.902	.343	1.054	194	.293
	Equal variances not assumed			1.141	33.305	.262
Professional Commitment	Equal variances assumed	.607	.437	-2.057	190	.041
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.339	33.012	.026
Organisational Citizenship Behaviour	Equal variances assumed	1.324	.251	-1.035	190	.302
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.348	37.938	.186
Affective Commitment	Equal variances assumed	.953	.330	-.102	190	.919
	Equal variances not assumed			-.117	31.206	.907
Continuance Commitment	Equal variances assumed	3.735	.055	-.831	191	.407
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.170	45.137	.248
Noemative Commitment	Equal variances assumed	.401	.527	.757	190	.450
	Equal variances not assumed			.805	33.074	.427
Organisational Commitment	Equal variances assumed	4.316	.039	.036	183	.971
	Equal variances not assumed			.043	32.794	.966

In the table 5, we can assume equal variances for male and female sample as p- value of the F-test in the case of OC (Continuance , Affective and normative commitment) comes out to be more than 0.05 (p equals.055, .330 and .527). Therefore the sixth null hypotheses, that there is no significant difference in the level of Normative, Affective and Continuance Commitment for male and female employees, are not rejected or may be accepted. The table 5 indicates that we can assume equal variances in case of Organisation Ownership, Sharing and Involvement and Professional Commitment as p-value of the F test (p equals .343, .320 and .437 respectively) comes out be more than 0.05. Therefore the sixth null hypotheses that there is no significant difference in the level of Organisational Ownership, Sharing and Involvement, and Professional Commitment for Male and Female are not rejected or may be accepted.

Findings and Conclsion

* No significant difference was found in the level of Organizational Ownership and Sharing and Involvement of employees at different hierarchical positions (managers, supervisors and workers).
* No significant difference was found in the level of Normative, Affective and Continuance Commitment at different hierarchical positions (managers, supervisors and workers).
* No significant difference was found in the level of Normative, Affective and Continuance Commitment for male and female employees
* No significant difference was found in the level of Organizational Ownership and Sharing and Involvement, and Professional Commitment for male and female employees.
* No significant difference was found in the level of Normative, Affective and Continuance Commitment for married and married/single employees.
* No significant difference was found in the level of Organizational Ownership and Sharing and Involvement for married and single employees. But a significant difference was found in the level of Professional Commitment for married and single employees.
* No significant correlation was found between Normative, Affective and Continuance Commitment, and total work experience of the employees.
* No significant correlation was found between Organizational Ownership and Sharing and Involvement and total work experience of the employees. But a significant correlation was found between total work experience and Professional Commitment of employees.
* No significant correlation was found between Normative, Affective and Continuance Commitment, and age of the employees. These results don't support the results of **Bhagat *et al.* (1981) and Kassahun (2005).**
* No significant correlation was found between Organization Ownership and Sharing and Involvement and age of the employees. But a significant correlation was found between age and Professional Commitment of employees.
* A very significant weak correlation was found between Organizational Commitment and Sharing & Involvement and Professional Commitment. A positive correlation was found between Organizational Commitment Ownership and Organizational Ownership.

* No significant difference was found in the level of Organizational Ownership and Sharing and Involvement for the employees possessing different educational levels. But a significant difference was found in the level of Professional Commitment of employees possessing different educational levels.

* No significant difference was found in the level of Normative, Affective and Continuance Commitment for the employees possessing different educational levels (Matriculate, Intermediate, Graduation, and Post Graduation). These results don't support the results of **Glisson and Charles (1988) and Bhagat *et al.*, (1981).**

References

1. **Allen, N.J. and Meyer, J.P. (1991),**The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization, *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, Vol.63 (1), pp1-18.

2. **Barnard C. (1938)**, "The Functions of the Executive", Harvard University Press: Cambridge.

3. **Bhagat, Rabi S. & Chassie Marilyn B. (1981),** "Determinants of Organizational Commitment in Working Women: Some Implications for Organizational Integration": *Journal of Occupational Behaviour*, Vol. 2, No. 1, pp. 17-30.

4. **Brief, A.P. and Motowidlo, S.J. (1986),** "Prosocial Organisational Behaviours", Academy of management review, Vol. 11, No. 4, PP. 710-725.

5. **Buchanan, B. (1974)**, Building Organisational Commitment: The socialization of Managers in Work Organization, *Administrative Science Quarterly,* Vol. 19, pp533-546

6. **Chaitanya, S.K. and Tripathi, N. (2001),**" Dimensions of OCB" Indian Journal of Industrial Relations, Vol. 37, No.2, PP 217-230.

7. **Cohen, A. (2006),**" The relationship between multiple commitments and OCB in Arab and Jewish culture", Journal of Vocational behavior, Vol. 69, No. 1, PP. 105-118.

8. **Foote, D.A. and Tang, T.L.P. (2008),** "Job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) Does team commitment make a difference in self directed teams?" Management Decisions, Vol.46, No. 6, pp. 933-947.

9. **Gautam, T., Dick, R.V., Wagner, U., Upadhyay, N., Davis, A.J., (2004),**" Organisational Citizenship Behavior and Organisational Commitment in Nepal ",

   Asian Journal of Social Psychology, Vol. 8, No. 3, pp. 305-314.

10. **George, J.M. and Brief, A.P. (1992)** "Feeling good-doing good: a conceptual analysis of the mood at work-organisational spontaneity relationship," Psychological Bulletin, Vol.112, No.2, pp. 310-329.

11. **Glisson, Charles & Durick, Mark. (1988)**, "Predictors of Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment in Human Service Organizations", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 33, No. 1, pp. 61-81.

12. **Gupta, P. and Khandelwall, P. (1988),** Role efficacy and organizational identification among professional Groups, *Productivity*, Vol. 29 (1), pp31-37

13. **Haigh, M.M. andf Pfau, M. (2006)** ," Bolstering organizational identity, commitment, and citizenship behaviours through the process of inoculation", International Journal of Organisational Analysis, Vol. 14, No.4, PP. 295-313.

14. **Hall, D. T., Schneider, B., and Nygfren, H. T. (1970),** Personal factors in organizational identification, *Administrative Science Quarterly,* Vol.15, pp176-190.

15. **Kanter, R.M. (1968),** Commitment and social Organization: A study of Commitment mechanism of utopian communities, *American Sociological Review*, vol.33, pp 499-517

16. **Kassahun, Tilaye (2005),** Level of Organizational commitment: Its Correlates and Predictors, *Indian Journal Industrial Relations*, Vol. 41, No. 1 pp

17. **Katz, D and Kahn, R.L. (1978),** The Social Psychology of Organization, 2nd edition, Wiley: New York.

18. **Lagomarsino, R.M. and Cardona, P. (2003),**" Relationship among leadership, organizational commitment, and OCB in Uruguayan health institutions", Social Science Research Network, IESE working paper No. D/494.

19. **Organ, D.W. (1988),** Organisational Citizenship Behaviour: The good soldier syndrome, Lexington, MA: Lexington Book.

20. **Podsakoff, P.M., Mackenzie, S.B., Paine, J.B., Bachrach, D.G. (2000),** "Organisational Citizenship Behaviour: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research", Journal of management, Vol. 26, No.3, pp. 513-563.

21. **Porter, L.W., Steers, R.M., Mowday, R.T. and Boulian, P.V. (1974),**Organisational Commitment, Job satisfaction and Turnover among Psychiatrist Technicians, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 59, pp.603-669

22. **Purang, P. (2008),** Dimensions of HRD Climate enhancing Organisational Commitment in Indian Organizations, *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, Vol. 43, No.4,pp 528-546

23. **Raju, P.M.and Srivastva, R.C. (1986),** Organisational commitment in relation to certain job attitudes, *Indian Journal of Industrial relations*, Vol.21, pp 462-472

24. **Salancik, G. (1977),** Commitment and the control of organizational behavior and belief. In B. Staw and G. Salancik (Eds.), New directions in organizational behavior (pp. 1-21). Chicago: St. Clair Press.