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What is organizational commitment?

Organizational commitment – psychological attitude refers to employee’s desire to stay in the organization, to be a good worker, and to make maximum efforts in the interests of the organization (Mowday et al., 1982)
What is organizational commitment?

3-component model (Allen & Meyer, 1990)

**Affective commitment** *(wants to stay)*
- refers to the employee’s emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the organization

**Continuance commitment** *(needs to stay)*
- refers to an awareness of the costs associated with leaving the organization

**Normative commitment** *(ought to stay)*
- refers to a feeling of obligation to continue employment
What organizational commitment is important?

Commitment is related to

- Job satisfaction (+)
- Job involvement (+)
- Organizational citizenship behaviour (+)
- Physical and psychological well-being (+)
- Performance (+)
- Intention to leave (−)
- Voluntary absenteeism (−)

Cooper-Hakim & Viswesvaran, 2005; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Meyer & Maltin, 2010; Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch, & Topolnytsky, 2002
Why organizational commitment is extremely important in case universities?

It is hard to fully describe and formally regulate of university teacher's work

It is very important the faculties are ready to work more than formally specified in their contracts and job responsibilities

Organizational commitment is one of the main predictors such extra-role behavior (Meyer et al. 2002)
Research question

What can predict commitment?:
organizational justice, organizational support, specific of the leadership, role ambiguity and role conflict

Most research on organizational commitment has been done in business organizations but universities have specific features.

RQ: What are specific characteristics of universities and academia predict commitment to the university among universities teachers?
Specific of the Universities

- Academic inbreeding
- Working in several higher education institutions
- Combining several professional roles (teaching, administrative work, research, etc.)

These factors may affect university commitment
Hypotheses 1-3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Insiders</th>
<th>Outsiders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Have not experience at another university</td>
<td>• Have experience at another university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Have longer history of the relationship with the university</td>
<td>• May have a more diverse job experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• May perceive transition to another job as more costly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Often get position because of personal relationship with professors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>H1-3: Being an insider is a positive predictor of the level of affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the university</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypotheses 4-5

Work in several institutions

- Awareness of belonging to each of them
- More complex personal identity
- May decrease perceived transition costs

Work in one institution

- More uniform job experience
- The institution have stronger effect on personal identity
- Perceived transition costs may be more strong

H4-5: Simultaneous work in several higher education institutions is a negative predictor of the level of affective and continuance commitment to the university
Hypothesis 6

H6: Combining several professional positions is associated with affective commitment directly and indirectly through role conflict.
Method

Procedure

• The survey was conducted from April to June 2014 via an online questionnaire
• Invitations to participate
  • subscribers of Russian journals about education and university life
  • thematic groups of different scientific fields in social networks
  • personal networks of the author and colleagues

Participants

• 317 teachers of Russian state universities
• 109 men, 208 women, M age 41.57 (SD = 11.24)
• average job tenure in the university was 11.72 (SD = 8.03)
Variables & Measures

Organizational commitment
• Organizational Commitment Scale (OCS) developed by Allen and Meyer (Allen & Meyer, 1990)

Insider/outsider
• Insider - if studied at the university where working (189 people)
• Outsider - if didn’t study at the university where working (128 people)

Role conflict
• Scale from General Nordic Questionnaire for Psychological and Social Factors at Work (Dallner et al., 2000)

Job satisfaction
• The Brief Index of Affective Job Satisfaction (BIAJS) (Thompson & Phua, 2012)
Organizational commitment’s predictors (OLS)

Models

\[ AC/CC/NC = b_0 + b_1 \times \text{insider/outsider} + b_2 \times \text{admin. position} + b_3 \times \text{add. work at another uni.} + b_4 \times \text{role conflict} \]

Controls
Job satisfaction
Role clarity
Sex (1–male)
Age
University location (1– Moscow or St. Petersburg)
Tenure in the university
## Organizational commitment’s predictors (OLS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>AC</th>
<th>CC</th>
<th>NC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Insider/outside (1–insider)</td>
<td>0.34*</td>
<td>−0.12</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work experience at another university (1–yes)</td>
<td>−0.23</td>
<td>−0.13</td>
<td>−0.79***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional work at another university (1–yes)</td>
<td>−0.16</td>
<td>−0.31</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional administrative position (1–yes)</td>
<td>0.30*</td>
<td>−0.27</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role clarity</td>
<td>0.43***</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>−0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role conflict</td>
<td>−0.26***</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>−0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>0.53***</td>
<td>−0.15</td>
<td>0.48***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (1–male)</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>−0.24</td>
<td>−0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>0.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University location (1–Moscow or St. Petersburg)</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure in the university</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>0.03**</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>2.07***</td>
<td>3.33***</td>
<td>2.21**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-squared</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>17.49***</td>
<td>2.17*</td>
<td>6.08***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Direct and indirect effect additional administrative position on affective commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admin. position $\Rightarrow$ affective commitment (direct)</td>
<td>0.24***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin. position $\Rightarrow$ role conflict</td>
<td>0.19***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role conflict $\Rightarrow$ affective commitment</td>
<td>-0.45***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin. position $\Rightarrow$ affective commitment (indirect through role conflict)</td>
<td>-0.09**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\chi^2$</td>
<td>21.65*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLI</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMSEA</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRMR</td>
<td>0.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-squared for affective commitment</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Direct and indirect effect additional administrative position on affective commitment

Admin. position \( \rightarrow \) Role conflict \( \rightarrow \) Affective commitment

- 0.24***
- 0.19***
- 0.09**
- 0.45***
Conclusions

• Being an insider predict the affective commitment and don’t predicts the continuance commitment. Graduation is the basis for an emotional attachment to this university.

• Having additional administrative position has a dual effect on the affective commitment: direct positive and indirect negative (through role conflict)
For details see
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