

SOUTH ASIAN JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT RESEARCH (SAJMR)

Volume 5 Number 1

January 2013

CONTENTS

Editorial Note

- Impact of Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Commitment on Organizational Effectiveness** 369
Dr. Luxmi Malodia
- Motivational level, Locus of Control and Burnout among Entrepreneurs** 383
Dr. Zafrul Allam
- The Impact of Bank-Specific and Macroeconomic Variables on the Profitability of Public Sector Banks in India: A Panel Study** 391
Bukka Mahesh Kumar, R. Prabhakar Rao
- Transportation Vehicles Management in Andhra Pradesh: A Case Study** 399
Prof. V.V.N. Somayajulu, K.A. Rajani, Naresh. R. Bodkhe
- Book Review**
- Software Project Management: A Real World Guide To Success** 408
Dr. S. D. Bhoite



**Chhatrapati Shahu Institute of Business
Education and Research (CSIBER)**

(An Autonomous Institute)

University Road, Kolhapur- 416 004 Maharashtra State, India.

SOUTH ASIAN JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT RESEARCH (SAJMR)

ISSN 0974-763X

(An International Peer Reviewed Research Journal)

Published By

Chhatrapati Shahu Institute of Business Education and Research (CSIBER)

University Road, Kolhapur – 416 004, Maharashtra, India

Ph: 91-231-2535706/07 Fax: 91-231-2535708 Website: www.siberindia.co.in

Email: sajmr@siberindia.co.in, sibersajmr@gmail.com



- Patron
Late Dr. A. D. Shinde
- Editor
Dr. T. V. G. Sarma
CSIBER, Kolhapur, India
- Editorial Board Members
Dr. Francisco J. L. S. Diniz
CETRAD, Portugal
- Dr. R. A. Shinde**
CSIBER, Kolhapur, India
- Dr. Paul B. Carr**
Regent University, USA
- Dr. M. M. Ali**
Director, CSIBER, Kolhapur, India
- Dr. R. V. Kulkarni**
CSIBER, Kolhapur, India
- Dr. Babu Thomas**
St. Aloysius Inst. Of Mgt. & IT. Mangalore, India
- Dr. Lal Das**
RSSW, Hyderabad, India
- Dr. M. Nand Kumar**
Goa University, Goa
- Dr. Gary Owens**
CERAR, Australia
- Dr. P.R. Puranik**
NMU, Jalgaon, India
- Dr. Babu Zachariah**
SIBER, Kolhapur, India
- Dr. Rajendra Nargundkar**
IFIM, Bangalore, India
- Dr. Yogesh B. Patil**
Symboisis Inst. of International Business, Pune, India
- Dr. R. M. Bhajracharya**
Kathmandu University, Nepal
- Dr. R. L. Hyderabad**
Karnataka University, India
- Dr. K. Pradeepkumar**
SIBER, Kolhapur,
- Dr. K. V. M. Varambally**
Manipal Inst. of Management, India
- Dr. B. U. Dhandra**
Gulbarga University, India
- Academic Assistance
Mr. V. Ravi Kishore Kumar
CSIBER, Kolhapur

Volume 5 Number 1

Editorial Note

Impact of Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Commitment on Organizational Effectiveness
Dr. Leena Moolali

Motivational Level, Locus of Control and Burnout among Entrepreneurs
Dr. Satish Akhate

The Impact of Bank Specific and Macroeconomic Variables on Profitability of Public Sector Banks in India: A Panel Study
Bukka Mahesh Kumar, Prasadnagar, India

Transportation Vehicles Management in Andhra Pradesh: A Case Study
Prof. V.M. Somayajulu, A. Balakrishna, Mahesh R. Bobbili

Book Review

Software Project Management: A Real World Guide To Success
Dr. S. D. Brown



Editorial Note

The world is passing through a severe economic turbulence. There is a downturn in the business world over and the performance indicators of many countries are showing a downward trend. The dynamics of the global businesses is also taking its toll on the performance of Indian business houses. The prices of most of the necessities have sky rocketed and on the foreign front the value of the rupee has been constantly depreciating. The unstable political situations in many states is adding to the cup of sorrows the country is facing in the recent times.

The policy makers and the planners are at crossroads to lay down a long term growth plan. The existing knowledge bank with the nation is seemingly inadequate to address and overcome the crises situation arising in the different sectors. In this context research on the variety of problems being faced by the different sectors and studies aimed at going to the root cause of the problems gain importance. The present volume of SAJMR is a humble contribution in this direction. The interdisciplinary nature of the articles encourages the researchers to take a broader view of the research problems and give a new insight into the problems being encountered in India in particular and the world at large. This interdisciplinary approach of the journal has been maintained since its inception five years ago. The research articles included in this issue too fall under this category. Articles dealing with transport sector management to the individual organization studies dealing with business are published in this issue. Any branch of knowledge cannot be said to be in tune with times if it does not have link with the information technology era. Accordingly a book review dealing with database management has been specially selected for the issue.

We are sure that the research articles with their applied methodology will serve as guide to new researchers and contribute to give new insight into the respective field of study.

Dr. T. V. G. Sarma

Editor

Impact of Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Commitment on Organizational Effectiveness

Dr. Luxmi Malodia

Reader, University Business School, Panjab University, Chandigarh (luxmimalodia@yahoo.com)

Abstract : This study was designed to compare organizational citizenship Behavior s and organizational commitment of the employees in public and private sector organizations in food processing industry and to investigate the relationship of organizational citizenship Behavior s and organizational commitment with organizational effectiveness. The scope of the study was public and private sector organizations belonging to Punjab and Haryana in food processing industry. The sample comprised of 196 respondents drawn from three public sector organizations, and six private sector organizations. The results revealed a very positive correlation of organizational commitment and citizenship Behavior s of employees with organizational effectiveness. The results further revealed that organizational commitment and organizational citizenship Behavior s are the significant predictors of organizational effectiveness.

Key words: Organizational Citizenship Behavior, Organizational Effectiveness and Organizational Commitment

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Organizational Effectiveness

The success of an organization is often said to be measured in terms of its effectiveness. Effectiveness refers mainly to goal-fulfillment. Campbell (1974) holds that the global question about whether an organization is 'Effective' or 'Ineffective' is virtually useless. Effectiveness is not one thing. An organization can be effective or ineffective on a number of different facets that may be relatively independent of one another. Interest on organizational effectiveness, is of course, not a recent phenomenon. Since Adam Smith, society has tried to organize human activity to yield the highest output. In one view an organization is seen as rational set of arrangements' oriented towards achieving certain goals. From this position effectiveness can be defined in terms of goal attainment. Others take an open system view of organization and define effectiveness as the degree to which an organization can preserve the integration of its parts. In this view the organization adaptations and survival became measure of organizational effectiveness. Penning and Goodman (1977) opine that organizations are effective to the extent that relevant constraints can be satisfied and organizational results made to approximate or exceed a set of referents from multiple goals.

Etzioni (1964) defines organizational effectiveness as "the degree to which an organization realizes its goals". (Cyert and March, 1965; Gross, 1979; Rhenman, 1967; Warner, 1967; Warriner, 1965) define effectiveness in terms of degree of goal achievement typically equate "goals", "objectives", "purpose", "mission", "aims" and "task". Workers cohesion, quality, innovativeness, adaptability, ability to transact with environment, productivity, efficiency, profit generation, goal realization, resource procurement, information management and communication – All attributes that can be viewed as means either to increase the efficiency of the productive process or of gaining access to greater or more valued resources - have been noted as aspects of organizational effectiveness.

To date, researchers have proposed a variety of specific dimensions of organizational effectiveness. Dixit (1987) provided a multidimensional scale of organizational effectiveness. The scale consists of 8 dimensions that make up the organizational effectiveness construct. The 8 dimensions are – flexibility, acquisition of resources growth, planning, productivity, availability of information or communication, stability,

cohesive workforce, and satisfied workforce.

1.2 Organizational Commitment

Organizational Commitment or Member Identity is a value laden behaviorally anchored cultural variable of organizational environment. It is an attitudinal or emotive dimension of work motivation, manifesting itself in member's behavior. Organizational Commitment is widely studied area in interest of individually and collectively with other vital organizational 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 Organizational 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. In an example of the psychological approach, Sheldon (1971) defines organizational commitment as an attitude or an orientation towards the organizations, which links or attracts the identity of the person to the organizations. 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 etc.)

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 Organization/social system, as reflected in his involvement with, loyalty for and belief in the values of the Organization. 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.

Organizational Commitment was found to be a very important organizational variable defining the success of an organization in many ways (being associated with major organizational variables). Organizational commitment was found to be associated with organizational adaptability, turnover, and tardiness rate (Angle *et al.* 1981 and Thanswor *et al.* 2004) showed the strong association between the subscales of Organizational Commitment and Organizational Citizenship Behavior. Jauch and Lawrence (1978) *found in their research, that the researchers with the strongest professional commitment had higher research productivity.* A strong body of theoretical research suggesting a negative relationship specifically between higher

commitment levels and lower turnover Intentions are well established (Chen *et al.*, 1998; Cohen, 1998; Cohen, 1993; Firth *et al.*, 2004; Meyer *et al.*, 2002; Iverson, 1999; Mowday *et al.*, 1982; Rosin and Korabik, 1995; Schwepker, 2001; Shore *et al.*, 1990; Vallabh and Donald, 2001; Williams and Hazer, 1986).

Studies have also been conducted to find the association between the three subscales i.e.: Normative, Affective and Continuance components of Organizational 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.

1.3 Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Organizational citizenship Behaviors (OCBs) are employee work Behaviors 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). Citizenship behaviors are often performed by employees to support the interests of the group or organization even though they may not directly lead to individual benefits. Examples of citizenship behaviors may range from helping a co-worker with a job-related problem even when such help is not required to wearing the company logo on a sweatshirt while attending a charity event. What is important is that both these examples describe behaviors which are helpful to the company, yet they are not behaviors considered part of the core elements of the job. Thus, managers often find it difficult to reward good citizenship directly, as well as difficult to punish directly the absence of such citizenship. 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 behaviors 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 organizational citizenship behaviors. However, prosocial organizational behavior 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 behaviors in that it only includes functional behaviors, but OCBs are not directly recognized by the organizational reward system, while organizational spontaneity could be part of such a reward system.

1.4 Relationship of Organizational Effectiveness with Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Commitment

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 employees must 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 Behaviors can be said to "lubricate the social machinery of the organization". Katz (1964) identified three categories of employee's behavior essential for organizational effectiveness. According to Katz (1964), individuals must first be induced to enter and remain with an organization; as

employees, they must carry out specific role requirements in a dependable fashion; and they must engage in innovative and spontaneous activity that goes beyond role prescriptions. Hendrix and McNichols (1984) found that OE can be improved if a group processing styles in a structured autonomy situation is created. Pooja Purang (2008) observed that the positive perception of HRD climate predict a better Commitment level.

A review of the literature on citizenship indicates that researchers generally maintain that organizational citizenship behaviors stem from two motivational bases: (1) job attitudes and/or (2) disposition/ personality (Organ and Ryan, 1995). The relationship between organizational citizenship behaviors and job attitudes is rooted in social exchange theory—that is, employees engage in organizational citizenship behaviors in order to reciprocate the actions of their organizations. The second rationale holds that organizational citizenship behaviors reflect an individual's predisposition to be helpful, cooperative, or conscientious. Research on citizenship has almost exclusively concerned antecedents consistent with these theoretical bases. Examples of the antecedents examined by researchers include job attitudes such as job satisfaction (Bateman and Organ, 1983; Smith, Organ and Near, 1983; Williams and Anderson, 1992), perceptions of fairness (Moorman, 1991), job cognitions (Organ and Konovsky, 1989), dispositional factors (e.g., agreeableness, conscientiousness, and equity sensitivity; Konovsky and Organ, 1996), concern for others (McNeely and Meglino, 1994), organizational justice (Niehoff and Moorman, 1993), and collectivism (Moorman and Blakely, 1995). Additionally, Organizational Citizenship Behavior has been found to be related to task characteristics (Farh *et al.*, 1990; Moorman and Sayeed, 1992), and interpersonal trust (Podsakoff *et al.*, 1990).

The common denominator across these studies is the notion that citizenship stems from an individual's desire to help others or the organization because of disposition or a sense of obligation; describing such individuals as

"good soldiers" or "good citizens" reinforces this idea. As early as 1964, Katz recognized the importance of organizational citizenship behavior for organizational effectiveness. Katz (1964) identified three categories of employee behavior essential for organizational effectiveness. According to Katz, individuals must first be induced to enter and remain with an organization; as employees, they must carry out specific role requirements in a dependable fashion; and they must engage in innovative and spontaneous activity that goes beyond role prescriptions.

2.0 Methodology

2.1 Present study

The above mentioned and other similar studies made the plot for the present study. The authors attempt to study organizational citizenship behaviors, organizational commitment and organizational effectiveness in two strata of culturally diverse organizations. In all, nine organizations belonging to Punjab and Haryana region were studied comprising of three public sector organizations and six private sector organizations in food processing Industry. Description of the organizations is shown in Exhibit 1.

Exhibit 1

Public Sector Organizations	Hafed, Panchkula (Haryana)
	Vita, Ambala (Haryana)
	Markfed, Patiala (Punjab)
Private Sector Organizations	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)

2.2 Objectives of the Study

The paper studies organizational citizenship behaviors, organizational commitment and its impact on organizational effectiveness in food processing industry (Both Public and Private Sector organizations). The main objectives of the study are as follows:

- To compare the level of organizational commitment and citizenship behaviors of employees in public and private sector organizations of food processing industry.
- To compare the level of organizational commitment and citizenship behaviors of employees among different hierarchical levels in food processing industry.
- To find the correlation between organizational commitment of employees and organizational effectiveness in food processing industry.
- To find the correlation between organizational citizenship behavior of employees and organizational effectiveness in food processing industry.
- To find the impact of organizational citizenship behaviors and organizational commitment on organizational effectiveness in food processing industry.

2.3 Hypothesis of the Study

- H_{1a}** There is a significant difference in the level of organizational commitment and citizenship behaviors of employees in public and private sector organizations in food processing industry.
- H_{2a}** There is a significant difference in the level of organizational commitment and citizenship behaviors of employees at different hierarchical levels in food processing industry.
- H_{3a}** There is a significant correlation between organizational citizenship

behaviors and organizational effectiveness in food processing industry.

- H_{4a}** There is a significant correlation between organizational commitment and organizational effectiveness in food processing industry.
- H_{5a}** Organizational effectiveness is positively and significantly predicted by organizational citizenship behaviors of employees in food processing industry.
- H_{6a}** Organizational effectiveness is positively and significantly predicted by organizational commitment of employees in food processing industry.

2.4 Research Design

The study is descriptive and empirical in nature. Three organizations were chosen from public sector and six from the private sector of food processing industry using systematic random sample. 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 are no professional qualifications.

2.5 Measures

Primary data was collected through preliminary interviews and questionnaires ultimately. Instrument organizational citizenship Behavior questionnaire (Lynn Van Dyne, 1995) adapted by Biswjeet Pattanyak, Rajnish Kumar Mishra and Phalgu Niranjana, 2003 is used to undertake the study. The scale is multidimensional, suggesting three subscales

i.e.; Organizational Ownership (14 items), Professional Commitment (10 items) and Sharing and Involvement (8 items). The cronbach alpha coefficient of the scale was found to be 0.87.

The second part of the questionnaire (Allen & Mayer 1991) focused on Organizational Commitment. The scale is multidimensional, suggesting three subscales i.e.; Normative (7 items), Affective (12 items) and Continuance Commitment (7 items). The cronbach alpha coefficient of the scale was found to be 0.85.

The third part of the questionnaire (Dr. N. Dixit) adapted by Gupta, 1994 focused on Organizational Effectiveness, and included (24) statements covering eight effectiveness measures i.e. Flexibility, Acquisition of

resources, Planning, Productivity and efficiency, Communication, Stability, Cohesive work force and Satisfied work force. The Cronbach Alpha coefficients for all effectiveness measures were found to be 0.9339. The questionnaire also sought demographic information of respondent's i.e. age, education, marital status, hierarchical level, experience in present organization, experience in present position & total work experience.

3.0 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.

3.1 H1-To test the 1st hypothesis, Independent Sample t-test is used for sectoral comparisons The results are presented in Table 1

Table 1: Comparison vis-à-vis Public and Private sector Organizations

Dimensions	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		T-test for Equality of Means							
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		
Sharing and Involvement	Equal variances assumed	.027	.870	-0.912	194	.363	-0.40172	.44066	-1.27083	.46738
				-0.893	157.170	.373	-0.40172	.44991	-1.29037	.48692
Organization Ownership	Equal variances assumed	8.120	.005	-0.056	194	.955	-0.02802	.49893	-1.01205	.95601
				-0.053	135.812	.958	-0.02802	.52730	-1.07079	1.01476
Professional Commitment	Equal variances assumed	.012	.912	-0.806	190	.421	-0.51964	.64469	-1.79131	.75203
				-0.809	172.372	.420	-0.51964	.64250	-1.78782	.74853
Organizational Citizenship Behavior	Equal variances assumed	.971	.326	-1.028	190	.305	-1.03929	1.01053	-3.03259	.95402
				-0.993	147.081	.322	-1.03929	1.04677	-3.10793	1.02936

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		T-test for Equality of Means						
Dimensions		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
Affective Commitment	Equal variances assumed	13.937	.000	-.108	190	.914	-.08120	.75038	-1.56135	1.39895
	Equal variances not assumed			-.116	189.845	.908	-.08120	.69876	-1.45953	1.29713
Continuance Commitment	Equal variances assumed	1.421	.235	2.940	191	.004	1.38142	.46989	.45457	2.30826
	Equal variances not assumed			2.974	176.986	.003	1.38142	.46445	.46485	2.29798
Normative Commitment	Equal variances assumed	.298	.586	-.597	190	.551	-.30536	.51144	-1.31418	.70347
	Equal variances not assumed			-.597	169.986	.551	-.30536	.51171	-1.31549	.70477
Organizational Commitment	Equal variances assumed	12.628	.000	.828	183	.409	1.14911	1.38793	-1.58930	3.88752
	Equal variances not assumed			.872	182.905	.384	1.14911	1.31793	-1.45118	3.74941

In all the cases, we cannot assume equal variances for Public and Private sector Organizations as p- value of the F-test in the case of Affective commitment comes out to be less than 0.05 But the results of Independent Sample t-test suggested no difference in the level of Affective and Normative Commitment for the employees of Public and Private sector Organizations, getting p-value more than 0.05 and suggested a significant difference in the level of Continuance Commitment for the employees of Public and Private sector organizations getting p-value less than .05 (p equals .004). . Therefore the first null hypotheses i.e. there is no significant difference between the level of normative and Affective Commitment of the employees in Public and Private sector Organizations in Food Processing Industry are not rejected or may be accepted and in case of Continuance Commitment the null hypotheses is rejected. In all the cases (table-5), we cannot assume equal variances for Public and Private sector

employees samples as p- value of the F-test in the case of Organizational Ownership comes out to be less than 0.05 (p equals 0.005). But the results of Independent Sample t-test suggested no difference in the level of Professional Commitment, Organizational Ownership and Sharing and Involvement for the employees of Public and Private sector organizations, getting p-value more than 0.05 (p equals .421, .955 and .363 respectively). Therefore in the first null hypothesis i.e. there is no significant difference in the level of Professional Commitment, Organizational Ownership and Sharing and Involvement for the employees of Public and Private sector organizations in Food Processing Industry are not rejected or may be accepted.

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,

3.2 H2-To test the 2nd hypothesis, One-way ANOVA is used for multi-level comparisons.

The results are presented in Table 2.

Table 2: ANOVA (Hierarchy-wise comparison)

Variables		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Organizational Citizenship Behavior	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			
Organization 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			
Organizational 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			

.130 and .747 respectively). Therefore the second 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 second 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 second null hypothesis that

there is no significant difference in the level of Professional Commitment at different hierarchical levels is rejected.

Correlation between Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Organizational Effectiveness Measure.

The results of Karl Pearson's Correlation (Table 3) suggested that all the three Organizational Citizenship Behavior dimensions (Organization Ownership, Professional Commitment and Sharing and Involvement) were positively correlated with Organizational Effectiveness ($r = 0.166$, $r = 0.121$ and $r = 0.283$ respectively). Therefore the third null hypothesis that there is significant correlation between organizational citizenship behavior and organizational effectiveness is

3.3 H3 & H4- To test the 3rd and 4th hypothesis, Karl Pearson's Correlation is used.

The results are presented in Table 3

Table 3: Correlations

		Affective Commitment	Continuance Commitment	Normative Commitment	Organization Ownership	Professional Commitment	Sharing and Involvement	Organizational Effectiveness
Affective Commitment	Pearson Correlation	1	.415(**)	.469(**)	-.061	.352(**)	.196(**)	
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.343	.000	.002	.000
	N	240	240	240	240	240	240	240
Continuance Commitment	Pearson Correlation	.415(**)	1	.393(**)	.159(*)	-.005	.227(**)	.358(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.014	.942	.000	.000
	N	240	240	240	240	240	240	240
Normative Commitment	Pearson Correlation	.469(**)	.393(**)	1	.135(*)	.079	.163(*)	.354(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.036	.221	.011	.000
	N	240	240	240	240	240	240	240
Organization Ownership	Pearson Correlation	-.061	.159(*)	.135(*)	1	-.130(*)	.228(**)	.166(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.343	.014	.036		.045	.000	.010
	N	240	240	240	240	240	240	240
Professional Commitment	Pearson Correlation	.352(**)	-.005	.079	-.130(*)	1	.155(*)	.121
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.942	.221	.045		.016	.062
	N	240	240	240	240	240	240	240
Sharing and Involvement	Pearson Correlation	.196(**)	.227(**)	.163(*)	.228(**)	.155(*)	1	.283(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.002	.000	.011	.000	.016		.000
	N	240	240	240	240	240	240	240
Organizational Effectiveness	Pearson Correlation	.475(**)	.358(**)	.354(**)	.166(**)	.121	.283(**)	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.010	.062	.000	
	N	240	240	240	240	240	240	240

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

partially accepted as in case of professional commitment the p-value is more than .05.

effectiveness is not rejected or may be accepted.

Correlation between Organizational Commitment and Organizational Effectiveness Measure

The results of Karl Pearson's Correlation (Table 3) suggested that all the three Organizational Commitment dimensions (Affective, Normative and Continuance Commitment) were significantly and positively correlated with Organization Effectiveness ($r = 0.475$, $r = 0.354$ and $r = 0.358$ respectively). Therefore the fourth null hypothesis that there is significant correlation between organizational commitment and organizational

Causal relationship between Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Organizational Effectiveness

The result of Simple Linear Regression test suggests that Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) is a significant predictor (Result of ANOVA in Table 4b, with p-value=.000) of Organizational Effectiveness with $R = .295$ (Table 4a), slope of regression line=.819 and intercept=1.070 (Table 4c), therefore fifth null hypothesis is accepted.

3.4 H5- To test the 5th hypothesis, Simple Linear Regression is used.

The results are presented in the Table 4a, 4b & 4c.

Table 4a: Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.295(a)	.087	.083	.60230

a Predictors: (Constant), OCB

Table 4b: ANOVA

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1 Regression	8.215	1	8.215	22.646c	.000(a)
Residual	86.337	238	.363		
Total	94.552	239			

a Predictors: (Constant), OCB

b Dependent Variable: OE

Table 4c: Coefficients

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1(Constant)	1.070	.573		1.866	.063
OCB	.819	.172	.295	4.759	.000

a Dependent Variable: OE

3.5 H6- To test the 6th hypothesis, Simple Linear Regression is used.

The results are presented in the Table 5a, 5b & 5c.

Table 5a: Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.504(a)	.254	.251	.54453

a Predictors: (Constant), OC

Table 5b: ANOVA

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1 Regression	23.982	1	23.982	80.882	.000(a)
Residual	70.570	238	.297		
Total	94.552	239			

a Predictors: (Constant), OC

b Dependent Variable: OE

Table 5c: Coefficients

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t		Sig.	
	B	Std. Error	Beta	B	Std. Error		
1(Constant)	.603	.356	.504	1.691		.092	
OC	.889	.099		8.993		.000	

a Dependent Variable: OE

Causal relationship between Organizational Commitment and Organizational Effectiveness

The result of Simple Linear Regression test suggests that Organizational Commitment (OC) is a significant predictor (Result of ANOVA in Table 5b, with p-value= .000) of Organizational Effectiveness with R=.504 (Table 5a), slope of regression line= .889 and intercept=0.603 (Table 5c), therefore sixth null hypothesis is accepted.

4.0 Findings and Conclusion

- 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 the employees public and private sector employees in Food Processing Industry.
- No significant difference was found in the level of Organizational Ownership,

Professional Commitment and Sharing and Involvement of employees in public and private sector Organizations in Food Processing Industry.

- The results revealed a very positive correlation of Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Organizational Commitment with Organizational Effectiveness
- The results revealed that Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Organizational Commitment are the significant predictors of Organizational Effectiveness
- Although overall results are approving the assertion of Organ and Podsakoff that aggregated Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Organizational Commitment are related to Organizational Effectiveness indicators. There are some limitations of the study, Like OCBs scale could have been administered to three assessors ,one the individual himself/herself, second to the superior and third to colleagues, as it would have provide holistic measurement of OCBs of an employee. Second limitation is about demographic variables of employees. More emphatic results could have been achieved for effect of demographic variable on level of OCBs. (e.g. Difference in the level of OCBs according to gender, age, educational background ,experience etc.)

References

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*, 63(1): 1-18.

Angle, Harold L. and Perry, James L. (1981) An Empirical Assessment of Organizational Commitment and Organizational Effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarter*, 26(1): 1-14.

- Barnard C. I. (1938) *The Functions of the Executive*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge.
- Bateman, T.S. and Organ, D.W. (1983) Job satisfaction and the good soldier: the relationship between affect and employee 'citizenship'. *Academy of Management Journal*, 26: 587-595.
- Brief, A.P. and Motowidlo, S.J. (1986) Prosocial Organizational Behaviors. *Academy of management review*, 11(4): 710-725.
- Buchanan, B. (1974) Building Organizational Commitment: The socialization of Managers in Work Organization. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 19: 533-546.
- Campbell, J.P. and others (1974) *The measurement of organizational effectiveness: A review of relevant research and opinion*. Navy Personnel Research Development Centre, Minneapolis.
- Chen, X.P., Hui, C. and Segó, D.J. (1998) The role of organizational citizenship behavior in turnover: Conceptualization and preliminary tests of key hypotheses. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83(6): 922-931.
- Cohen, A. (1993) Work commitment in relations to withdrawal intentions and union effectiveness. *Journal of Business Research*, 26(1): 75-90.
- Cohen, A. (1998) An Examination of the relationship between work commitment and work outcomes among hospital nurses. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 14(1): 1-17.
- Cyert, R. M. and James G. M. (1965) *A Behavioral Theory of the Firm*. Englewood Cliffs, Prentice Hall.
- Etzioni, A. (1964) *Modern organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Farh, J., Podsakoff, P.M., and Organ, D.W. (1990) Accounting for organizational citizenship behavior: Leader fairness and task scope versus satisfaction. *Journal of Management*, 16: 705-722.
- Firth, L., Mellor, D.J., Moore, K.A. and Loquet, C. (2004) How can managers reduce employee intention to quit?. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 19(2): 170-187.
- George, J.M. and Brief, A.P. (1992) Feeling good-doing good: a conceptual analysis of the mood at work-organizational spontaneity relationship. *Psychological Bulletin*, 112(2): 310-329.
- Goodman, P.S. and Pennings, J.M. (1977) *New Perspective on Organizational Effectiveness*. Jossey-Bass Publishers, San Francisco.
- Gross, E. (1979) The definition of organizational goals. *British Journal of Sociology*, 20: 277-294.
- Hall, D. T., Schneider, B., and Nygfren, H. T. (1970) Personal factors in organizational identification. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 15: 76-190.
- Hendrix, H. W. and McNichols, W. C. (1984) OE as a function of managerial styles, situational environment, as effectiveness criterion. *the journal of experimental education*, 52(3): 145-151, Clemon University.
- Iverson, R.D. (1999) An event history analysis of employee turnover: the case of hospital employees

in Australia. *Human Resource Management Review*, 9(4): 397-418.

Jauch, Lawrence R., Glueck, William F. and Osborn, Richard N. (1978) Organizational Loyalty, Professional Commitment, and Academic Research Productivity. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 21(1): 84-92.

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

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

Katz, D. (1964) The motivational basis of organizational behavior. *Behavioral Science*, 9: 131-133.

McNeely, B.L. and Meglino, B.M. (1994) The role of dispositional and situational antecedents in prosocial organizational behavior: An examination of the intended beneficiaries of prosocial behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79: 836-844.

Meyer, J.P., Stanley, D.J., Herscovitch, L. and 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.

Moorman, R. (1991) Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors: do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76(6): 845-855.

Moorman, R.H. and Blakely, G.L. (1995) Individualism- collectivism as an individual difference predictor of organization citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 16: 127-142.

Moorman, R.H. and Sayeed, L. (1992) Can using computers promote organizational citizenship? A study relating computer usage, task characteristics, and OCB'. Unpublished manuscript, West Virginia University, Morgantown, WV.

Mowday, R.T., Porter, L.W. and Steers, R.M. (1982) *Employee Organization linkages: The psychology of commitment, absenteeism and turnover*. Academic Press, New York.

Niehoff, B.P. and Moorman, R.H. (1993) Justice as a mediator of the relationship between methods of monitoring and organizational citizenship behavior. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36: 527-556.

Organ, D.W. (1988) *Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Good Soldier Syndrome*. Lexington Books: Lexington, MA.

Organ, D.W. and Ryan, K. (1995) A meta analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology*, 48: 775-802.

Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B., Moorman R.H., and Fetter, R. (1990) Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Leadership Quarterly*, 1: 107-142.

Podsakoff, P.M., Mackenzie, S.B., Paine, J.B., Bachrach, D.G. (2000) Organizational Citizenship Behavior : A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research. *Journal of management*, 26(3): 513-563.

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

Purang, P. (2008) Dimensions of HRD Climate enhancing Organizational Commitment in Indian Organizations. *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 43(4): 528-546.

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

Rhenman, E. (1967) Organizational Goals. *Acta Sociological*, 10: 275-287.

Rosin, H. and Korabik, K. (1995) Organizational experiences and propensity to leave: A multivariate investigation of men and women managers. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 46: 1-16.

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

Schwepker, C.H. (2001) Ethical climate's relationship to job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intention in the sales force. *Journal of Business Research*, 54(1): 39-52.

Sheldon, M.E. (1971) Investments and involvements and mechanisms producing commitment to organization. *Administrative Science Quarterly*. 16: 142-150.

Shore, L.M. and Martin, H.J. (1989) Job satisfaction and organizational commitment in relation to work performance and turnover intentions. *Human Relations*, 42: 625-638.

Smith, C.A., Organ, D.W., and Near, J.P. (1983) Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68: 653-663.

Thanswor, G. D., Rolf, V., Wagner, U., Upadhyay, N. and Davis A. J. (2004) Organizational citizenship behavior and Organizational commitment in Nepal. *Aston Academy for Research in Management: Isbn No. 1 85449 6204*.

Vallabh, M. and Donald, F. (2001) A comparison of black and white managers on intent to leave and job mobility. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 27(2): 1-19.

Warner, W.K. (1967) Problems in measuring the goal attainment of voluntary associations. *Journal of Adult Education*, 19: 3-14.

Warriner, C.K. (1965) The problems of organizational purpose. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 6: 139-146.

William L.J. and Hazer J.T. (1986) Antecedents and consequences of Job Satisfaction and commitment to turnover models: A reanalysis using latent variables structural equation methods. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(2): 219-231.

Williams, L.J. and Anderson, S.E. (1992) An alternative approach to method effects using latent variable models: Applications in organizational behavior research. Paper presented at the Academy of Management Meetings, Las Vegas, NV.
