

Self-Regulatory Behaviour at Work: A Path to Organizational Commitment

Mamta Sharma¹, Davneet Kaur²

¹Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Punjabi University, Patiala, Punjab, India

²Research Scholar, Department of Psychology, Punjabi University, Patiala, Punjab, India

Abstract- The primary goal of any organization is the optimal utilization of its employees and enhancement of their commitment, which is now-a-days, one of the biggest challenge in organizational behaviour and human resource management. The current study has been undertaken to investigate the association between Self-Regulation and Organizational Commitment. The Sample of study consisted of 200 employees, age 30 to 45 years with minimum 7-10 year of working experience from national and multinational companies in India. Correlation analysis were used to assess the relation of self-regulation with organizational commitment along with its three domains. Results revealed that self-regulation is positively & significantly correlated with organizational commitment ($r = 0.70^{**}$). The correlation between self-regulation and affective ($r = 0.76^{**}$) as well as continuance commitment ($r = 0.25^{**}$) also came out significant, but no significant correlation has been found between self-regulation and normative commitment ($r = 0.14$). Our results point to the important role that self-regulatory processes play in affecting the different components of commitment. These behaviours relate positively to organizational commitment in employees at work. This could have practical implications for personnel selection, development, and leadership.

Keywords: Self-Regulation, Organizational Commitment, Employee

I. INTRODUCTION

Now a day's organizations are facing the challenge of committed work force. In the past organizations secure the loyalty of their employees by guaranteeing them job security, but due to competitive pressure, organizations tend toward downsizing, restructuring and transformation which create a less secure organizational climate [1]. Organization commitment is a degree to which employee identify with his or her organization. In oxford dictionary commitment is described as engagement or involvement that restrict freedom of action. Every employee varies in the degree of attachment. This degree is influenced by various factors such as affection, rational choice and habit [2]. According to Meyer and Allen (1991), "Organizational commitment is a psychological state that characterizes the employee's relationship with the organization and has implications for the decision to continue membership in an organization"[3]. Commitment has potential to affect organization effectiveness and employee well-being [4]. Various researches have given their own perspective. Meyer And Allen, (1997) has proposed Tri-Dimensional model of organization commitment [5]. This model conceptualize commitment into three separable dimensions namely affective, continuance and normative commitment. These dimensions are different from one another provide implications for employee's behaviour. Affective commitment represents individual emotional attachment to organization. Employees who are effectively committed continue work with organization because they want to do so [3]. Continuous commitment represents the individual instrumental attachment with organization. Employee with continuous commitment stays with organization because they need to do so [3]. Normative commitment represents work behaviour of individual guided by duty obligation and loyalty toward the organization. Employee stay in organization because they ought to. Committed employee give significant positive outcome such as performance, adaptability and job satisfaction ([6]; [7]; [8]). Organization is considered dysfunctional when employees are under committed and over committed [9]. Under committed employee face fear of failure and success, procrastination & chronic under achievement and over committed are overly loyal employee, burnout, obsessive compulsive behaviour, perfectionism & extreme high level energy [9]. Several investigations suggest that a wide variety of factors such as age, gender, family structure, time perspective [10], long working hours [11], attitudes and values of people in work [12], locus of control, and self-regulation, drugs consumption [13], self-selection biases [14], and social relationships quality [15] have been found to influence organizational commitment.

Self-regulation is defined as the ability to develop, implement, and flexibly maintain planned behavior in order to achieve one's goals [16]. It is described as consisting in the operations performed by the self in order "to alter its own habitual or unwanted responses to achieve a conscious or non-conscious goal" [17]. Self-regulation theories assume that the individual is the problem solution introducer and their behavior reflects the effort to approach the probable gap between statuesque and an ideal future goal or state [18]. Individual often face conflict in long term and short term goals. Short term goals provides immediate gratification and long term goals provide stable benefits. So better is to resist gratification and work for long term benefits and this is done through the process of

self-regulation. Self-regulation has major role in individual's life as it goal oriented nature make individual compatible with life problems. Theories of self-regulation focused upon various aspects Miller and Brown formulate seven steps model of self-regulation. Any disturbance in these may flatter self-regulation. Seven steps includes 1) Receiving relevant information; 2) Evaluating the information and comparing it to norms; 3) Triggering change; 4) Searching for options; 5) Formulating a plan; 6) Implementing the plan; and 7) Assessing the plan's effectiveness. If these steps are effectively approached yield to effective self-regulation and observable progress toward self-goals, social expectations and norms [19]. If self-control is of low level is related to aggression and violence in adolescents [20]; [21]) and adults ([22]; [23]), number of psychopathology causing potential damage to interpersonal relation, depression, anxiety, somatization and psychoticism. High level of self-regulation lead to family cohesion, fewer conflicts, effective social functioning ([24]; [25]), effective anger management, emotional stability, agreeableness, emotional stability, less alcohol consumption and empathetic perspective talking [26].

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The Previous literature focused only upon work and non-work domain influence upon each other, but recent researches has focused upon personal preferences for the treatment of all life domains which focus on individual to make choice of what, where and when to utilize personal resources across the life domains. Optimal utilization of employees potential is primary goal of every organization and this can be only done by making the employees committed and satisfied. M. Pourkiani et.al (2016) studied the effect of self-awareness and self-regulation on Organizational Commitment of employees with job satisfaction as moderator. Results showed that self-awareness and self-regulation has significant positive effect on organization commitment. Job satisfaction works as moderator in creating commitment. So self-regulation and self-awareness along with career and intrapersonal relationship bring success in organizational success. Individual with high commitment with their organization have fewer problems such as absenteeism, resignation and termination from their jobs [27]. Another study by Murthy, R., (2014) which has focused upon the relationship between self-efficacy, work engagement and organizational commitment of executives by using survey design methodology. Results revealed that organizational commitment has significant positive relation with self-efficacy and between work engagement and organizational commitment. Self-efficacy and work engagement are significant predictor of organizational commitment of executives. Implication of this research indicates the need of self-efficacy training of executives [28]. Luthans and his team have found that Self-efficacy can be developed in employees with a two to three hour intervention [29]. Based upon self-regulatory theories researchers suggest the effective allocation of personal resources not only decrease negative outcome but also contributes to positive outcomes [30]. Implication for this research focuses on providing training on resource allocation [31]. Manz and Sims (1986) describe leadership in a self-managing work team environment as something of a paradox [32]. According to their view the role of the supervisor is to help employees generate self-control. The supervisor encourages self-managing work team members to develop their performance standards, conduct self-evaluations and self-regulate their own behavior. Because work team members in the process of producing a product or delivering a service, learn how to perform those behaviors, self-leadership is therefore expected to have a direct impact on performance effectiveness. One factor that trigger and influence change in organization is self-regulation of employees, which contribute to organization commitment, performance of organization, leadership and pay etc ([33]; [34]). Aforementioned studies clarify that self-regulation has very powerful impact on organizational commitment. These findings shed light on importance of self-regulation training of executives. Training in self-regulation would enable the employees to develop and enhance their psychological capacities and this would resulted in increased organizational commitment.

Keeping in view the important role of self-regulation, the aim of the present study was to explore the influence of self-regulation on organizational commitment and its dimensions

III. HYPOTHESIS

Self-regulation would be positively correlated with organizational commitment and its dimensions.

IV. METHDOLOGY

Sample -Sample will selected randomly from various private industrial and organization setups. Sample of 200 subjects at managerial level will be selected .The participant will be in the age range of 30 to 45 year with 7 -10 year of working experience. Sample will be taken from Punjab, Pune, Chandigarh and Delhi.

Design- Correlation analysis is applied to assess the data.

V. TOOLS

Self-regulation questionnaire (Brown, Miller, & Lawendowski, 1999) The scale consisting of 63 Items assesses seven sub self-regulatory processes. The scale consists of one principal component rather than specific factors corresponding to rational subscale. The scale consisting of 63 items on 5-point Likert scale. Reliability of the scale is .94.

Organizational commitment Questionnaire (Meyer and Allen, 1993): This scale comprises three sub-scale namely, affective commitment, Continuance commitment and normative commitment. The Organizational commitment Questionnaire comprises 24 items which are rated on seven point Likert scale ranging from 1 to 7. The reliability of affective, normative and continuance commitment are .87, .75 and .79 respectively. Total reliability coefficient of questionnaire is found as .74.

VI. RESULTS

Table no. 1: Showing correlation matrix of relationship between dimensions of dependent variable organizational commitment and independent variable namely self-regulation.

Self-Regulation	Affective Commitment	Continuance Commitment	Normative Commitment	Organizational Commitment
	0.76**	0.25**	0.14	0.70**

*P<0.05

**p<0.01

Correlation matrix (Table No.1) depict the relationship between dimensions dependent variable that is organizational commitment (affective commitment, continuance commitment, normative commitment) and independent variable namely self-regulation. Results revealed that self-regulation significantly influence organizational commitment and its dimensions. Self-regulation was significantly positively correlated with affective commitment ($r = .76^{**}$), continuance commitment ($r = 0.25^{**}$) and organizational commitment ($r = 0.70^{**}$), but self-regulation and normative commitment correlation come out to be non-significant ($r = 0.14$).

VII. DISCUSSION

The Present research hypothesized that self-regulation would be significantly correlated with organizational commitment and its dimensions namely affective commitment, continuance commitment and normative commitment. Present research findings are in line with our research hypothesis that is self-regulation is positively significantly correlated with organizational commitment ($r = 0.70^{**}$) and only two of its dimensions such as affective commitment ($r = 0.76^{**}$) and continuance commitment ($r = 0.25^{**}$) but self-regulation and normative commitment results come out to be non-significant ($r = 0.14$). Means that employee those who are high on self-regulation are more committed toward their work. They are high on affective and continuance domain of organizational commitment. They feel more attachment toward their work and are willing to continue their job. Self-regulated employee share strong bond with their organization and are more willing to continue with it because of perceived benefits. Previous studies are also in line with present findings. Ahmad (2015) investigate the association between self-monitoring and organization commitment on 680 employees from government and private sector in Pakistan. Results showed significant positive correlation between self-regulation and affective domain of commitment and overall organization commitment [35]. Meyer and Maltin (2010) proposed a theoretical work based upon self-determination theory [36]. This framework proposed that basic psychological need that is satisfaction at work create the base for commitment, autonomous action regulation and intrinsic motivation which further facilitate well being ([37]; [38]). O'Neill and Mone (1998) studied upon 242 health care employees found that employees who set own deadlines for goal attainment and perceived their goals as specific and clear were more likely to be satisfied with their job, and less likely to intend to leave the organization. More the committed employees more possibility of doing extra efforts and participate in the creative activities on the behalf of their organization and this behaviour guarantees organization effectiveness and success[39]. In the present research, relation between self-regulation and normative commitment come out to be non-significant. Normative commitment is developed before joining of organization through the process of socialization [40], whereas self-regulation is internal process and normative committed employee is more influenced by external or social pressure and attempt to fulfill obligations and avoid losses. Thus, they are more likely to be committed to the organization out of a sense of obligation or necessity [41]. So self-regulation is less likely to influence normative domain of commitment. Leone and Hawkin (2006) argued that employee with high self-monitoring are more competent, perform well and attract toward promotional opportunities but less likely to be committed with their organization [42]. Personality is an attitude and organizational commitments is behavior. Personality always influences the behavior, self-regulation also

has direct and indirect association with different work outcomes like organizational commitment [35]. Establishment of commitment helps in reinforcement of self-regulation which in turn buffer the adverse effects of job demands ([43]; [44]; [45]). Work teams which have employees with high self-regulation are supposed to be effective and have good quality of life [46] and this lead to increased employee satisfaction, positive environment for interpersonal relation among employees, more opportunity to learn new skills, increase performance and motivation. Moreover it also reduce absenteeism and turnovers ([46]; [47]; [48]).

VIII. CONCLUSION

Flexible rules of organization produce autonomy and regulation, which attract the employees towards their organization. As a result affective, continuance and normative commitment increases in employees. Self-regulation plays an important role in the developing positive attitude toward organization. Training in self-regulation would enable the employees to develop and enhance their psychological capacities and this would resulted in increased organizational commitment. Training on resource allocation helps employee getting maximum output in minimum utilization of energy and time and fulfil the work demand automatically with less efforts. In addition its helps employees in developing effective strategies for work place tasks. Finally, organization can provide employees with greater autonomy, so that they can control when, where, and how they choose to accomplish their workplace demands. (Grzywacz, Carlson & Shulkin, 2008). It is concluded that self-regulation enhance the organizational commitment in employees.

IX. REFERENCES

- [1] Islam, T., Ahmad, Z., Ahmed, I., Ahmad, A., Saeed, M. & Muhammad, S, K. (2012). Does Compensation and Demographic Variable Influence on Teachers Commitment and Job Satisfaction: A Study of University of the Punjab, PAKISTAN, International Journal of Business and Management. 7(4): pp. 35- 43. Available at: www.ccsenet.org/ijbm
- [2] Jokivuori, P. 2002. Sitoutuminen työorganisaatioon ja ammattijärjestykseen – Kilpailevia vai täydentäviä? University of Jyväskylä. Faculty of Social Sciences. Doctoral thesis. Available on the Internet. . Accessed 8.11.2013.
- [3] Meyer, J. P. & Allen, N.J. (1991). A Three- Component Conceptualization of Organizational Commitment, Human Resources Management Review, Cilt 1, 61-89.
- [4] Meyer J P and Herscovitch L (2001), “Commitment in the Workplace: Toward a General Model”, Human Resource Management Review, Vol. 11, pp. 299-326.
- [5] Meyer J and Allen N (1997), “Commitment in the Workplace: Theory, Research, and Application”, Sage Publications.
- [6] Angle, H., & Perry, J. (1981). An empirical assessment of organizational commitment and organizational effectiveness. Administrative Science Quarterly, 26, 1-14.
- [7] Hunt, S. D., Chonko, L. B., & Wood, V. R. (1985). Organisational Commitment and Marketing. Journal of Marketing, 49, 112-126. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/1251181>
- [8] Mowday, R. T., Steers, R. M., & Porter, L.W. (1979). The measurement of organizational Commitment. Journal of Vocational Behaviour, 14, 224-247. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0001-8791\(79\)90072-1](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0001-8791(79)90072-1)
- [9] Lowman, R.L. (1993). The Inter-Domain Model of Career Assessment and Counseling. (Online). Retrieved from <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/j.1556-6676.1993.tb02240.x/abstract#publicationhistory>. Accessed on October3 2016.
- [10] Zimbardo, P. G., & Boyd, J. N. (1999). Putting time in perspective: A valid, reliable individual-difference metric. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 77, 1271-88. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.77.6.1271
- [11] Langford, P. H., Parkes, L. P., & Metcalf, L. (2006). Developing a structural equation model of organisational performance and employee engagement. Paper presented at the Joint Conference of the Australian Psychological Society and the New Zealand Psychological Society, Auckland.
- [12] Tulgan. B. (1996). What is generation x? [On-line], The Workforce of the Future. Available: <http://www.rainmakerthinking.com>.
- [13] Zimbardo, P. G., Keough, K. A., & Boyd, J. N. (1997). Present time perspective as a predictor of risky driving, personality and individual differences. Personality and Individual Differences, 23(6), 1007-1023.
- [14] Harber, K. A., Zimbardo, P. G. and Boyd, J. N. (2003) ‘Participant Self-selection Biases as a Function of Individual Differences in Time Perspective’, Basic and Applied Social Psychology 25: 255–64.
- [15] Holman, E. A., & Zimbardo, P. G. (2009). The social language of time: The time perspective- social 396 network connection. Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 31(2), 136–147.
- [16] Brown, J. M., Miller, W. R., & Lawendowski, L. A. (1999). The Self-Regulation Questionnaire. In L. VandeCreek & T. L. Jackson (Eds.), Innovations in clinical practice: A source book (Vol. 17, pp. 281-289). Sarasota, FL: Professional Resource Press.
- [17] Vohs, K. D., & Schmeichel, B. J. (2003). Self-regulation and the extended now: Controlling the self alters the subjective experience of time. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 85, 217–230.
- [18] Philips, E. E. (1998). Attention and self-regulation. Journal of Cognition Psychology, 45, 1252-1262.
- [19] Miller, W. R., & Brown, J. M. (1991). Self-regulation as a conceptual basis for the prevention and treatment of addictive behaviours. In N. Heather, W. R. Miller & J. Greeley (Eds.), Self-control and the addictive behaviours (pp. 3-79). Sydney: Maxwell Macmillan Publishing Australia.
- [20] Feldman, S. S., & Weinberger, D. A. (1994). Self-restraint as a mediator of family influences on boys’ delinquent behavior: A longitudinal study. Child Development, 65, 195–211.
- [21] Krueger, R. F., Caspi, A., Moffitt, T. E., White, J., & Stouthamer-Loeber, M. (1996). Delay of gratification, psychopathology, and personality: Is low selfcontrol specific to externalizing problems? Journal of Personality, 64, 107–129.
- [22] Avakame, E. F. (1998). Intergenerational transmission of violence, self-control, and conjugal violence: A comparative analysis of physical violence and psychological aggression. Violence and Victims, 13, 301–316.
- [23] Gottfredson, M. R., & Hirschi, T. (1990). A general theory of crime. Stanford, CT: Stanford University Press.

- [24] Eisenberg N, Fabes RA, Shepard SA, Murphy BC, Guthrie IK, Jones S, et al. (1997). Contemporaneous and longitudinal prediction of children's social functioning from regulation and emotionality. *Child Development*, 68:642–664.
- [25] Fabes, R. A, Eisenberg, N., Jones, S., Smith, M., Guthrie, I., Poulin, R., Shepard, S., & Friedman, J. (1999). Regulation, emotionality, and preschoolers' socially competent peer interactions. *Child Development*, 70, 432– 442.
- [26] Davis, M. H., and Oathout, H. A. (1987). Maintenance of satisfaction in romantic relationships: Empathy and relational competence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 53, 397-410.
- [27] Pourkiani, M., Seyedi, S. M., Sarasia, H. S. (2016). The effect of self-awareness and self-regulation on organizational commitment employees of Islamic Azad University of Mashhad with mediating role of job satisfaction. *Journal of Fundamental and Applied Sciences*.
- [28] Murthy, R. T. (2014). Psychological well-being and organizational commitment in executives. *Indian Streams Research Journal*, 4(3), 1-5.
- [29] Luthans, F., Avolio, B. J., Avey, J. B. & Norman, S. M. (2007). Psychological capital: Measurement and relationship with performance and satisfaction. *Personnel Psychology*, 60, 541–572.
- [30] Grawitch, M. J. & Barber, L. K., (2010). Rethinking the work-life interface: It's not about balance, It's about resource allocation. *Applied Psychology Health and Well-Being* 2(2):1-33.
- [31] Aguinis, H., & Kraiger, K. (2009). Benefits of training and development for individuals and teams, organizations, and society. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 60, 451–474.
- [32] Manz, C. & Sims, H., (1986), *Leading Self-Managed Groups: A Conceptual Analysis of a Paradox*, *Economic and Industrial Democracy*, 7 pp. 141-165.
- [33] Miller, J. S. & Cardy, R. L. (2000). Self-monitoring and performance appraisal: Rating outcomes in project teams, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21(6), 609.
- [34] Jawahar, I. M., & Mattsson, J. (2005). Sexism and beautyism effects in selection as function of self-monitoring level of decision maker. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90, 563–573.
- [35] Ahmad, F. & Danish, R. Q. (2015). Effect of ormalization on Organizational Commitment; Interactional Role of Self-Monitoring in the Service Sector. *American Journal of Economics, Finance and Management* Vol. 1, No. 4, 2015, pp. 229-235. <http://www.aiscience.org/journal/ajefm>
- [36] Meyer, J. P. & Maltin, E. R., (2010). Employee commitment and well-being: a critical review, theoretical framework and research agenda. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 77(2):323-337.
- [37] Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. New York: Plenum.
- [38] Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist*, 55, 68–78.
- [39] O'Neill, B.S. & Mone, M.A. (1998). Investigating equity sensitivity as a moderator between self-efficacy and workplace attitudes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83: 805–816.
- [40] Wiener, Y. (1982). Commitment in organizations: A normative view. *Academy of Management Review*, 7, 418–428.
- [41] Kark, R., & Van-Dijk, D. (2007). Motivation to lead, motivation to follow: The role of the self-regulatory focus in leadership processes. *Academy of Management Review*, 32, 500–528.
- [42] Leone, C., & Hawkins, L.B. (2006). Self-monitoring and close relationships. *Journal of Personality*, 74, 739-778.
- [43] Muraven, M. (2008). Prejudice as self-control failure. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 38, 314-333.
- [44] Muraven, M., Gagné, M., & Rosman, H. (2008). Helpful self-control: Autonomy support, vitality, and depletion. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 44, 573–585. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2007.10.008>
- [45] Rivkin, W., Diestel, S., & Schmidt, K.-H. (2015). Affective commitment as a moderator of the adverse relationships between day-specific selfcontrol demands and psychological well-being. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 88, 185–194. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2015.03.005>
- [46] Cohen, S. G., & Ledford, G. E., (1994). The effectiveness of self-managing teams: A quasi-experiment. *Human Relations*, 1994, 47, 13-43.
- [47] Pearson, R. (1992) Introduction, in A. Ward, J. Gregory & N. Yuval-Davis (Eds) *Women and Citizenship in Europe: borders, rights and duties*. Stoke-on-Trent: Trentham Books.
- [48] Stewart, G.L., Manz, C.C. (1995). Leadership for self-managing work teams: A typology and integrative model. *Human Relations*, 48(7), 747-770.