



EFFECTS OF WORKGROUP AND ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT ON DISCRETIONARY BEHAVIOR



Mohammad Mahmoudi Maymand¹ --- Hossein Younesi² --- Hamed Derakhshide^{3†}

¹Associate Professor, Department of Executive Management and MBA, PNU University, Tehran, Iran

²M. S.c of Agricultural Economics, Azad University, Arsanjan, Iran

³Phd Student of Administration Management, PNU University, Tehran, Iran

ABSTRACT

Today, it is important for many organizations to use workgroups for solving complex problems and tasks. The purpose of this paper is to examine and compare how commitment among workgroup members, directed towards the workgroup and organization respectively, influences discretionary work behavior. A deductive and quantitative method is used that was translated into a descriptive cross-sectional study of 138 individuals in 33 different workgroups operating in a professional environment. Various statistical methods including regression analysis was used to test the drafted hypotheses. The results indicated commitment among workgroup participants, both directed towards the organization and workgroup appears to be positively related to organization citizenship behavior. Also, Commitment directed towards the workgroup is observed to be a stronger predictor of organization citizenship behavior, and in turn discretionary behaviors, than commitment focused towards the organization.

© 2016 AESS Publications. All Rights Reserved.

Keywords: Workgroup, Organizational commitment, Discretionary behavior, Organization citizenship behavior, Employee commitment, Group level.

Contribution/ Originality

This study is one of very few studies which have investigated effects of workgroup and organizational commitment on discretionary behavior based on the comprehensive literature review in the area of firms industry.

1. INTRODUCTION

Work in modern firms today is increasingly characterized by being of an advanced and non-routine character. Many tasks require a flexible and knowledgeable workforce. This circumstance is based on the fact that modern economies are increasingly advanced. What can be seen today in the developed parts of the world are economies that are dominated by services (Schön, 2007). These economies are characterized by being knowledge-based, and many of the firms that are operating in them have a professionalized workforce (Von Nordenflycht, 2010). This is due to the nature of the work that these firms undertake, which is often advanced. Moreover, the markets in which these organizations operate are increasingly complex (Scott and Tiessen, 1999). In order to solve many of the complex problems that firms face today, specialized knowledge and competences must be combined. In order to accomplish this, organizations form professional workgroups (Okhuysen and Eisenhardt, 2002). With the increasing organization of work in group constellations, it is relevant to examine what causes groups to perform well and yield desirable outcomes in a professional context. Research in the team context has mainly been focused on the leadership level and

less on participants or members (Wheelan, 2013). According to Wheelan, this is a problem since there should be a focus on all the individuals that compose the workgroup. If you look at the individual level, and into what makes individuals perform well, commitment is widely recognized antecedent. Commitment in the professional environment on the individual and group level, is one of the strongest predictors of both individual and group outcomes (Mickan and Rodger, 2000). In line with this, one can see that firms increasingly rely on a committed workforce to stay competitive in the current business climate (Meyer and Parfyonova, 2010). In further detail, commitment has been divided into several different sub-types since an individual can show and feel commitment for different reasons. This has been captured in the three-component model designed by Meyer and Allen (1991) which outlines that individuals can either feel affective, normative or continuance commitment. Basically, individuals can be attached to a course of action, or a unit, either because of an inner drive, expectations by their surrounding environment, or because of a perceived costs associated with abandoning the action or unit. When examining the performance or outcomes of professional workgroups, one may find that these are difficult to measure from several points of view. For instance, the tasks assigned to a project group can change during the course of the project. Goals can be redefined and unexpected events might affect the outcome. This occurs to a larger extent in certain types of organizations. Work that is the least defined in terms of formal task and job descriptions, is most commonly found in professional service firms (Løwendahl, 2005). However, this does not only hold true for what can be considered as a traditional service firm, but also, as argued above, for most organizations in the modern economy (Von Nordenflycht, 2010). In these organizations, management of employees, and insurance that goals are fulfilled, is to a large extent relying on individuals engaging in behaviors to figure out what needs to be done by their own initiative (Løwendahl, 2005). One way of capturing these behaviors, is to look at extra-role or discretionary behavior (Organ, 1988). Conducting tasks that are formally defined is described as focal behavior. Discretionary behavior on the other hand is work behavior that is beneficial for the organization, which does not meet the definition of focal behavior. In organizational research, one can find several theories related to discretionary behavior. Grouped, they are generally referred to as extra-role behaviors (ERB). As identified by Van Dyne *et al.* (1995) there are four different major types extra role behaviors: Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB), ProSocial Organizational Behavior (PSOD), Whistle-Blowing (WB), and Principled Organizational Dissent (POD). Among these, OCB is the most predominant in theory Organ *et al.* (2006). In summary, it is relevant to examine commitment and its component on the group level, in a professional setting, to see what impact it has on the organizational outcome of discretionary behavior. In order to measure organizational behavior, OCB is a suitable construct to use. This is in essence what this thesis will analyze in order to develop a deeper understanding of what causes groups to produce positive outcomes.

The purpose of this paper is to analyze how different commitments among members of workgroups, affects discretionary behavior on the group level. As part of this, the aim of this study is to understand how different types of commitments affect this relationship.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW AND HYPOTHESIS GENERATION

2.1. Workgroups

Forsyth (2010) defines a group as “two or more individuals who are connected by and within social relationships” (Forsyth, 2010). This definition is broad and covers all types of social groups. Some researchers are more specific and defined the characteristics of groups in the professional environment. Cohen and Bailey (1997) have focused on teams in an organizational context and have reached a more narrow definition:

A team is a collection of individuals who are interdependent in their tasks, who share responsibility for outcomes, who see themselves and who are seen by others as an intact social entity embedded in one or more larger social systems (for example, business unit or the corporation), and who manage their relationships across organizational boundaries. A number of key conditions have been identified in groups that succeed in terms of achieving desired group outcomes. In more detail, a great number of determinants have been identified that relate to

the external environment, leadership, individual composition and communication (Northouse, 2013). Furthermore, effective teams are characterized by a high level of coordination and communication among group members, strong social relationships between individuals in the group, systems for providing feedback, as well as effective decision-making and conflict management (Mickan and Rodger, 2000). While several outcomes on the group level are similar to individual outputs in an organization, workgroups have a few advantages compared to individuals and are a necessity for achieving both effectiveness and efficiency in many modern organizations (De Dreu and Weingart, 2003). For instance, positive effects of innovation and problem solving workgroups can achieve have been documented (Curral *et al.*, 2001). For solving complex problems and task of an intricate character, professional workgroups show higher competence than individuals (Salas *et al.*, 2008).

2.2. Organizational Citizenship Behavior

OCB can be described 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” (Organ, 1988). The formulation was later modified into “performance that supports the social and psychological environment in which task performance takes place”. The result of this definition allows a distinction between task performance and OCB, which has been showed to exist in several studies (Rotundo and Sackett, 2002). Although the concept is abstract and has been intensely discussed, most predominant researchers in the OCB research area subscribe to the definitions above (LePine *et al.*, 2002). Several different theories on leadership have been tested and shown correlation towards OCB. However, it has not been determined that a particular leader style has been connected with OCB (Davoudi, 2012). However, specific leader behaviors such as supportiveness and consideration and altruistic acts have proved to be beneficial for OCB. The construct of OCB is multidimensional and thus is composed by several components. The development of the different dimensions of OCB has been conducted incrementally and this started with the introduction of the two dimensions of altruism and general compliance by Smith *et al.* (1983). Organ (1988) later expanded the dimension of general compliance into civic virtue, conscientiousness, courtesy, and sportsmanship.

Organ (1988) points out that while OCB takes place on the individual level, the effects are shown when it is displayed on a collective level. Thus, OCB displayed by single individuals is negligible; it is when a group of people together display OCB that a significant effect can be found. In line with this, aggregated unit or group analysis of OCB is interesting to measure. Researchs have increasingly focused on examining OCB on the group level. In the meta-analysis by Podsakoff *et al.* (2000) the authors conclude that more research of OCB on the group level is required. When examining the research that has been conducted since the aforementioned article was written, one can observe that a significant number of studies focused towards examining OCB on the group level (Nielsen *et al.*, 2009).

As OCB research has examined the construct on the workgroup level, measurements for commitment on the consolidated group level have also been designed. Group Organizational Citizenship Behavior (GOCB) is one result of such an ambition, as introduced by Chen *et al.* (2002). GOCB has been conceptualized to indicate the extent to which the members of a workgroup engage in OCB. It does not measure the group as a unified actor and nor does it compare the unit to other organizational units in terms of citizenship behavior.

2.3. Employee Commitment

Commitment in organizations has caught the interest of many psychology and management scholars for several decades now (Morrow, 2011). Commitment can be described as an individual's psychological attachment towards an entity or course of action (Meyer and Herscovitch, 2001). In similarity to several other attitudinal constructs, commitment is somewhat ambiguously defined in research. Along with this argument, commitment is similar to a number of other concepts including, motivation, and employee engagement (Saks, 2006). “Commitment defined as a

force that binds an individual to a course of action that is of relevance to a particular target (Meyer and Herscovitch, 2001). Commitment may be directed towards different constituencies within the organization (Reichers, 1985). This expansion of organizational commitment research has added explanatory value to attachment and outcomes on various levels in organizations. Common foci that have been examined in literature, beyond organizational commitment, include commitment directed towards coworkers, goals, job, supervisor, union, and workgroups (Vandenberghe *et al.*, 2004).

In the early 1990s, Meyer and Allen (1991) developed the three-component model (TCM); a conceptualization of organizational commitment that introduced a multi-mindset approach to commitment. Their distinction between affective commitment (AC), normative commitment (NC) and continuance commitment (CC) has been popular in consecutive research (Chen and Francesco, 2003). In the TCM, this distinction was made in order to account for different antecedents of the three commitment types. AC refers to emotional attachment or identification of an employee to an organization. It is connected to how employees identify themselves and interact with organizations. NC reflects an obligation to remain in an organization (Meyer and Allen, 1991). This can for example be materialized in an obligation that an employee feels towards a supervisor, such as completing a specific task for her or him, or in an obligation towards a customer to represent his or her interests in an organization. The final of the three measures captures commitment based on the perceived cost of leaving the organization the employee is engaged in Meyer and Allen (1991). The rationale behind it evolved from what Becker (1960) referred to as side-bets, investments that would be lost if one would discontinue a course of action. Due to its nature, other authors have called this type also calculative commitment (Chen and Francesco, 2003). A more visual depiction of this commitment form would be an employee, whose deciding factor for staying with an organization would be that he or she was given stock options that would be lost if the organization would be left by him or her prior to a set date that lies in the future.

Commitment and its relationship with outcomes have generated a noteworthy amount of research and it has been shown to relate to several different positive results in the professional context. These include for instance perceived job alternatives, intention to leave, attendance, lateness, and employee turnover. Commitment has also been shown to influence job performance, both through focal and discretionary behavior (e.g. OCB) on the individual level (Lavelle *et al.*, 2009). Studies which are showing that commitment is linked to job performance, usually indicate that AC has the most beneficial effect on it Jaros (1997) followed by NC and then CC. Moreover, it has been documented that commitment to the supervisor has a strong impact on performance and that workgroup commitment has an indirect connection to performance through this measure (Stinglhamber *et al.*, 2002).

2.4. The Relationship between Commitment and OCB on the Group Level

When building on the work of Meyer and Allen (1991) TCM, Meyer and Herscovitch (2001) proposed that different types of commitment on the individual level had different implications on work outcomes or performance. The authors also divided the outcomes into focal and discretionary behaviors. As outlined previously, these refer to in-role and extra-role behavior respectively. By dividing the categorizations of AC, NC, and CC into high and low levels among individuals and comparing them with focal and discretionary work outcomes, a number of interesting propositions were presented in Figure 1, to be found below. In general, high presence of any type of commitment should yield positive results on focal behavior and all but CC-LoAlt on discretionary behavior. Pure forms of AC account as the strongest predictor for both enacted focal and discretionary behavior, followed by employee commitments based on NC and CC. Meyer and Herscovitch (2001) noted that the probability that focal or discretionary behavior will occur is higher for all three commitment types when they are strong than when they are weak. In accordance with OCB research on both the individual and group level the following hypotheses are drafted:

H1a: Affective Commitment focused towards the workgroup is a predictor of GOCB

H1b: Affective Commitment focused towards the organization is a predictor of GOCB

H2a: Normative Commitment focused towards the workgroup is a predictor of GOCB

H2b: Normative Commitment focused towards the organization is a predictor of GOCB

Furthermore, Vandenberghe with associates (2007) found, when examining the components of CC (i.e. HiSac and LoAlt) and their relationship with organizational outcomes that HiSac was positively related to outcomes while LoAlt was negatively related. The study thus shows that a distinction between the CC types should be made. In accordance with this, the two types of CC should have different effects on OCB. In line with this reasoning, the following hypotheses concerning CC are formulated below:

H3a: High Sacrifice Continuance Commitment focused towards the workgroup is a predictor of GOCB

H3b: High Sacrifice Continuance Commitment focused towards the organization is a predictor of GOCB

H4a: Low Alternatives Continuance Commitment focused towards the workgroup is a predictor of GOCB

H4b: Low Alternatives Continuance Commitment focused towards the organization is a predictor of GOCB

It has been established that individuals generally feel more attached to entities and goals that are closer to them. Applying this to the relationship between commitment and OCB on the group level would imply that individuals' commitment to the workgroup should stimulate GOCB more than commitment towards the organization, in line with the target similarity model. Based on this and what have said throughout this section, the following hypotheses are generated:

H5: Affective Commitment focused towards the workgroup is more strongly related to GOCB than Affective Commitment focused towards the organization

H6: Normative Commitment focused towards the workgroup is more strongly related to GOCB than Normative Commitment focused towards the organization

H7: High Sacrifice Continuance Commitment focused towards the workgroup is more strongly related to GOCB than High Sacrifice Continuance Commitment focused towards the organization

H8: Low Alternatives Continuance Commitment focused towards the workgroup is more strongly related to GOCB than Low Alternatives Continuance Commitment focused towards the organization

3. METHODOLOGY

As the theoretical foundation for this master thesis is well developed, a quantitative study has been undertaken in accordance to this . This is based on the assumption that the antecedents and the conditions of commitment on work-related situations, as well as the theoretical foundations, processes and outcomes of professional workgroups, have been fairly well understood by science. For this study a survey was conducted using a questionnaire that was submitted to employees being part of workgroups. In order to compile the questionnaire, questions were imported from other validated measurement scales. To identify which control variables to include in the questionnaire, an examination of the most cited literature review and meta-studies was conducted. This study has targeted workgroups in firms employing professional teams, as characterized by the authors of this paper. These teams face tasks that are of a non-routine and ambiguous character. The rationale behind this is to approach teams in a professional environment where discretionary behavior is relevant as well as of high importance for performing a task well. It was determined that only teams that are assigned tasks of an ambiguous type would be considered. Additional selection criteria were group interaction frequency and group size. Larger groups in general experience lower marginal individual contribution to performance and risk having less clear boundaries.

3.1. Variables and Their Measurements

This study the dependent variable is GOCB. To measure discretionary behavior the OCB construct was chosen, and in line with this a questionnaire that measures OCB on the group level. The chosen scale, which has been composed by Vigoda-Gadot *et al.* (2007) is based upon the measurement scales developed by Organ (1988) . By applying the TCM (Meyer and Allen, 1991) commitment was measured by its three dimensions of AC, NC, and CC. CC was split up according to the two sub-dimensions of HiSac and LoAlt (Vandenberghe *et al.*, 2007). The questions

used for measuring all the commitment types were imported from the questionnaire developed by Vandenberghe et al. (2007). The commitment questions collected information on commitment across two foci: to the organization and to the workgroup. By combining the commitment types and commitment foci, eight independent variables were created as displayed in: Organizational Affective Commitment (OAC), Workgroup Affective Commitment (GAC), Organizational Normative Commitment (ONC), Workgroup Normative Commitment (GNC), Organizational Perceived High Sacrifice Continuance Commitment(OCC-HiSac), Workgroup Perceived High Sacrifice Continuance Commitment(GCC-HiSac), Organizational Low Alternatives Continuance Commitment(OCC-LoAlt), Workgroup Low Alternatives Continuance Commitment(GCC-LoAlt).

3.2. Questionnaire Design and Data Collection

The questionnaire used in this study was crafted in two stages and the questions and formulations were tested through a pre-test. Initially, suitable variables were identified through a literature review and measurement scales were subsequently searched for. Once a set of appropriate questions had been identified from validated surveys, a questionnaire was compiled. This initial questionnaire was used in a pre-test including 16 individuals fitting the selection criteria. The questionnaire was designed using the web survey service Qualtrics, to be filled out online by the respondents. All attitudinal questions were measured on a Likert scale ranging from 1-7 with the exception of GOCB, which was measured on a Likert scale ranging from 1-5. All the questions in a block measuring the same item had a randomized order. In total 71 questions were included in the questionnaire. As the length of a questionnaire can influence the quality of the responses negatively (Biemer and Lyberg, 2003) the amount of items tested for in the questionnaire were limited to those considered to be most important. In total, around 100 organizations were approached, in Iran, with the inquiry if they would like to participate in the study. In total, 19 organizations decided to join the study. To examine the reliability of the empirical data, consistency analysis has been done on the basis of Cronbach’s Alpha method (Table 1).

Table-1. Cronbach's Alpha

| Variable | Cronbach's Alpha |
|--|------------------|
| GOCB | .90 |
| Organization-Commitment | .86 |
| Group-Commitment | .85 |
| Control variables(Satisfaction, Leader support, Conscientious, Organizational Justice) | .92 |

Source: Authors

The proposed regression model below was drafted in line with the identified variables:

$$GOCB_i = \alpha + \beta_1 OAC + \beta_2 GAC + \beta_3 ONC + \beta_4 GNC + \beta_5 OCC-HiSac + \beta_6 GCC-HiSac + \beta_7 OCC-LoAlt + \beta_8 GCC-LoAlt + \beta_9 LSUP + \beta_{10} CONS + \beta_{11} SATIS + \beta_{12} OJUS + \beta_{13} SIZE_L + \beta_{14} Corp_L + \beta_{15} TNURE_low + \beta_{16} MFREQ_low + \beta_{17} City + \epsilon_i$$

3.3. Empirical Findings

3.3.1. Results of the Correlation-Matrix

Table 2 displays the means, standard deviations, and inter-correlations for the main research and control variables. The table 2 provides preliminary support for five of the twelve hypotheses. As expected, the correlation matrix shows that AC and CC-HiSac directed towards the organization and workgroup, respectively, are positively correlated with GOCB (OAC/GOCB, r=.42; OCC-HiSac/GOCB, r=.53; OCC-LoAlt/GOCB, r=.35; GAC/GOCB, r=.57; GCC-HiSac/GOCB, .51). In addition, OCC-LoAlt exhibits a positive correlation with GOCB (OCC-

LoAlt/GOCB, $r=.35$). Contrary hereto, GCC-LoAlt as well as NC for both foci fail to achieve significant correlations with GOCB. Moreover, the four control variables job satisfaction, leader support, conscientiousness and organizational justice all reach high correlation levels with GOCB. Furthermore, it is apparent that high intercorrelations between the control variables and the main research variables exist in this study. While this is very true for the organizational commitment variables concerning all the control variables, intercorrelations are much weaker between control variables and workgroup commitment variables. In fact, a correlation can only be observed for the workgroup commitment variable GAC with the control variables job satisfaction and leader support as well as GCC-HiSac, concerning leader support. This is not surprising, as job satisfaction and leader support are expected to strongly affect workgroup variables in general.

Table-2. Correlation Matrix

| Means, Standard Deviations, and Intercorrelations | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|------|-------|-------|------|----|----|
| Variable | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 |
| 1. GOCB | - | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| O-Commitment | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Affective | .42* | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Normative | .32 | .66** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. CC-HiSac | .53** | .56** | .47** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. CC-LoAlt | .35* | .31 | .34 | .66** | | | | | | | | | | |
| G-Commitment | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6. Affective | .57** | .54** | .37* | .22 | -.02 | | | | | | | | | |
| 7. Normative | .27 | .16 | .67** | .35* | .21 | .29 | | | | | | | | |
| 8. CC-HiSac | .51** | .06 | .40* | .63* | .39* | .27 | .61** | | | | | | | |
| 9. CC-LoAlt | -.12 | - | -.28 | -.21 | .07 | -.18 | .21 | .17 | | | | | | |
| | | .49** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Control variables | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10. Satisfaction | .51** | .64** | .47** | .48** | .35* | .65** | .28 | .27 | -.09 | | | | | |
| 11. Leader support | .66** | .52** | .35* | .55* | .38* | .60* | .29 | .43* | .08 | .84** | | | | |
| 12. Conscientious | .54** | .45* | .39* | .37* | .22 | .25 | .27 | .21 | -.22 | .39 | .37* | | | |
| 13. O-Justice | .37* | .59** | .58** | .66** | .67** | .34 | .34* | .27 | -.05 | .75** | .68** | .43* | | |
| Mean | 3.96 | 5.20 | 4.46 | 4.47 | 3.66 | 5.36 | 4.44 | 4.58 | 3.03 | 5.25 | 5.41 | 6.01 | | |
| S.d. | .37 | .82 | .93 | 1.12 | 1.17 | .59 | .93 | 1.06 | .83 | .54 | .73 | .46 | | |

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

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

3.4. Results of the Multiple-Linear Regression

Table 3 presents the results for the multiple-linear regressions. The outcome of regression MLR_1a (Adjusted $R^2=.76$, $F=15.31$, $p(F)\leq.001$) gives strong support for H1a, showing that workgroup affective commitment is a unique independent predictor for GOCB ($B=.41$, $p\leq.001$). The same is true for the two perceived high sacrifice variables on the organization, respectively workgroup level. However, while the regression for GCC-HiSac yields decent significance levels (MLR_3a: Adjusted $R^2=.50$, $F=5.51$, $p(F)\leq.001$), the regression for the organizational component is a bit less sound (MLR3_b: Adjusted $R^2=.39$, $F=3.94$, $p(F)\leq.01$). Still, the regressions MLR_3a and MLR_3b, holding respective B values of .24 ($p\leq.01$) for GCC-HiSac and .15 ($p\leq.05$) for OCC-HiSac, are significant, thus giving substantial support for H3a and H3b.

In light of no support for OCC-LoAlt, neither through previous ANOVAs nor through the regressions displayed in this section, hypotheses H4a and H4b have to be rejected. Thus, this study could not show that lack of alternatives is a predictor for GOCB. A similar observation can be made for NC. Although the ordinal variable of ONC was found

to significantly affect GOCB in a One-way ANOVA test, both the bivariate analysis and the regression MLR_2b provided contrary results. Although there might be a non-linear relationship between ONC and GOCB, the assumption that ONC is a predictor for GOCB cannot be assured with confidence in light of a missing linear relationship, which this study tried to confirm. Hence, this study was not able to confirm hypothesis H2b, but had to reject it.

The previously introduced Table 3 holds additional information about the hierarchical relationship that was tested in order to make a statement for hypothesis H6-H8. Step one of the hierarchical multiple regressions included entering all dummy variables as well as the interval variable conscientiousness and the respective commitment variable on the organizational level.

Table-3. Multiple Regression & Hierarchical Multiple Regression

| Multiple Regression & Hierarchical Multiple Regression | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|-----------|--------|--------|---|--------|--------|-------------------------------------|--------|--------|
| | Commitment type | | | | | | | | | |
| | AC ^b | Normative | | | Continuance Perceived High Sacrifice | | | Continuance Lack of Alternatives | | |
| | B | B | B | | B | B | | B | B | |
| Hierarchical Multiple Regression | | | HMLR_6 | | | HMLR_7 | | | HMLR_8 | |
| | | | Step 1 | Step 2 | | Step 1 | Step 2 | | Step 1 | Step 2 |
| Multiple Regression | MLR_1a | MLR_2a | MLR_2b | | MLR_3a | MLR_3a | | MLR_4a | MLR_4b | |
| Dummy variables | | | | | | | | | | |
| City | .36*** | .20 | .24* | .24 | -.08 | .15 | .06 | .21 | .24 | .22 |
| Large corporation | .18* | .12 | .12 | .12 | .26* | .12 | .24* | .09 | .08 | .09 |
| Large team size | .21** | .09 | .09 | .09 | .07 | -.05 | .03 | .01 | .07 | .01 |
| Low team tenure | .15* | .11 | .14 | .14 | .18 | .13 | .18 | .09 | .10 | .10 |
| Meeting frequency | .12 | .12 | .15 | .15 | .15 | .13 | .15 | .07 | .11 | .07 |
| Control variable | | | | | | | | | | |
| Conscientiousness | .22* | .35* | .29 | .29 | .22 | .25 | .20 | .37* | .39* | .35* |
| Main research var. | | | | | | | | | | |
| (1a) GAC | .41*** | | | | | | | | | |
| (2a) GNC | | .07 | | | .01 | | | | | |
| (2b) ONC | | | .09 | | .09 | | | | | |
| (3a) GCC-HiSac | | | | | .24* | | .20* | | | |
| (3b) OCC-HiSac | | | | | | .15* | .05 | | | |
| (4a) GCC-LoAlt | | | | | | | | .06 | | .06 |
| (4b) OCC-LoAlt | | | | | | | | | -.02 | -.03 |
| R ² | .81 | .43 | .46 | .46 | .61 | .52 | .62 | .44 | .41 | .45 |
| Adjusted R ² | .76 | .27 | .30 | .27 | .50 | .39 | .49 | .29 | .25 | .26 |
| F | 15.31*** | 2.72* | 2.98* | 2.51* | 5.55*** | 3.94** | 4.79** | 2.84* | 2.51* | 2.43* |

***p<.001, ** p<.01, * p<.05

Step 2 consisted of entering the respective workgroup commitment variable that was to be contrasted to the organizational level. As a result, perceived high sacrifice was found to have a significant unique predictive capacity

only on the workgroup level (GCC-HiSac/GOCB: $B=.20, p \leq .05$) in the corresponding HMLR_7 regression (Adjusted $R^2=.49, F=4.79, p(F) \leq .001, \Delta$ in $R^2=.09, F$ for Δ in $R^2=5.63, p(F\Delta R^2) \leq .05$). On the grounds of NC and CC-LoAlt not having a predictive capacity for GOCB, hypotheses H6 and H8 are presumed to get no support in a hierarchical multiple regression construct. This is confirmed through the regressions HMLR_6 and HMLR_8. Therefore, H6 and H8 have to be rejected.

3.5. Results of the Two-way ANOVA

Given that OAC could not be analyzed in the context of regressions, Table 4 and Table 5 display the results of the Two-way ANOVA that had been catered towards receiving information in order to confirm or reject hypothesis H5.

Table-4. Descriptive of Between-Subjects Two-way ANOVA

| Two-Way ANOVA ^a | | | | |
|----------------------------|----------|------|---------------|----|
| Descriptives | | | | |
| | | Mean | Std.Deviation | n |
| GAC low | OAC low | 3.68 | .35 | 10 |
| | OAC high | 3.99 | .37 | 6 |
| | Total | 3.79 | .38 | 16 |
| GAC high | OAC low | 4.05 | .25 | 6 |
| | OAC high | 4.11 | .29 | 11 |
| | Total | 4.09 | .27 | 17 |
| | OAC low | 3.82 | .36 | 16 |
| | OAC high | 4.06 | .31 | 17 |
| | Total | 3.95 | .35 | 33 |

a. Dependent variable: GOCB; GAC: Affective Commitment directed towards the workgroup; OAC: Affective Commitment directed towards the organization

Table-5. Between-Subjects Two-way ANOVA

| Two-way ANOVA ^a | | | |
|----------------------------------|------|---------|--------------------------|
| Test of Between-Subjects Effects | | | |
| | F | p-value | Partial Eta ² |
| GAC | 4.60 | .041 | .137 |
| OAC | 2.49 | .126 | .079 |
| Interaction Effect | 1.20 | .283 | .040 |

a. Dependent variable: GOCB; GAC: Affective Commitment directed towards the workgroup; OAC: Affective Commitment directed towards the organization

The Two-way ANOVA displays that GAC is a unique independent predictor for GOCB above and beyond any AC that might be present on the organizational level (GAC: $F=4.60, p \leq .05$; OAC: $F=2.49, p=.13$). Moreover, GAC's partial eta squared value indicates that 14% of the variance in GOCB can be explained by low or high values of GAC. Last, the Two-way ANOVA yields that no significant interaction effect between GAC and OAC could be observed ($F=1.20, p=.28$).

Hence, hypothesis H5, stating that GAC is a stronger predictor for GOCB than GOC, can be confirmed with confidence. In the table below (Table6. Summary of Findings), a summary of the hypotheses is presented. As it can be seen, there are a few interesting and unexpected findings.

Table-6. Summary of Findings

| Hypothesis No. | Commitment Type | Foci Type | Predictive capacity for GOCB |
|----------------|-------------------|--------------|------------------------------|
| H1a | Affective | Workgroup | confirmed |
| H1b | Affective | organization | confirmed |
| H2a | Normative | workgroup | Rejected |
| H2b | Normative | organization | Rejected |
| H3a | High Sacrifice | workgroup | Confirmed |
| H3b | High Sacrifice | organization | confirmed |
| H4a | Lack Alternatives | workgroup | Rejected |
| H4b | Lack Alternatives | Organization | Rejected |
| H5 | Affective | | Confirmed |
| H6 | Normative | | Rejected |
| H7 | High Sacrifice | | Confirmed |
| H8 | Lack Alternatives | | Rejected |

Source: Authors

4. CONCLUSION

The results of this paper show that commitment in general is positively related to GOCB, which is in line with what one may assume when reviewing the literature on OCB and commitment. However, a relationship could not be established between all dimensions of commitment and OCB. NC and CC-LoAlt across both foci did not show any relationship with GOCB. In several studies, CC has not shown any relationship or a negative relationship with OCB (Lambert *et al.*, 2013). When examining the results of the two dimensions of CC and their relation to GOCB, they are in line with Vandenberghe *et al.* (2007) observations on commitment in relation to other organizational outcomes. This study, hence, gives further support to the idea that one should split CC into the two dimensions of HiSac and LoAlt, especially in a group setting. As HiSac is a somewhat recently adopted dimension in research and has been very limitedly studied on the group level, not that much can be said about it. While it is referring to factors such as compensation and work environment, one should also consider group level implications. One can theorize that this case is extra important as HiSac might be of higher importance in a group focus compared to an organizational focus. This is reasonable, as you have a social component on the group level (Nielsen *et al.*, 2009). Heffner and Rentsch (2001) point out that research has indicated that employees in general will report higher social interaction towards proximal constituencies compared to distant constituencies. HiSac may be more relevant as one might sacrifice relationships that one has with coworkers along with feelings of social belongingness to a group. This can be argued to be more significant on an entity close to the individual (workgroup) rather than one that is more distant.

LoAlt on the other side is reasonably the component of CC that is uncorrelated and sometimes negatively correlated with OCB. In this study, it could, as expected, not be shown that LoAlt had an influence on GOCB. Several researchers have identified that CC should be split into these two parts and have also observed that LoAlt has no or a negative effect on organizational outcomes. NC has previously been shown to relate to OCB (Vigoda-Gadot *et al.*, 2007). This relationship could however not be shown in this study, for either of the foci, when relating it to GOCB. This was, thus, an unexpected result. However, several researchers have found NC to be problematic and in some cases redundant (Cohen, 2007). One suggestion for why the ambiguity of NC exists is that the commitment form captures a propensity to be committed rather than 'real' commitment. It has also been pointed out that NC and AC have several conceptual overlaps (Ko *et al.*, 1997). The empirical findings on NC may contradict Pohl and Paillé (2011) findings on the same construct in line with the proposition by Vigoda-Gadot *et al.* (2007) that group level analysis can provide results that analyses on the individual level or aggregated individual level cannot capture. This could give an explanation for the results of NC in this study. However, since no strong relationships for NC is observed, it is difficult to draw any conclusions. It could be assumed that NC in the group context is different forms individual context. On the group level focus, HiSac may capture some of the attachments that may not exist on the individual level. For instance, if taking a social perspective, HiSac and NC could be closely related. If an employee

decides to leave a group where he or she has close social ties, leaving is a personal sacrifice, but at the same time, a breach of expectations from the group. Thus, HiSac and NC are in this case two sides of the same coin. As established earlier, AC is generally viewed to be the most important form of commitment to study in relationship discretionary behavior, both in individual and group level analyses (Wasti and Can, 2008). The results in this thesis could partially support this. Even though this study did not directly test for it, it appears that AC is the strongest predictor of GOCB among the different commitment types in the TCM. When complementing the TCM with the two dimensions of CC, it would appear in contrast to theory on the individual level, that CC in the aspect of HiSac has a stronger relationship with GOCB than NC.

This study has been examining the group level outcomes of employee commitment across the workgroup and organizational foci in relationship with discretionary behavior. The results of this study indicate that while both organizationally directed commitment and workgroup commitment has an effect on GOCB, commitment towards the group is more important. Another finding is that the two sub-dimensions of continuance commitment, perceived high sacrifice and lack of alternatives, are relevant to take into account when examining GOCB. The results have important practical implications since it shows that organizations should be concerned with building commitment in general, and that managers should focus their efforts on building attachment to groups rather than attachment to the organization. Also, in order to build commitment in teams, managers should try to find out how they can increase the perceived sacrifice for individuals of leaving the group, as this is shown to have a strong relationship with GOCB. Even though this study has several limitations, especially concerning sample size, this paper has outlined interesting possible directions for future research on commitment in a group context. However, further research is needed to understand how commitment among individuals in group settings affects group outcomes. The same is true for discretionary behavior in group settings.

REFERENCES

- Becker, S.H., 1960. Notes on the concept of commitment. *American Journal of Sociology*, 66(1): 32-40.
- Biemer, P.P. and L.E. Lyberg, 2003. *Introduction to survey quality*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Chen, X.P., S.S.K. Lam, J. Schaubroeck and S. Naumann, 2002. Group organizational citizenship behavior: A conceptualization and preliminary test of its antecedents and consequences. Paper Presented at the Academy of Management Proceedings, 1: K1-K6.
- Chen, Z.X. and A.M. Francesco, 2003. The relationship between the three components of commitment and employee performance in China. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 62(17): 490-510.
- Cohen, A., 2007. Commitment before and after: An evaluation and reconceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 17(3): 336-354.
- Cohen, S.G. and D.E. Bailey, 1997. What makes teams work: Group effectiveness research from the shop floor to the executive suite. *Journal of Management*, 23(3): 239-290.
- Currall, L.A., R.H. Forrester, J.F. Dawson and M.A. West, 2001. It's what you do and the way that you do it: Team task, team size, and innovation-related group processes. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 10(2): 187-204.
- Davoudi, S.M.M., 2012. A comprehensive study of organizational citizenship behavior (OCB): Introducing the term, clarifying its consequences and identifying its antecedents. *Arth Prabhand: A Journal of Economics and Management*, 1(2): 73-85.
- De Dreu, C.K. and L.R. Weingart, 2003. Task versus relationship conflict, team performance, and team member satisfaction: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(4): 741-749.
- Forsyth, D.R., 2010. *Group dynamics*. Wadsworth: Cengage Learning.
- Heffner, T.S. and J.R. Rentsch, 2001. Organizational commitment and social interaction: A multiple constituencies approach. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 59(12): 471-490.
- Jaros, S.J., 1997. An assessment of Meyer and Allen's (1991) three-component model of organizational commitment and turnover intentions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 51(3): 319-337.

- Ko, J., J.L. Price and C.W. Mueller, 1997. Assessment of Meyer and Allen's three-component model of organizational commitment in South Korea. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82(6): 961–973.
- Lambert, E.G., B. Kim, T. Kelley and N.L. Hogan, 2013. The association of affective and continuance commitment with correctional staff life satisfaction. *Social Science Journal*, 50(2): 195-203.
- Lavelle, J.J., J. Brockner, M.A. Konovsky, K.H. Price, A.B. Henley, A. Taneja and V. Vinekar, 2009. Commitment, procedural fairness, and organizational citizenship behavior: A multifoci analysis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 30(3): 337-357.
- LePine, J.A., A. Erez and D.E. Johnson, 2002. The nature and dimensionality of organizational citizenship behavior: A critical review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(1): 52-65.
- Løwendahl, B., 2005. Strategic management of professional service firms. Copenhagen: Copenhagen Business School Press.
- Meyer, J.P. and N.J. Allen, 1991. A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1(1): 61-89.
- Meyer, J.P. and L. Herscovitch, 2001. Commitment in the workplace: Toward a general model. *Human Resource Management Review*, 11(3): 299-326.
- Meyer, J.P. and N.M. Parfyonova, 2010. Normative commitment in the workplace: A theoretical analysis and re-conceptualization. *Human Resource Management Review*, 20(4): 283-294.
- Mickan, S. and S. Rodger, 2000. The organisational context for teamwork: Comparing health care and business literature. *Australian Health Review*, 23(1): 179-192.
- Morrow, P.C., 2011. Managing organizational commitment: Insights from longitudinal research. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 79(1): 18-35.
- Nielsen, T.M., G.A. Hrivnak and M. Shaw, 2009. Organizational citizenship behavior and performance a meta-analysis of group-level research. *Small Group Research*, 40(5): 555-577.
- Northouse, P.G., 2013. Leadership: Theory and practice. 6th Edn., Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Okhuysen, G.A. and K.M. Eisenhardt, 2002. Integrating knowledge in groups: How formal interventions enable flexibility. *Organization Science*, 13(4): 370-386.
- Organ, D.W., 1988. Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome. Lexington, Mass: Lexington Books.
- Organ, D.W., P.M. Podsakoff and S.B. MacKenzie, 2006. Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature, antecedents, and consequences. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Podsakoff, P.M., B.S. MacKenzie, J.B. Paine and G.D. Bachrach, 2000. Organizational citizenship behaviors: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research. *Journal of Management*, 26(3): 513-563.
- Pohl, S. and P. Paillé, 2011. The impact of perceived organizational commitment and leader commitment on organizational citizenship behaviour. *International Journal of Organization Theory & Behavior PrAcademics Press*, 14(2): 117-133.
- Reichers, A.E., 1985. A review and reconceptualization of organizational commitment. *Academy of Management Review*, 10(3): 465-476.
- Rotundo, M. and P.R. Sackett, 2002. The relative importance of task, citizenship, and counterproductive performance to global ratings of job performance: A policy-capturing approach. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(1): 66-80.
- Saks, A.M., 2006. Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21(7): 600-619.
- Salas, E., N.J. Cooke and M.A. Rosen, 2008. On teams, teamwork, and team performance: Discoveries and developments. *Human Factors*, 50(3): 540-547.
- Schön, L., 2007. En modern svensk ekonomisk historia: Tillväxt och omvandling under två sekel. 2nd Edn., Stockholm: SNS Förlag.
- Scott, T.W. and P. Tiessen, 1999. Performance measurement and managerial teams. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 24(3): 263-285.
- Smith, C., D.W. Organ and J.P. Near, 1983. Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68(4): 653-663.

- Stinglhamber, F., K. Bentein and C. Vandenberghe, 2002. Extension of the three-component model of commitment to five foci: Development of measures and substantive test. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, 18(2): 123–138.
- Van Dyne, L., L.L. Cummings and P.J. McLean, 1995. Extra-role behaviors-in pursuit of construct and definitional clarity a bridge over muddied waters. *Research in Organizational Behavior: An Annual Series of Analytical Essays and Critical Reviews*, 17(9): 215-285.
- Vandenberghe, C., K. Bentein, R. Michon, J. Chebat, M. Tremblay and J. Fils, 2007. An examination of the role of perceived support and employee commitment in employee-customer encounters. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(4): 1177-1187.
- Vandenberghe, C., K. Bentein and F. Stinglhamber, 2004. Affective commitment to the organization, supervisor, and work group: Antecedents and outcomes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 64(1): 47-71.
- Vigoda-Gadot, E., I. Beerli, T. Birman-Shemesh and A. Somech, 2007. Group-level organizational citizenship behavior in the education system: A scale reconstruction and validation. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 43(4): 462-493.
- Von Nordenflycht, A., 2010. What is a professional service firm? Toward a theory and taxonomy of knowledge-intensive firms. *Academy of Management Review*, 35(1): 155-174.
- Wasti, S.A. and Ö. Can, 2008. Affective and normative commitment to organization, supervisor, and coworkers: Do collectivist values matter? *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 73(3): 404-413.
- Wheelan, S.A., 2013. *Creating effective teams: A guide for members and leaders*. 4th Edn., Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Views and opinions expressed in this article are the views and opinions of the authors, International Journal of Asian Social Science shall not be responsible or answerable for any loss, damage or liability etc. caused in relation to/arising out of the use of the content.