
**MORE OR LESS ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT: THE
COMPARISON BETWEEN EXECUTIVES AND NON-EXECUTIVES AT A
PUBLIC BANK IN THAILAND**

Dr. Chaiyaset Promsri

Faculty of Business Administration, Rajamangala University of Technology Phra Nakhon, Bangkok,
Thailand

Corresponding Author's Email: Chaiyaset.p@rmutp.ac.th

Abstract

The purpose of this present study was to examine mean differences in organizational commitment between executive group and non-executive group at a public bank in Thailand. A sample of 143 employees working at different hierarchical levels from one public bank in Thailand was collected through a 17-item of a modified version of Organizational Commitment Scale. Results of independent samples t-test analysis revealed that there was a significant difference in organizational commitment between non-executives and executives ($t = -5.505$, $p < 0.001$). To compare three types of organizational commitment, the results also found significant differences in affective commitment ($t = -4.693$, $p < 0.001$), continuance commitment ($t = -4.963$, $p < 0.001$), and normative commitment ($t = -5.004$, $p < 0.001$) between non-executives and executives. Discussion and recommendations for further studies were also labeled.

Keywords: Organizational commitment, hierarchical level, a public bank

Introduction

The banking industry has changed tremendously in the past decade, which affects the attitudes of employees to adapt hastily and flexibly. The banking industry has been reported as a high turnover rate industry (Shukla & Sinha, 2013; Sattar & Ahmed, 2014), which banks must be aware of the costs and impacts and understand the fundamental causes, and create strategies to manage them (Crowe Compensation Survey, 2017). High turnover rate in the banking industry reflects the problem of organizational commitment, which refers employees' identification to and attachment with their organization and want to remain as an organizational member (Philips & Gully, 2012; Baldwin, Bommer, & Rubin, 2013).

Various studies attempted to examine the effects of organizational commitment on work performance. Previous research revealed that the presence of organizational commitment can lead to enhance a higher productivity and organizational performance (Osa & Amos, 2014). In addition, employees who are affectively committed to the organization have a low tendency to demonstrate withdrawal behaviors (Lee, Carswell, & Allen, 2000; Hausknecht, Hiller, & Vence, 2008). In addition, earlier research also scrutinized the associations between socio-demographic factors and organizational commitment. Among these variables, hierarchical level has been studied to examine whether there is a significant difference in organizational commitment between employees with different management levels. Past studies consistently found that employees with the different positions or hierarchical levels are committed to their organizations

differently (Khandelwal & Dhar, 2003; Suman & Srivastava, 2012; Sisodia & Das, 2013; Jena, 2015; Kónya, Matic, & Pavlović; 2016). However, research on the comparison between managing position and non-managing position in organizational commitment in Thai context has been overlooked and needed more emphasis in order to increase a body of knowledge in this field. Therefore, the purpose of this present study was to compare mean differences in organizational commitment between executive group and non-executive group at a public bank in Thailand.

Literature Reviews

Organizational commitment refers to an attitude representing an employee's identification with and connection to the organization (Griffin, 2011). An employee who is strongly committed to the organization perceives oneself as a part of the organization while an employee who is not intensely committed to the organization may view oneself as an external member. Meyer and Allen (1991) proposed three components of identified individual's degree of attachment to the organization encompassing affective, continuance, and normative commitment, which are described as follows:

Affective commitment represents an employee's positive emotional connection to remain in the organization and robust identification with its values and goals. Employees who are affectively committed want to stay with the organization due to the feeling to individual attachment with people in the organization or experience enjoyment with membership (Philips & Gully, 2012; Baldwin, Bommer, & Rubin, 2013).

Continuance commitment alludes to the realization of costs linked to job quitting and the benefits related to remaining as a member in the organization (Kavaliauskiene, 2012)

Normative commitment refers to an employee's feeling of obligation to stay with the organization due to the moral or ethical reasons or pressures from others (Greenberg, 2011; Aamodt, 2013)

Past research indicated that employees with different demographic characteristics in particular hierarchical levels can have distinguished levels of organizational commitment. Employees can be committed to the organization in affective, continuance, and normative ways at the same time with different degrees of intensity, which implies that organizational commitment is not mutually restricted. For example, Suman and Srivastava (2012) found that employees who worked at different hierarchical levels had been influenced by different personal and organizational characteristics on organizational commitment. This can be implied that employees with different hierarchical levels may be committed to the organization distinctively. This finding was confirmed by Sisodia and Das (2013) who found a significant difference in organizational commitment between high level of hierarchical group and low level of hierarchical group. The results showed that high level of hierarchical group had a higher mean score than low level of hierarchical group. Also, Khandelwal and Dhar (2003) revealed that employees and managers were committed differently to the bank in terms of organizational commitment. However, this study investigated organizational commitment in an entire perspective rather than focusing on three-component of organizational commitment. The recent

study of Jena (2015) examined the relations between demographic factors and three-components of organizational commitment among 240 shift workers in India. This study discovered that executives and non-executives were committed differently in which executives were more committed than non-executives in terms of affective commitment while non-executives were more committed than executives in terms of continuance commitment. However, this study did not find a significant difference in normative commitment between executive group and non-executive group. Likewise, Kónya, Matić, and Pavlović (2016) conducted the study to examine the different levels of organizational commitment from employees in Serbia and Hungary with different demographic characteristics. This study's findings revealed statistically significant differences between participants in management and non-management position in terms of commitment to organizational values and commitment to stay with the organization. This study found that managing position had higher levels of both types of commitment than non-managing position. Although this study did not use three-component proposed by Meyer and Allen (1991), it implied that people with the different positions or organizational levels had perceived organizational commitment in a different way. According to literature reviews, this present study proposed research hypotheses as follows:

H₁: There is a significant difference in organizational commitment between executive group and non-executive group at a public bank headquarters.

H₂: There is a significant difference in affective commitment between executive group and non-executive group at a public bank headquarters.

H₃: There is a significant difference in continuance commitment between executive group and non-executive group at a public bank headquarters.

H₄: There is a significant difference in normative commitment between executive group and non-executive group at a public bank headquarters

Methodology

This study was a descriptive study in which different level of three-component of organizational commitment in hierarchical level were compared. Participants in this present study were employees who worked at a public bank headquarters in Thailand. A total of 143 were usable for data analysis. A self-administrated questionnaire was used as the instrument for data collection. A modified version of Organizational Commitment Scale developed by Meyer and Allen (1991) was used to identify organizational commitment of employees at this public bank. A 17-item of this scale measurement was a 5-point rating scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Content validity with index-objective congruence (IOC) method was conducted to ensure the quality of this instrument. Internal consistency reliability with Cronbach's alpha test was also calculated to gauge how well a questionnaire measure what needs to be measured. Table 1 exhibited alpha scores of organizational commitment and each component, which all of them had alpha score above 0.7. According to Nunally (1978), an alpha score of more than 0.7 is acceptable.

Table 1 Reliability Coefficients of Three Dimensions of Organizational Commitment

Scale Measurement	No. of Items	Alpha Score
Affective Commitment	10	0.73
Continuance Commitment	4	0.77
Normative Commitment	3	0.75
Organizational Commitment	17	0.87

Results

Table 2 demonstrated frequency distribution of Thai government bank employees’ socio demographic characteristics. As shown, the majority of participants in this present study were female (69.2%). More than a half of respondents were aged between 31-40 years (56.6%). Almost 60 percent of them earned an undergraduate degree (58.7%). For hierarchical level, more than a half of participants who contributed in this study worked in executive level (52.4%). The most frequently reported working experience of people at this government bank was more than 15 years (45.5%).

Table 2 Frequency Distribution of Thai Government Bank Employees’ Socio-Demographic Characteristics (n=143)

	Frequency	Percentage
Gender		
Male	44	30.8
Female	99	69.2
Total	143	100
Age		
20-30 years	27	18.9
31-40 years	81	56.6
41-50 years	27	18.9
More than 50 years	8	5.6
Total	143	100

Educational Level		
Bachelor's Degree	84	58.7
Master's Degree	43	30.1
Doctorate's Degree	7	4.9
Others	9	6.3
Total	143	100
Hierarchical Level		
Non-executive	68	47.6
Executive	75	52.4
Total	143	100
Working Experience in Year		
Less than 5 years	21	14.6
5-10 years	42	29.4
11-15 years	15	10.5
More than 15 years	65	45.5
Total	143	100

The analysis of independent samples t-test showed a significant difference in organizational commitment between non-executives and executives ($t = -5.505$, $p < 0.001$). The mean score of organizational commitment in non-executives was 2.38 and in executives was 2.88. This can be concluded that non-executives had less identification with and attachment to the bank than executives. To place an emphasis on each component of organizational commitment, the results of this present study found that there were significant differences in affective commitment ($t = -4.693$, $p < 0.001$), continuance commitment ($t = -4.963$, $p < 0.001$), and normative commitment ($t = -5.004$, $p < 0.001$) between non-executives and executives. The mean score of affective commitment in non-executives was 2.64 and in executives was 3.06. This suggested that non-executives are less committed to the bank than executives. The mean score of continuance commitment in non-executives was 2.03 and in executives was 2.63. This represented that non-executives had less desire to stay with the bank due to economic and social costs of leaving than executives. The mean score of normative commitment in non-executives was 1.95 and in executives was 2.62. This can be concluded that non-executives felt less

obligated to remain as a bank member than executives. As the significant level of 0.001 has shown for all types of organizational commitment when compared mean differences between non-executives and executives, research hypothesis #1, #2, #3, and #4 of this present study were confirmed.

Table 3 Results of the Independent Samples T-Test of Organizational Commitment related to Hierarchical Level

Variables	Employee (n =68)		Manager (n=75)		df	t	p
	M	SD	M	SD			
Affective Commitment	2.64	.548	3.06	.531	141	-4.693	.000***
Continuance Commitment	2.03	.674	2.63	.771		-4.963	.000***
Normative Commitment	1.95	.684	2.62	.912		-5.004	.000***
Organizational Commitment	2.38	.544	2.88	.578		-5.505	.000***

***Significant Level at .001

Conclusion, Discussions, and Recommendations

The purpose of this present study was to compare mean differences in organizational commitment and each component of organizational commitment between non-executives and executives. The results revealed that there were significant differences in organizational commitment and each component between non-executives and executives. The findings increase a body of knowledge in the field of organizational behaviors since a few studies examined the mean differences in organizational commitment between in respect with hierarchical level. The study’s findings were consistent with Sisodia and Das (2013) who found the employees in high hierarchical group had greater mean score of organizational commitment than employees in low hierarchical level. This also supported Hossain (2000) who indicated that bank executives had more satisfaction in their jobs than non-executives. In addition, this present study also confirmed Khandelwal and Dhar (2003) who discovered that employees and managers were committed differently to the bank in terms of organizational commitment. This study found that managers with internal and external locus of control had greater level of organizational commitment than employees with external locus of control. However, these past studies did not identify the differences in hierarchical level for each component of organizational commitment. Unlike the previous study, Jena (2015) examined the relations between individual differences and three components of organizational commitment. This study found that executives and non-executives were committed differently in which executives were more committed than non-executives in terms of affective commitment while non-executives had a higher score on continuance

commitment than executives. Based on these findings, this present study partially supported Jena's findings since executive group had a higher score on all three components than non-executive group.

The reason that manager group had a higher level of affective commitment than non-manager group is due to a sense of pleasure when completing their tasks, which can help them maintain in the current position and increase the opportunity to get a higher position. As a manager, they might be given the opportunity to be involved with the corporate culture creation and working atmosphere development, which builds stronger emotional attachment to the organization and people than their employees. Moreover, since manager group has received a higher salary and worked in a higher position, they are much more aware of the costs related to leaving the bank than non-manager group. That's why the level of continuance commitment of manager group was rated higher than non-manager group. For normative commitment, it can be described that manager group has a feeling of more obligation than non-manager group because they received the support from the supervisor to get through difficult tasks, or to get the reimbursement for their further study. The results of this study supported the conclusion of Colquitt, LePine, & Wesson (2017), which noted that the importance of these three components of organizational commitment can be varied over the development of a career.

As manager group in this public bank has a higher score of three components of organizational commitment than non-manager group, changing in working atmosphere, organizational culture, and motivation programs for this public bank should be established in order to increase job satisfaction and organizational commitment of employees in this bank. In addition, as employees may varyingly rate the significance of organizational commitment over the progression of their occupation, the replication study of comparison between executive group and non-executive group in organizational commitment should be conducted. Furthermore, the comparative study of organizational commitment between public and private bank should also be studied in the future.

Acknowledgement

I am very thankful to Rajamangala University of Technology Phra Nakhon for facility support and publication sponsorship.

References

- Aamodt, M. G. (2013). *Applying psychology to work. (7th ed.)*. Wadsworth, Cengage Learning: International Edition.
- Baldwin, T., Bommer, W., & Rubin, R. (2013). *Managing organizational behavior: what great managers know and do. (2nd ed.)*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Colquitt, J. A., LePine, J. A., & Wesson, M. J. (2017). *Organizational Behavior: improving performance and commitment in the workplace (5th ed.)*. McGraw-Hill: International Edition.
- Crowe Compensation Survey. (2017). Employee turnover: dealing with costs seen and hidden. Retrieved from www.bankingexchange.com/news-feed/item/6715-employee-turnover-dealing-with-costs-seen-and-hidden
- Greenberg, J. (2011). *Behavior in organizations. (10th ed.)*. Pearson: Global Edition.
- Griffin, R. W. (2011). *Management: principles and practices. (10th ed.)* International

Edition: South-Western.

- Hausknecht, J. P., Hiller, N. J., & Vence, R. J. (2008). Work-unit absenteeism: effects of satisfaction, commitment, labor market conditions, and time. *Academy of Management Journal*, 51(6), 1223-1245.
- Hossain, M. (2000). Job satisfaction of commercial bank employees in Bangladesh: a comparative study of private and public sectors. *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 35(3), 347-361.
- Jena, R. K. (2015). An assessment of demographic factors affecting organizational commitment among shift workers in India. *Management: Journal of Contemporary Management Issues*, 20(1), 59-77.
- Kavaliauskiene, Z. (2012). Hierarchical dependence of antecedents of employee's continuance commitment, *Social Research*, 1(26), 53-59.
- Khandelwal, S. & Dhar, U. (2003). Locus of control and hierarchy as determinants of organizational commitment in the bank industry. Retrieved from www.academia.edu/660243/Locus_of_control_and_hierarchy_as_determinants_of_organizational_commitment_in_the_banking_industry
- Kónya, V., Matic, D., & Pavlović, J. (2016). The influence of demographics, job characteristics and characteristics of organizations on employee commitment. *Acta Polytechnica Hungarica*, 13(3), 119-138.
- Lee, K., Carswell, J. J., & Allen, N. J. (2000). A meta-analytic review of occupational commitment: relations with person-and work-related variables. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(5), 799-811.
- Meyer, J. P. & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1(1), 61-89.
- Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric theory*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Osa, I. G. & Amos, I. O. (2014). The impact of organizational commitment on employee productivity: A case study of Nigeria Brewery, PLC. *IMPACT: International Journal of Research in Business Management*, 2(9), 107-122.
- Phillips, J. M. & Gully, S. M. (2012). *Organizational behavior: tools for success*. Cengage Learning: International Edition.
- Sattar, S. & Ahmed, S. (2014). Factors effecting employee turnover in banking sector. *Developing Country Studies*, 4(3), 110-115.
- Shukla, S. & Sinha, A. (2013). Employee turnover in banking sector: empirical evidence. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 11(5), 57-61.
- Sisodia, S. & Das, I. (2013). Effect of job autonomy upon organizational commitment of employees at different hierarchical level. *Psychological Thought*, 6(2), 241-251.
- Suman, S. & Srivastava, A. K. (2012). Antecedents of organizational commitment across hierarchical levels. *Psychology and Developing Societies*, 24(1), 61-83.