

The Role of Demographic Factors in Predicting Organizational Commitment Among Security Employees

PhD Cand. Abdülkadir AVCI

Suleyman Demirel University Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences

Prof. Dr. Ramazan ERDEM

Suleyman Demirel University Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences

Abstract

The construct, "organizational commitment" has been a subject of interest for a long time for the people who study the organizational psychology. Employees' organizational commitment is a complex matter and there are many factors which affect the organizational commitment of employees. Even though the organization has important role in it, demographic and individual characteristics of employees have also significant influence on organizational commitment. In this study a cross-sectional survey was conducted using a convenience sample of 336 security employees in a military organization to establish possible relationship between organisational commitment and important demographic variables (nationality, rank, gender, age, education, marital status, tenure). The data obtained by the survey were analysed using the SPSS 21.0 package program. In statistical analyses, T-test and variance (ANOVA) analyses were used. The results of the data showed that affective commitment of employees who had been working between 11-15 years was significantly differentiated from those of working years over 25 years. The results of this study also showed that officers had more normative commitment than civilians and the supervisors had less normative commitment than non-supervisors. The analysis also showed that males and younger employees differed significantly in normative commitment than their female counterparts and older employees. However, no statistically significant difference was found in education and marital status.

Keywords: Organizational commitment, demographic factor, security employees.

Introduction

Organizational commitment is at the forefront concept that has been extensively addressed since the 1950s in the literature of organizational behavior and it is more often associated with job satisfaction, organizational citizenship behavior, burnout, motivation, and loyalty. Kelman (1958:53) expressed commitment concept in terms of changes in attitudes and actions produced by social influence may occur at different levels and distinguished three different process of influence as compliance, identification and internalization. (Buchanan, 1974: 533) called commitment as a partisan, affective attachment to the goals and values of an organization, to one's role in relation to goals and values, and to the organization for its own sake, apart from its purely instrumental worth and emphasized that commitment had consists of three components; (a) identification-adoption as one's own the goals and values of the organization, (b) involvement-psychological immersion or absorption in the activities of one's work role, and (c) loyalty-a feeling of affection for and attachment to the organization. According to O'Reilly and Chatman (1986: 493) "organizational commitment is conceived of as the psychological attachment felt by the person for the organization; it will reflect the degree to which the individual internalizes or adopts characteristics or perspectives of the organization."

There are many factors that affect organizational commitment. At the end of meta-analyses Mathieu ve Zajac (1990: 175) divided factors that affect organizational commitment into five groups: personal characteristics (age, sex, education, marital status, position tenure, organizational tenure, perceived personal competence, ability, salary, protestant work ethic and job level), job characteristics (skill variety, task autonomy, challenge, job scope), group-leader relations (group cohesiveness, task interdependence, leader initiating structure, leader consideration, leader communication and perceived leadership), organizational characteristics (organizational size and organizational centralization) and role states (role ambiguity, role conflict and role overload). But Meyer et al. (2002: 28-32) proposed four groups: demographic variables (age, gender, education, and organization tenure), individual differences (locus of control and self-efficacy), work experiences (organizational support, role ambiguity and role conflict) and alternatives/investments.

When the studies on commitment are searched; Meyer and Allen's (1991) three-component model of organizational commitment has become the dominant model for study of organizational commitment and has been used widespread in organizational behavior research. Meyer and Allen's (1991: 67-69; 1997: 11-13) three-component model of commitment has three different components that correspond with different psychological states: (a) a desire (affective commitment), (b) a need (continuance commitment), and (c) an obligation (normative commitment) to maintain employment in an organization. (Meyer and Allen, 1997: 61).

In this study, it is aimed to examine the organizational commitment of security employees in terms of various demographic characteristics (nationality, status, gender, age, education, supervisor, marital status, tenure).

Methods

In this study a cross-sectional survey was conducted using a convenience sample of 336 security employees in a military organization consisting of seventeen countries: Turkey, U.S.A., Germany, Portugese, Slovenia, Austria, Poland, Greece, Swiss, Ireland, Hungary, Romania, Croatia, Czech Republic, Sweden, Italy, Finland, Denmark, Norway, Britain, Netherlands, Ukraine, Canada, Lithuanian, Bulgaria, Albania and Kosovo. Country-based assessment was not made because of the number of countries is in large and the number of personnel in the participating countries varies considerably from each other. Instead, a four-zone grouping was used to categorize European countries. (United Nations E-Government Survey, New York, 2016, pp.219). The countries in Europe have been categorized in the study as North-Western Europe and South-Eastern Europe. Descriptive statistics of participants are shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics of the Participants

Demographic Variables	Category	N	%
Nationality	Turkey	54	16,1
	North American Countries	44	13,2
	North and Western European Countries	96	28,5
	Southern and Eastern European Countries	142	42,2
Status	Officer	185	55,1
	Non-Commissioned Officer	115	34,2
	Civilian Employee	36	10,7
Supervising	Supervisor	222	66
	Non-supervisor	114	34

Gender	Male	303	90,2
	Female	33	9,8
Tenure	1-5 years	33	9,8
	6-10 years	75	22,4
	11-15 years	73	21,7
	16-24 years	95	28,3
	More than 25 years	60	17,8
Marital Status	Single	80	23,8
	Married	218	64,9
	Divorced and others.	38	11,3
Education	High School and Middle School Graduate	90	26,8
	College/University Graduate	142	42,2
	Post Graduate Degree	104	31
Age	22-34	132	39,3
	35 and Over	204	60,7

In the study, based on the Three-Component Model (TCM) of commitment (Meyer & Allen, 1991;1997), the TCM Employee Commitment Survey was used to determine the organizational commitment of participants. Confirmatory factor analysis was applied to investigate the construct validity of the model and results suggested that three-component model of Meyer-Allen was valid. Nine items with a factor load of less than 0.32 were excluded from the analysis and the model was analysed with; 5 items related to Affective Commitment, 6 items related to Continuance Commitment and 4 items related to Normative Commitment.

Results

The effect of participants' demographic variables (nationality, status, supervising, gender, tenure, marital status, educational level and age) on organizational commitment was tested by t-test and analysis of variance (ANOVA). The results of the analyses are shown in Tables 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7.

As shown in Table 2, the difference in affective commitment ($F_{335}=,117, p>,05$) and continuance commitment ($F_{335}=,382, p>,05$) does not have significant effect on status. This result showed that, status does not have any effect on affective commitment and continuance commitment. In the Normative Commitment ($F_{335}=8,322, p<,05$) dimension, the difference was found to be significant. It has been found that the normative commitment of officers and non-commissioned officer differs significantly from civilian employees.

Table 2. Anova Results by Status

	Status	N	Mean	S. Deviation	sd	F	P
Affective Commitment	Officer	185	5,09	1,22	2/333	,117	,838
	Non-Commissioned Officer	115	5,13	1,11			

	Civilian Employee	36	5,22	1,34			
Continuance Commitment	Officer	185	4,04	1,21	2/333	,382	,683
	Non-Commissioned Officer	115	4,15	1,05			
	Civilian Employee	36	4,00	1,31			
Normative Commitment	Officer	185	4,3324	1,03	2/333	8,322	,000
	Non-Commissioned Officer	115	4,07	,86			
	Civilian Employee	36	3,60	1,41			

As shown in Table 3, the difference in normative commitment ($F_{335}=,789, p>,05$) and continuance commitment ($F_{335}=1,159, p>,05$) did not have significant effect on tenure. This result showed that, tenure does not have any effect on normative commitment and continuance commitment. In the Affective Commitment ($F_{335}=2,900, p<,05$) dimension, the difference was found to be significant. It has been found that the affective commitment of employees working in the organization between 11-15 years significantly from 25 years and over.

Table 3. Anova Results by Tenure

	Tenure	N	Mean	S. Deviation	sd	F	P
Affective Commitment	1-5 years	33	5,01	1,28	4/331	2,900	,022
	6-10 years	75	4,98	1,26			
	11-15 years	73	5,36	,99			
	16-24 years	95	5,29	1,15			
	25 years and over	60	4,77	1,25			
Continuance Commitment	1-5 years	33	3,86	1,09	4/331	1,159	,329
	6-10 years	75	4,22	1,09			
	11-15 years	73	4,17	1,17			
	16-24 years	95	4,08	1,18			
	25 years and over	60	3,87	1,28			
Normative Commitment	1-5 years	33	4,00	,83	4/331	,789	,533
	6-10 years	75	4,20	,90			
	11-15 years	73	4,31	1,10			
	16-24 years	95	4,07	1,20			
	25 years and over	60	4,16	,98			

As shown in Table 4, the difference in normative commitment ($F_{335}=92,578, p>,05$) and continuance commitment ($F_{335}=10,337, p>,05$) has significant effect on nationality. It has been found that the continuance commitment of Turkey participants differs significantly from European countries participants, normative commitment of Turkey participants differs significantly from all the countries soldiers and normative commitment of North American countries participants differs significantly from southern and eastern european countries. In the affective commitment ($F_{335}=2,649, p<,05$) dimension the difference was not found to be significant. This result showed that, nationality does not have any effect on affective commitment.

Table 4. Anova Results by Nationality

	Nationality	N	Mean	S. Deviation	sd	F	P
Affective Commitment	Turkey	54	5,40	1,37	3/332	2,649	,049
	North American C.	44	5,25	1,09			
	North and Western European C.	96	4,86	1,17			
	Southern and Eastern European C.	142	5,14	1,14			
Continuance Commitment	Turkey	54	4,78	1,11	3/332	10,337	,000
	North American C.	44	4,31	1,04			
	North and Western European C.	96	3,89	,96			
	Southern and Eastern European C.	142	3,86	1,25			
Normative Commitment	Turkey	54	5,50	,85	3/332	92,578	,000
	North American C.	44	4,75	,63			
	North and Western European C.	96	4,04	,67			
	Southern and Eastern European C.	142	3,55	,84			

As shown in Table 5, the difference in normative commitment [$t_{(303)}=3,092$; $p<0,01$] has significant effect on gender. It has been found that the normative commitment of males are higher than females and differs significantly.

Table 5. T Test Results by Gender

	Gender	N	Mean	S. Deviation	t	p
Affective Commitment	Male	303	5,10	1,19	-,766	0,444
	Female	33	5,27	1,17		
Continuance Commitment	Male	303	4,06	1,17	-,402	,688
	Female	33	4,15	1,18		
Normative Commitment	Male	303	4,22	1,03	3,092	,002
	Female	33	3,63	,98		

As shown in Table 6, the difference in normative commitment [$t_{(222)}= 2,700$; $p<0,01$] has significant effect on supervising. It has been found that the normative commitment of non-supervisors is higher than supervisors and differs significantly.

Table 6. T Test Results by Supervising

	Supervising	N	Mean	S. Deviation	t	p
Affective Commitment	Supervisor	222	5,05	1,21	-1,387	,167
	Non-supervisor	114	5,24	1,15		

Continuance Commitment	Supervisor	222	4,13	1,15	1,271	,205
	Non-supervisor	114	3,96	1,20		
Normative Commitment	Supervisor	222	4,27	1,02	2,700	,007
	Non-supervisor	114	3,95	1,07		

As shown in Table 7, the difference in normative commitment [$t_{(132)} = 4,563$; $p < 0,05$] has significant effect on age. It has been found that the normative commitment of 22-34 ages is higher than 35 and over ages and differs significantly.

Table 7. T Test Results by Age

	Age	N	Mean	S. Deviation	t	p
Affective Commitment	22-34	132	5,13	1,20	,295	,588
	35 and Over	204	5,11	1,19		
Continuance Commitment	22-34	132	4,13	1,13	,553	,458
	35 and Over	204	4,04	1,20		
Normative Commitment	22-34	132	4,18	,93	4,563	,033
	35 and Over	204	4,14	1,11		

The one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) is used to determine whether there are any statistically significant differences between educational level and marital status of participants. As a result of the analysis, the educational level and marital status of participants did not seem to have a significant effect on affective, continuance and normative commitment.

Conclusion

The results from these study indicated that the demographic factors; nationality, status, supervising, gender, tenure and age significantly differ organizational commitment except marital status and educational level. In conclusion: (1) Normative commitment of officers and non-commissioned officer differs significantly from civilian employees. (2) Continuance commitment of Turkey participants differs significantly from European countries participants, normative commitment of Turkey participants differs significantly from all the countries soldiers and normative commitment of North American countries participants differs significantly from southern and eastern European countries. (3) Normative commitment of males is higher than females. (4) Normative commitment of non-supervisors is higher than supervisors. (5) Normative commitment of 22-34 ages is higher than 35 and over age. (6) Educational level and marital status of participants doesn't differ significantly.

This study showed that demographic factors have effect on different dimensions of organizational commitment. Most of the obtained results of the present study are in conformity with previous studies. But this study also shows contradictions with antecedents. For example, two meta-analyses – Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch, and Teplitsky (2002) and Mathieu and Zajac (1990) – find no effect of age, gender or education on either affective or continuance commitment. Organizational commitment of employees has always been important issue and should be taken into consideration for managers. However, there is no universal set of rules that can be applied in every organization and it should never be forgotten the importance of individual values in understanding commitment in the workplace.

References

- [1] Buchanan, B. (1974). Building Organizational Commitment: The Socialization of Managers In Work Organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 19(4), pp. 533-546.
- [2] Kelman, H. C. (1958). Compliance, Identification, and Internalization: Three Processes of Attitude Change. *The Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 2(1), pp. 51-60.
- [3] Mathieu, J. E., and Zajac, D. M. (1990). A Review and Meta-Analysis of the Antecedents, Correlates, and Consequences of Organizational Commitment. *Psychological Bulletin*, 108(2), pp. 171-194.
- [4] Meyer, J. P. and Allen, N. J. (1991). A Three-Component Conceptualization of Organizational Commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1(1), pp. 61-89.
- [5] Meyer, J. P. and Allen, N. J. (1997). *Commitment in the Workplace: Theory, Research, and Application*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- [6] Meyer, J. P., Stanley, D. J., Herscovitch, L., & Topolnytsky, L. (2002). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: A meta-analysis of antecedents, correlates, and consequences. *Journal of vocational behavior*, 61(1), 20-52.
- [7] O'Reilly, C. A. and Chatman, C. (1986). Organizational Commitment and Psychological Attachment: The Effects of Compliance, Identification, and Internalization on Prosocial Behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(3), pp. 492-499.
- [8] United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs. (2016) United Nations E-Government Survey E-Government In Support Of Sustainable Development, New York.