

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SOCIAL ORIENTATION AND ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT

Erdei Panni *

Károly Ihrig Doctoral School of Management and Business, Faculty of Economics, University of Debrecen, Hungary

Keywords:

Social orientation
Organizational commitment
Person-Job fit

Article history:

Received 31 Jan 2016
Revised 28 Febr 2016
Accepted 31 March 2016

Abstract

In today's rapidly changing business environment committed workers are indispensable for companies to stay in competition. Identification of factors that support the commitment represents an advantage for organizations. Research so far has put great emphasis on job-specific factors, but this article has the focus on personal factors like social orientation. With regard to social orientation, science distinct individualistic people who are less binding as a result of positive or negative reasons, and collectivists, who become committed more easily because of positive reasons like they love to be part of the team, or negatives like they have a fear that they might lose their important relationships. In this article we use our own results of testing to confirm that collectivists become committed more easily via positive or negative reasons than others.

1. Introduction

Committed employees may be essential for companies to stay successful. It is important therefore to identify the factors that may affect commitment. This study investigates if different types of social orientation may affect commitment and if yes, than how. The purpose of our study is to reveal if there are any significant relationships between social orientations but most of all collectivism and work commitment, and if commitment is more related to collectivism than to various dimensions of individualism.

1.1. Commitment to workplace

Committed employees play a main role in the success of companies because their performance is high, they rarely late, and they are missing less than their non-committed coworkers. The future of the company is more important for them and they are able to provide higher performance even in hard times when the company faces difficulties, and they remain loyal to the company on a long term [4, 6]. Most of the researches in this field focus on job-specific factors [1, 2, 5, 6, 10]. Present study examines not job-specific factors but a person-specific factor - social orientation's relation to commitment. Meyer and Allen [7] created the three-component model of work commitment, in which the three components are three different psychological states. The first pillar of the model is the individual's emotional attachment to the organization which indicates that the individual is a member of the organization, because she or he wishes to be a member of it. This one is called Affective Commitment. The second is Continuance Commitment which means that the individual stays part of an organization to avoid the perceived high costs of leaving it. Third one is called Normative Commitment. In this case there are moral reasons why the employee stays at the organization. The three different types of commitment are presented at the

* Erdei Panni. Tel.: +36 30 646 0928
E-mail: erdei.panni@econ.unideb.hu

same time but with different strengths at any employees. Affective and Normative Commitment emerges due to positive reasons, while Continuance Commitment is caused by negative reasons.

1.2. Social orientation

The social orientation “describes the fundamental relations of the individual and the community in a society” [9]. People have different attitudes to the community, some people share community values and also solidarity is important for them, others prefer to emphasize their uniqueness and independence. Our relations to others are determined with the dimensions of social orientations: individualism and collectivism. Csukonyi’s [4] tetrahedron model explains the dimensions of social orientation. The model splits the individualism dimension into three subcategories: personal, hedonistic and competing. Personal individualistic people try to emphasize their individuality, they are characterized by a distancing from the group. The hedonistic individualists’ aim is to maximize their individual profit, and if they have interest in it, they are ready to assume group membership, but they also easily change groups. Competition is not typical of them. The competing individualists prefer their own goals against the community’s goals, and as the group’s name indicates competition with others also plays an important role in their lives. Collectivists in contrast with individualists put the community at the center. One part of their self-determination is to belong to a group, and they are willing to sacrifice their personal goals to achieve the objectives of the group. They are characterized by familyism, identification with the group, and respect for the hierarchy of the group. They focus on personality factors that are common to those of the group members. They are strongly linked to others, they really want to comply with the others’ requests, they are less independent, and are reluctant to assume responsibility.

2. Material and Methods

According to the secondary research the main hypothesis is that there is a positive correlation between the commitment to the workplace - caused by positive or negative reasons - and collectivism. An online questionnaire was created which was spread by social media. Participation in the study was voluntary and anonymous, the respondents did not receive any financial compensation. 87% of the respondents were women, the average age was 29.66 years (SD = 7.31). 94% of the respondents have at least GCSE and 77% work as employees. The respondent have been working for more than 8 years on average and the current one is their third workplace. Participants typically don’t want to switch their jobs, 47% definitely want to stay on the current jobs in the next three years. After the demographic data collection followed the questionnaire measuring collectivism and the three dimensions of individualism [3], finally the one measuring work commitment created by Zborai [11]. Data analysis was conducted using SPSS software package. The reliability of the scales used in the questionnaire was appropriate. The Cronbach's alpha was 0.69 in case of the collectivism, 0.75 in case of the personal individualism, 0.58 in case of competing individualism and 0.54 in the case of hedonistic individualism. In the case of the scale that measures getting committed due positive reasons it was 0.91, while it was 0.72 in the case of negative reasons. The normality test showed that the data are not normally distributed. The data were analyzed with rank correlation test and regression analysis.

3. Results

First Spearman's rank correlation analysis was made, the results are shown in (table 1).

Table 1: Correlations of the variables (* $p \leq 0.05$; ** $p \leq 0.01$; $N=268$)

Spearman-rho	Collectivism	Personal Individualism	Competing Individualism	Hedonistic Individualism
Positive commitment	0.238** 0.000	0.168** 0.006		0.127* 0.037
Negative commitment		-0.174** 0.004		

Data: own research

Between positive commitment and collectivism there is a positive correlation ($rS = 0.238$, $p = 0.000$). The more collectivist someone is, the more committed she or he will be due to positive reasons. For collectivists it's particularly important to belong to a group. The positive engagement can be explained by that 60% of the study population works mostly as part of a team, which is an attractive environment for the collectivist people. There is also a positive correlation between the positive commitment and hedonistic individualism dimension ($rS = 0.127$, $p = 0.037$). The hedonistic individualistic people usually do not distance themselves from groups, because connections can help them achieve their goals. Their positive commitment can be explained by the fact that 80% of the respondents do not want to switch jobs. Between positive commitment and personal individualism there is also a positive relationship ($rS = 0.168$, $p = 0.006$). Based on the literature it is not expected, because they distance themselves from groups, and it is not typical of them being linked to communities [3]. This result may be explained by the establishment of person-job, which means that the organizational goals meet the objectives of the personal individualistic people. Person-job fit is presented in the data, since they have an average of 4.25 years of work in the current company and they do not plan to change jobs. There seems to be a negative correlation between commitment due to negative reasons and personal individualism ($rS = -0.174$, $p = 0.004$). Personal individualistic people are self-confident and less afraid of the disadvantages resulting from the loss of jobs, because they think it is easy to find a new place for a professional like they are. 83% of the respondents stated that it was not particularly difficult to get their current job, and this might be why they think that integration to another company would not cause them any problems in the future, which means that negative commitment does not play a significant role in their lives.

Table 2: Significant results of regression analysis of factors influencing commitment due to positive reasons

$R^2=0.113$	b	$SE B$	β	p
Constant	4.283 (2.628, 6.206)	0.887		0.001
Collectivism	0.195 (-0.005, 0.391)	0.099	0.149	0.056
Hedonistic Individualism	0.269 (0.087, 0.437)	0.087	0.214	0.003

Data: own research

Correlation testing was followed by regression analysis for a more accurate understanding of the picture. Since the sample does not follow a normal distribution, a Bootstrap regression was used in the SPSS program. The examination of positive commitment took place first. Some

variables did not explain the positive commitment and were therefore excluded from the model, from the least explanatory variables one by one, until all the remaining independent variables had significant effects on the dependent variable, the commitment. As showed in (Table 2), commitment due to positive reasons is affected by collectivism ($b = 0.195$ [-0.005, 0.391], $p = 0.056$) and hedonistic individualism ($b = 0.269$ [0.087, 0.437], $p = 0.003$) too. In the case of collectivism the results show that the more collectivist one person is, the more it becomes committed due to positive reasons ($b = 0.195$ [0.005, 0.391], $p = 0.056$), which is in line with the results of the correlation analysis. Further it is also observed that the more hedonistic individualistic someone is, the more committed she or he will be due to positive reasons ($b = 0.269$ [0.087, 0.437], $p = 0.003$). This result confirms the results of the correlation analysis concerning hedonistic individualism. Regression analysis was made for commitment due to negative reasons as well. The steps of the test were the same, by removing the least explanatory variables two explanatory variables were left in the model that impact the negative commitment: these are collectivism ($b = 0.211$ [0.052, 0.351], $p = 0.006$) and personal individualism ($b = -0.173$ [-0.338, -0.030], $p = 0.027$). The results are shown in (Table 3).

Table 3: Significant results of regression analysis of factors influencing commitment due to negative reasons

$R^2=0,041$	b	$SE B$	β	p
Constant	2,767 (1,725, 3,972)	0,569		0,001
Collectivism	0,211 (0,052, 0,351)	0,076	0,168	0,006
Personal Individualism	-0,173 (-0,338, -0,030)	0,080	-0,135	0,027

Data: own research

The results showed that the more collectivist someone is, the more committed she or he can be due to negative reasons too ($b = 0.211$ [0.052, 0.351], $p = 0.006$). Belonging to a particular group is a very important part of a typical collectivist person's self-determination. Changing a job may mean the loss of some existing social relations, which means a great burden and cost to them. They rather strengthen their adherence and involvement to the existing organization and this is how they become committed due negative reasons. The majority of the sample has no plans to leave the place of work, which may explain the relationship between collectivism and commitment due to negative reasons. 47% plans on a long-term, they want to stay in current employment for more than 3 years, 33% marked 1-3 years by the question "how long you plan to stay in the company?". A further result of the regression analysis is that the more individualistic someone is in the personal dimension, the less committed he or she will be due to negative reasons ($b = -0.173$ [-0.338, -0.030]; $p = 0.027$), which corresponds to the results of the correlation test. According to the results of regression tests on commitment caused by positive and negative reasons the hypothesis is true. Collectivist people easily become committed to the job because of positive attributes as well as negative feelings from the threat of job losses.

4. Conclusions

Based on the results it can be stated that individual differences in social orientation affect the organizational commitment. Exploring the quality, extent and causes of commitment while taking individual factors into account may result in the opportunity to create a work environment that helps to maximize the commitment of employees. There is no single proven recipe that can be applied to all employees to raise awareness, it is more useful to focus on person-job fit, which is able to increase the commitment of each person towards the organization.

References

- [1] Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1990). Organizational socialization tactics: A longitudinal analysis of links to newcomers' commitment and role orientation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33(4), 847-858.
- [2] Buchanan, B. (1974). Building organizational commitment: The socialization of managers in work organizations. *Administrative science quarterly*, 533-546.
- [3] Csukonyi, Cs. (2008). A társas orientáció (individualizmus és kollektívizmus) és a "cultural trade-off"-hipotézis tudatos alkalmazhatóságának vizsgálati lépései. Dissertation. University of Debrecen, 48-81.
- [4] Dajnoki K. (2007): A teljesítményértékelés folyamata In: Humán Erőforrás Gazdálkodás és Vezetés. (Szerk.: Dajnoki K. – Berde Cs.), Szaktudás Kiadó Ház, Budapest, 116-125.
- [5] Leiter, M. P., & Maslach, C. (1988). The Impact of Interpersonal Environment on Burnout and Organizational Commitment. *Journal of organizational behavior*, 9, 297-308.
- [6] Lok, P., & Crawford, J. (2004). The effect of organizational culture and leadership style on job satisfaction and organizational commitment: A cross-national comparison. *Journal of management development*, 23(4), 321-338.
- [7] Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human resource management review*, 1(1), 61-89.
- [8] Mowday, R. T., Steers, R. M., & Porter, L. W. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of vocational behavior*, 14(2), 224-247.
- [9] Münnich, Á. (ed.) (2002). A jövő vezetőinek jelene. ELTE, Budapest.
- [10] O'Driscoll, M. P., & Randall, D. M. (1999). Perceived organizational support, satisfaction with rewards, and employee job involvement and organizational commitment. *Applied Psychology*, 48(2), 197-209.
- [11] Zborai, Zs. (2008). Mit ér az elkötelezett munkavállaló? Master's Thesis. University of Debrecen, 45.