An Exploration of Determinants of Organizational Commitment

Emphasis on the Relationship between Organizational Democracy and Commitment

Boya Chen

Capstone Project

Martin School of Public Policy and Administration

University of Kentucky

Spring 2013

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

In public organizations, organizational commitment plays a significant role in determining both efficiency and efficacy of the organization. Organizational commitment is just like an invisible hand affecting the performance of staff. The degree of organizational commitment can also be a double-edged sword, by which performance outcomes can either be promoted dramatically or impaired greatly. The purpose of the paper is to examine the determinants of organizational commitment, especially the relationship between organizational commitment and organizational democracy.

From the literature review, I build a model including several variables. The dependent variable in my model is organizational commitment. Independent variables in my model are organizational democracy, perceived personal competence, leader communication, role conflicts. I control for a series of variables related to personal characteristics. I classify, merge and put data into a linear regression model in order to examine the relationship between these variables. Outcomes of the model show six characteristics of organizational democracy that have statistically significant effects on organizational commitment. They are individual autonomy at work, a responsible system, the organization's effort to give meaningful work to employees, respect and tolerance to minorities and differences within organization, encouragement of team work and the distance between management and employees.

Background

Since organizational commitment occupies an important position that cannot be neglected, it becomes necessary to explore determinants of organizational commitment. It is conceivable that

organizational democracy has a strong influence on employees' commitment to the organization. I did an internship in an organization whose tasks involve little individual autonomy in one's own work. Although employees' autonomy on work cannot explain organizational democracy fully, it is a performance or consequence of organizational democracy. After I had this experience, I learned that so many things would be affected by the lack of organizational democracy including employees' commitment to their organization. I could often hear people complaining as "I do not know why I should do my job in this way", or "I do not have thought myself, I'm a machine that only runs commands instead". By limiting workers' autonomy on their tasks, impairing the opportunities of expressing individual opinions or dissent to upper-level managers and operating a one-sided work model that is making subordinates implement what upper-level staff order them without much feedback. This could lead to the organization becoming ossified, a lack of vigour in its workers, and more crucially, reduce the morale of employees and their interest to work for the organization continually.

Consequently, from my perspective, organizational democracy is a crucial element in determining all aspects of a public organization, including organizational commitment of employees.

Literature Review

"Organizational democracy is a system of organization that is based on freedom, instead of fear and control. It is a way of designing organizations to amplify the possibilities of human potential — and the organization as a whole"[1].

---

[1] http://www.worldblu.com/democratic-design/

In his article "Theoretical Postulations on Organization Democracy", Luhman (2006) develops the concept of organizational democracy. It consists of twenty three characteristics. The most salient of these are the "specialization of management skills and knowledge in distinct individuals"; accountability to workers; rotation of management duty among group members; and cooperation during work. The first code indicates that, for different management positions within the department, they call for specialized management skills and knowledge of a certain person. According to Luhman, this code criterion is most frequently performed among all characteristics of organizational democracy. Accountability to workers refers to a system within an organization is responsible to its employees. The third code refers specifically to that individuals are rotated between different positions frequently to get work life enriched. Finally, cooperation between workers during daily work is emphasized by the organization, which is also a significant indicator of organizational democracy. The order of importance of these characteristics is based on the frequency they are performed by public organizations examined as sample data in previous studies. Further characteristics of organizational democracy include that the individual has autonomy in deciding how to finish their tasks, decisions are made either by majority approval or by achieving group consensus, employees treat minority and difference with tolerance and respect, and all employees earn a near equal wage are all vital in determining organizational democracy. All of these characteristics are viable in theory. When it comes to the reality, it should depend on the specific situation to examine the viability of each characteristic. Some of these characteristics should not be applied to all public organization.

There are prerequisites for organizations to have successful democratization processes. Caimano (2004) explains that while smaller organizations are relatively easier to achieve democracy, larger organizations are difficult to transfer themselves into a "full democracy".

Additionally, in Pakistan (2010)'s view, employees have a malleable view of their organization, which helps to implement democracy successfully. It is particularly so in young organizations. In this case, people always will not have a clear sense of organizational characteristics like goals and strategy, or roles played by each party within the organization. A climate that encourages constructive mutual and self-criticism, a relatively turbulent environment around the organization that pushes it to innovate and generate ideas, a team culture, membership with similar backgrounds and values, an organizational atmosphere within which employees of the organization trust each other wholly, a horizontal and flat organization rather than a vertical and tall one are all elements make it easier or more likely for an organization to adopt elements of democracy.

According to Harrison and Edward (2004), organizational democracy has a variety of consequences. Organizational democracy makes people be more responsible for their tasks because they take more ownership on their works. In this way it reduces the probability of misconduct. Organizational democracy creates a more participative organizational culture overall which encourages innovation and creativity. It also allows employees to develop their full abilities by decentralizing power by giving them more discretion. With more decisions they need to make and more accountability they need to take, it is believable for employers to dig their learning, thinking potential further, and develop their capacities to a large extent. Harrison and Edward (2004) also indicated side effects of organizational democracy. Inappropriate decisions may be made or and improper approaches may be adopted by lower level employees with a more limited educational background and less work experience. Since many people are involved, it takes a large amount of time to come to an agreement on any particular issue, which leads to a reduction of efficiency to a large extent.

The term "organizational commitment", according to Rainey (2003), refers to various loyalties and attachments different individuals hold toward their organizations. The higher the organizational commitment is, the more responsible an individual is to the organization.

Organizational commitment is expected to be influenced by a series of elements. According to John and Dennis's (1990) meta-analysis, the element named "perceived personal competence" has the strongest positive relationship with the degree of organizational commitment. Morris and Sherman (1981) interpreted perceived personal competence as a mean of self-estimation that links individuals to organizations. It means if a person estimates him/herself to have a stronger competence, he/she could be more devoted to the organization he/she works, and thus builds up a stronger linkage between organization and him/herself. Leader communication is the secondary critical variable that affects the organizational commitment. John and Dennis (1990) claimed that a leader who has more accurate and timely types of communication tends to increase the degree of organization commitment of employees. On the other hand, organizational commitment is also negatively shaped by number of elements. In particular, the "role conflict" variable has the most negative effect on the organizational commitment according to John and Dennis's study. The role conflict is likely to reduce the morale of employees greatly, so that it can impair employees' commitment to their organization. Hackman & Oldham (1976) argued that organizational commitment is affected by job characteristics that make a job inherently interesting and psychologically attractive, such as the use of a variety of skills, task significance, task identity, autonomy and the like.

Organizational democracy is expected to play a new potential role that affects organizational commitment. In Harrison and Edward (2004)'s opinion, organizational democracy can help to foster commitment to the organization since employees could have the ability to influence the

organization in which they work. By increasing participation in decision-making can decisions be implemented in a more smooth way, as well as improving the commitment of employees to the final adoption.

Research design

My null hypothesis (H_0) is that the perceived personal competence, leader communication, role conflict and perceptions of organizational democracy are not associated with organizational commitment. The alternative hypothesis (H_1), which is informed by my literature review, states that these variables influence organizational commitment. I expect perceived personal competence, leader communication and organizational democracy to positively predict organizational commitment, while I expect role conflict to have a negative impact on organizational commitment.

Data Collection

I obtained the data for my analysis from Gould-Williams' (2008) survey of Welsh local government employees. There are 22 local governments in Wales. Sixteen of these participated in Gould-Williams's (2008) survey. Each of these delivers the eight services covered in my Capstone: (i) Education (the administrative staff overseeing the schools within a local government area); (ii) Social Services (Children's Services); (iii) Planning; (iv) Housing Management; (v) Revenues and Benefits; (vi) Waste Management; (vii) Leisure and Culture; and (viii) Human Resources. Potentially, Gould-Williams could have obtained responses from 16×8=128 service departments. However, the dataset only includes 119 service departments out

of 128 due to the non-compliance of leaders of service in five governments. Most aspects of local government service provision are contained in the survey ranging from highly personalized, individual services (Children's social services) to physical resources (Refuse collection and Waste Management).

The surveyed sample is a group of 6,625 individuals in different positions. They received self-completion questionnaires. 1,755 employees returned their questionnaires on time, yielding a response rate of 26.5%.

The questionnaire consists of eight sections. In each section, there are several questions concerning a particular topic. Section one contains questions related to respondents' department, asking how much employees feel they belong to the department and their perceptions about how much their department cares about them. Section two contains questions about how employees feel about their jobs, such as asking people how they feel about their work performance, to what extent do people have autonomy in their jobs, and the intensity of their work. The third section asks questions related to management, it asks about the relationship between management and employees, decision-making and management effectiveness. The fourth section asks how employees think of their supervisor. The fifth section raises questions about personal behavior at work. Later sections are not relevant to the topic of my Capstone.

For most of these questions, there are several answer choices, where one end indicates full agreement and the other end disagreement. They are on an ordered scale, ranging from "Strongly disagree" to the "Strongly agree". In the fifth section, only five options are provided to each question, but they are still on an ordered scale, ranging from "Not at all" to "At every available opportunity" indicating the frequency of their working behavior.

An exploration of determinants of organizational commitment

My estimation sample consists of 1747 employees in Education, Social Services, Planning, Housing Management, Revenues and Benefits, Waste Management, Leisure and Culture, and Human Resources service departments. Among these, 247 persons (14.14%) are managers, 383 (21.92%) are supervisors, and 1117 (63.94%) of them are not managers. 239 of them (13.68%) are from the Education department, 264 (15.11%) are Human Resource staff, 226 (12.94%) are from the Leisure Department, 207 of them (11.85%) are from Planning Department, 242 (13.85%) are from the Revenue and Benefits Department, 208 (11.91%) are from the Social Service Department, 149 of them (8.53%) are from the Waste management Department, and 212 of them (12.14%) are from the Housing Management Department.

Variable explanation

According to Luhman, general criterion for organizational democracy is classified into from code1 to code23. For a convenience concern, I give aspects or characteristics of organizational democracy according to Luhman's coding number in my model and my analysis of the outcome.

According to the limitation of dataset, I chose codes presented below to represent the organizational democracy. They are code 2. Cooperation is emphasized during work. Code 3. Individuals have a large degree of autonomy to control their own works. Code 4. Decisions are made either by majority approval or by achieving common consensus. Code 6. A system that is responsible for the workers. Code 7. All employees can access to organizational information and they are given skills to cope with those information. Code 9. The organization strives to give individual meaningful tasks. Code 10. Individuals have large amount of skills that can be used in their tenure. Code 11. Any hierarchical system is restricted severely or even eliminated. Code 21.

An exploration of determinants of organizational commitment

Individual works with tolerance and respect towards minority and differences within their organization.

Table 1. Dependent Variable Description (Organizational Commitment)

Variable	Explanation (Statements/questions)
OCOM2_1	I really feel as if this department's problems are my own
OCOM3_1	I do not feel like 'part of the family' at my department
OCOM4_1	I do not feel a strong sense of belonging to my department
OCOM5_1	I do not feel 'emotionally attached' to this department

For the dependent variable in my study, organizational commitment, there are four questions: 1. "I really feel as if this department's problems are my own". 2. "I do not feel like 'part of the family' at my department". 3. " I do not feel a strong sense of belonging to my department". 4. " I do not feel 'emotionally attached' to this department". Mowdray (1992) defined "organizational commitment" as including three components. They are "an identification with the goals and values of the organization", "a desire to belong to the organization", and "a willingness to display effort on behalf of the organization" (2). Meanwhile, Meyer and Allen proposed a model that highlights affective commitment (individuals want to be attached to the organization), continuance commitment (individuals feel they need to be attached to the organization), and normative commitment (individuals feel they ought to remain with the organization). Of the four questions, the first three correspond to the "a desire to belong to the organization" category of Mondray. The last question, which is "I really feel as if this department's problems are my own", belongs to Mondray's category "willingness to display effort on behalf of the organization". All four questions correspond to Meyer and Allen's concept

An exploration of determinants of organizational commitment

of affective commitment.

Table 2. Independent Variable Description (Organizational Democracy)

Variable	Explanation (statements/questions)	Organization democracy codes (Luhman)
HR5_1	Team working is strongly encouraged in our department	2. Individuals are conscious of cooperating with each other and getting the greater good.
TMWK2_1	I need to work closely with my fellow team members to carry out my job	
TMWK1_1	I work as part of a team	
IRCLIM3_1	Employees and management in this department try to cooperate as much as possible	
EMP7_1	I have significant autonomy in determining how I do my job	3. Individuals have control over their own works.
EMP8_1	I can decide on my own how to go about doing my work	
EMP9_1	I have considerable opportunity for independence and freedom in how I do my job	
OCITZ11_1	How often do you perform according to your supervisor's requirements	
OCITZ12_1	How often do you perform all the tasks that are expected of you	
IRCLIM5_1	I think management in this department makes decisions in the best interests of all employees	4 the rule to make decision is either by majority approval or by achieving collective consensus.
JCLIM2_1	Employee input is obtained prior to making decisions	
HR7_1	Management involves employees when they make decisions that affect them	6. A system that is responsible for the workers.
OSUPP1_1	My department really cares about my wellbeing	
OSUPP2_1	My department cares about my opinions	
OSUPP3_1	Help is available from my department when I have a problem	
OSUPP5_1	My department strongly considers my goals and values	
OSUPP6_1	My department shows very little concern for me	
JCLIM4_1	Decisions that effect employees are made ethically	
JCLIM5_1	The reasons behind decisions are explained to us	
JCLIM6_1	All sides affected by decision are consulted	
JCLIM7_1	Employees' concern with decisions are listened to	
JCLIM8_1	Employees can request clarification or Additional information about decision	
JCLIM9_1	Employees can appeal or challenge decisions	
JCLIM10_1	The rights of employees are taken into account	

	when making decisions	
D_HR1	Employees are provided with sufficient opportunities for training	7. All employees can access to organizational information and they are given skills to cope with those information.
HR2_1	I receive the training I need to do my job	
HR1_1	I am provided with sufficient opportunities for training and development	
HR3_1	This department keeps me informed about business issues and about how well it's doing	
EMP3_1	The work I do is meaningful to me	9. The organization strives to give individual meaningful tasks.
EMP2_1	My job activities are personally meaningful to me	
EMP6_1	I have mastered the skills necessary for my job	10. Individuals have large amount of skills that can be used in their tenure.
HR4_1	There is a clear status difference between management and staff in this department	11. Any hierarchical system is restricted severely or even eliminated.
D_HR4	there's a clear status difference between management and staff	
IJUST1_1	To what extent does your supervisor consider your point of view?	21. Individuals work with tolerance and respect towards minority and differences within their organization.
IRCLIM4_1	Employees and management in this department respect each other	
OSUPP7_1	My department would forgive an honest mistake on my part	
IJUST3_1	To what extent does your supervisor provide you with feedback about decisions and their implications	
IJUST4_1	To what extent does your supervisor treat you with kindness and consideration	
IJUST5_1	To what extent does your supervisor show concern for your rights as an employee	

For the major explanatory variable "organization democracy", I identify relevant items on the questionnaire using Luhman's 23 aspects of organization democracy.

Table 3. Independent Variable Description (Perceived Personal Competence)

Variable	Explanation (statements/questions)
EMP4_1	I am confident about my ability to do my job
EMP5_1	I am self-assured about my capabilities to perform my work activities

For the first explanatory variable, "perceived personal competence", statements related to it includes " I am confident about my ability to do my job", "I am self-assured about my capabilities to perform my work activities".

Table 4. Independent Variable Description (Leader Communication)

Variable	Explanation (statements/questions)
LCLIM1_1	Managers in my department establish clear work objectives
LCLIM3_1	Managers in my department delegate work effectively
SUPSK_1	Your immediate supervisor has the skills needed to effectively supervise you

For the second explanatory variable, leader communication, from my personal perspective, there are three statements related to it, they are "Managers in my department establish clear work objectives", "Managers in my department delegate work effectively", "your immediate supervisor has the skills needed to effectively supervise you".

Table 5. Independent Variable Description (Role Conflict)

Variable	Explanation (Statement/questions)
WKPR6_1	Different groups at work demand things from me that are hard to combine

For the third explanatory variable "role conflict", there is one relevant item on the

An exploration of determinants of organizational commitment

questionnaire: " Different groups at work demand things from me that are hard to combine".

Research Model

I test my hypothesis using multiple linear regression. My dependent and key explanatory variables are all on a seven-point scale. I control for the following employee characteristics: gender, job title, whether or not the person is a professional, contract status, union membership status, and service department as control variables. And I turned each of these control variables to dummy variables.

The equation for the model can be specified as:

Organizational

commitment$=b_0+b_d X_d+b_{ppc} X_{ppc}+b_{lc} X_{lc}+b_{rc} X_{rc}++b_{gender} X_{gender}+b_{job-t} X_{job-t}+b_{prof} X_{prof}+$

$b_{cs} X_{cs}+b_{ums} X_{ums} + b_{dep} X_{dep} + e$

Where Y donates the dependent variable, namely "organizational commitment". X_d represents the organizational democracy variable. X_{ppc} represents "perceived personal competence", X_{lc} donates "leadership communication" variable, and X_{rc} refers to "role conflicts" variable. X_{gender} refers to control variable gender, X_{job-t} represents control variable job title, X_{prof} donates the control variable profession, X_{cs} refers to control variable contract status, X_{ums} is the control variable union membership status, X_{dep} indicates control variable of personal belonged department. And $\square$ denotes the random error in the model.

There are several questions or statements related to one variable, I want to check the alpha scale reliability coefficient for variables related to one common variable to see if they have

relatively high consistency. If the reliability coefficient is higher than 0.7, then those variables

are considered to be highly consistent with each other. So that they can be merged to predict the

effect the variable has on the organizational commitment.

Table6. Alpha Scale Reliability Coefficient

Organizational commitment		0.7466
Perceived personal competence		0.8813
Leader communication		0.7655
Role conflicts		/
Organizational democracy	Luhman Code 2 cooperation	0.5172
	Luhman Code3 individual autonomy in work	0.7523
	Luhman Code4 majority approval decision-making	0.7482
	Luhman Code6 acocountability to workers	0.9384
	Luhman Code7 viability of accessing information and chance of given skills	0.7779
	Luhman Code9 meaningful tasks	0.9437
	Luhman Code10 enough skills master in one's tenure	/
	Luhman Code11 hierarchical system restricted	/
	Luhman Code21 minority and difference respect	0.8625

According to Table 6, statements for the dependent variable (organizational commitment), and

independent variables (perceived personal competence, leader communication, Luhman's code 3,

4, 6, 7, 9 and 21 of organizational democracy) can be combined to determine the relationship

between organizational commitment and independent variables. Means to combine them is to

add values of each statement up and divided by the item numbers of statements. For example, the

way I combine the independent variable would be adding values of four statements related to

organizational commitment, and divided the total value by four.

Table7. Summary Statistics for the estimation sample (1,234 employees)

Explanations	Variables	Mean	S.D.	Min	Max
Averaged organizational commitment	**OCOMA**	4.51	1.34	1	7
Team work encouragement	**HR5_1**	4.98	1.53	1	7
Work as a team	**TMWK1_1**	0.94	0.24	0	1
Carry out jobs cooperatively	**TMWK2_1**	5.15	2.09	-1	7
Cooperation between management and employees	**IRCLIM3_1**	4.89	1.33	1	7
Individual autonomy	**Code3**	5.03	0.76	1.8	6.2
Majority approval decision making	**Code4**	3.92	1.38	1	7
A responsible system	**Code6**	4.29	1.18	1	7
Skills given	**Code7**	4.76	1.39	1	7
Meaningful tasks	**Code9**	5.4	1.43	1	7
Skills mastered	**EMP6_1**	5.83	1.02	1	7
Hierarchical system restricted	**HR4_1**	3.38	1.63	1	7
Tolerance and respect	**Code21**	5.14	1.15	1	7
Perceived personal competence	**PPC**	6.05	0.86	1	7
Leader communication	**LC**	4.68	1.28	1	7
Role conflict	**WKPR6_1**	4.04	1.63	1	7
Planning department	**d1**	0.13	0.34	0	1
Social Service department	**d2**	0.12	0.33	0	1
Education department	**d4**	0.14	0.34	0	1
Leisure department	**d5**	0.1	0.29	0	1
Waste Management department	**d6**	0.08	0.27	0	1
Revenue and Benefits department	**d7**	0.15	0.36	0	1
Human Resource department	**d8**	0.16	0.37	0	1
Female	**g1**	0.62	0.49	0	1
Manager	**j1**	0.15	0.35	0	1
Non-manager	**j3**	0.63	0.48	0	1
Non professional	**p1**	0.49	0.5	0	1
Temporary contract status	**C2**	0.1	0.3	0	1
Member of union	**U1**	0.51	0.5	0	1
Member of other union	**U2**	0.15	0.35	0	1
Never been member of union	**U4**	0.23	0.42	0	1

An exploration of determinants of organizational commitment

Results

Table8. Results

Explanations	Variables	Coef.	Std. Err.	P>t
Team work encouragement	HR5_1	0.127981	0.026708	<0.0001
Work as a team	TMWK1_1	-0.02446	0.204059	0.905
Carry out jobs cooperatively	TMWK2_1	0.033561	0.024677	0.174
Cooperation between management and employees	IRCLIM3_1	0.010938	0.031114	0.725
Individual autonomy	Code3	0.10157	0.049003	0.038
Majority approval decision making	Code4	-0.03066	0.039373	0.436
A responsible system	Code6	0.36659	0.053785	<0.0001
Skills given	Code7	0.018092	0.028698	0.529
Meaningful tasks	Code9	0.160778	0.024861	<0.0001
Skills mastered	Code10	0.017286	0.043565	0.692
Hierarchical system restricted	Code11	0.081594	0.020472	<0.0001
Tolerance and respect	Code21	0.087387	0.041534	0.036
Perceived personal competence	PPC	0.07245	0.052253	0.166
Leader communication	LC	-0.02662	0.038529	0.49
Role conflict	WKPR6_1	0.015208	0.021258	0.474
Planning department	d1	-0.01917	0.124842	0.878
Social Service department	d2	-0.0403	0.12859	0.754
Education department	d4	-0.06873	0.123517	0.578
Leisure department	d5	0.181819	0.135755	0.181
Waste Management department	d6	0.236202	0.14337	0.1
Revenue and Benefits department	d7	0.115607	0.123065	0.348
Human Resource department	d8	-0.03059	0.118358	0.796
Female	g1	0.09626	0.068488	0.16
Manager	j1	0.023002	0.10725	0.83
Non-manager	j3	-0.14373	0.082499	0.082
Non professional	p1	0.04879	0.078265	0.533
Temporary contract status	C2	-0.16993	0.108318	0.117
Member of union	U1	-0.05001	0.099796	0.616
Member of other union	U2	-0.02598	0.122613	0.832
Never been member of union	U4	-0.01443	0.111489	0.897
	_cons	-0.42873	0.377702	0.257
Observations	1,234			
R-squared	0.383			

Standard errors in parentheses
*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

According to Table 8, six elements out of twelve organizational democracy variables show a

statistically significant relationship with organizational democracy. To be specific, individual

autonomy on work, a system that is responsible for workers, organization strives to give

individual meaningful tasks, work with respect and tolerance towards minority and differences, team-working encouragement and the division status between management and employees have statistically significant relationship with organizational commitment.

When controlled for variables as individual's gender, job position, professional status, contract status, Union membership status, and belonged department, I get results as presented below.

First, an increase of one unit (about 2/3 of a standard deviation of teamwork encouragement) on employees' perceptions of teamwork encouragement is associated with a .1 unit increase (about 1/10 of a standard deviation of organizational commitment) in organizational commitment.

Second, an increase of one unit (about 4/3 of a standard deviation of individual autonomy) on employees' individual autonomy on their works is associated with a .1 unit increase (about 1/10 of a standard deviation) in organizational commitment.

Third, an increase of one unit (about 5/6 of a standard deviation of a responsible system) on a system' s responsibilities to its workers is associated with a .4 units increase (about 1/3 of a standard deviation) in organizational commitment.

Fourth, an increase of one unit (about 5/7 of a standard deviation of meaningful tasks) on an organization's trying to give its employees meaningful tasks is associated with a .2 units increase (about 1/6 of a standard deviation) in organizational commitment.

Fifth, an increase of one unit (about 5/8 of a standard deviation of restricted hierarchical system) on hierarchical system restricted is associated with a .1 unit increase (about 1/10 of a standard deviation) in organizational commitment.

Sixth, an increase of one unit (about 5/6 of a standard deviation of tolerance and respect) on employees work with tolerance and respects towards minorities and differences is associated with a .1unit increase (about 1/10 of a standard deviation) in organizational commitment.

For other independent variables included in the model, they appear a statistically insignificant relationship with the dependent variable.

The personal perceived competence shares a positive relationship with organizational commitment. Whenever the personal perceived competence increases by 1 scale, organizational commitment would increases by 0.0725 scales. The result corresponds with my prior assumption that is inferred from literatures.

Second, "role conflicts" is turned out to have a positive relationship with organizational commitment, which is on the opposite of previous assumption. I inferred that the role conflicts have a negative impact on organizational commitment, which is turned out to be a wrong answer. When staffs' feeling of "different groups at work demand things from one that are hard to combine" increase by one scale, organizational commitment would increase by 0.0152 scales.

Next, leader communication shares a negative insignificant relationship with organizational commitment. It is opposing to my assumption that accurate and effective communication style of leaders improves the degree of organizational commitment. When leader communication increases by one scale, organizational commitment decreases by 0.0266 scales.

Discussion

In my prior assumption, I expect that organizational democracy would have a positive impact on organization commitment. I find partial support for this hypothesis. Some aspects of organizational democracy indeed shape organization commitment positively, while for others, the null hypothesis of no relationship cannot be rejected. More specifically, some team-working elements contained in code 2 shapes organization commitment positively. The extent team working is encouraged within a department and individual needs to work closely with his/her

fellow team members to carry out job both share positive relationship with organization commitment.

Because teamwork means cooperation is a significant symptom or symbol of organizational democracy, and because I inferred that organizational democracy increases workers' organizational commitment, thus I predicted teamwork promotes the degree of organizational commitment. However, elements of teamwork can shape organizational commitment in different direction that is somewhat contradictory. I infer this kind of distinction caused by misunderstanding and misinterpreting statements related to teamwork. From statements' literal meanings, "I work as part of a team" is a reality statement. It seems like individual is cooperating with each other but actually it is not necessary a situation like this. We cannot reject the possibility that a person is working in a team but he/she does not in cooperation. Some statements are also feeling-present statements. The data used to do the estimation is based on how people feel about it. People may have inaccurate feeling about cooperation within their department, which may also cause data inaccuracy. This kind of inaccurate feeling of workers and misconception of readers can result in data inaccuracy, and leads to inexactitude choose of data and misinterpretation of the result.

Conclusion

According to result showed above, six elements share significantly positive relationship with organizational commitment. They are individual autonomy on work, a system that is responsible for workers, organization strives to give individual meaningful tasks, work with respect and tolerance towards minority and differences, team-working encouragement and the division status between management and employees.

Among all control variable, women, managers, nonprofessional, people who have permanent contract status, people who are not union membership but used to be members of union are likely to have a higher organizational commitment than any other group of population.

Limitations

As an abstract concept, the concept of democracy is hard to define, and thus its detailed definition is controversial. Although I believe Luhman's organizational democracy characteristics are relatively specific compared to other studies, it cannot be a perfect one that is unassailable. As well as the definition of organizational commitment, personal perceived competence, leader communication and role conflict. The operationalization of these concepts is not perfect. There may be measurement error.

The dataset is somewhat limited. It cannot cover all necessary conditions for each variable, especially organizational democracy. Only nine out of twenty-three of Luhman's organizational democracy characteristics are covered.

I chose statements and questions and tied them to a specific variable according to my best judgment. Others might disagree with some of the choices I made, which could also lead to some differences in findings.

Recommendations

Individual characteristics such as gender, job position, union membership status can affect organizational commitment, but they cannot be changed easily. In order to improve

organizational commitment in an organization, an organization should try to create an atmosphere in which individual has large autonomy in determining how they do their jobs. Cooperation should be encouraged strongly within a department. Besides, the organization should be responsible for workers, strive to give employees meaningful tasks, make people treat minorities and differences with tolerance and respect. The atmosphere created within an organization is important. If people within an organization are treated with tolerance and respect, or if people feel they are cared for, and being protected, then they tend to have a higher organizational commitment. Last but not the least, a flat structure for organization rather than a hierarchical system is of great help to promote the organizational commitment of employees.

References

Caimano, F. Vincent. (2004). Executive Commentary, *Academy of Management Executive*, 18, 96 – 97.

Harrison, S& Edward, R. (2004). Is organizational democracy worth the effort, *The Academy of Management Executive, 18*(3), 49-53.

Hackman, J. R. & Oldham, G. R. (1976). Motivation through the design of work: Test of a theory. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 16, 250-279.

John, E. & Dennis, M. (1990). A review and meta-analysis of the antecedents, correlates, and consequences of organizational commitment. *Psychological bulletin, 108*(2), 171-194.

Luhman, J. (2006). Theoretical Postulations on Organization Democracy. *Journal of Management Inquiry, 15*(168), 173.

Morris, J. H & Sherman, J. D. (1981). Generalizability of an organizational commitment model. *Academy of Management Journal*, 24, 512-526.

Nehmeh, R. (2009). What is organizational commitment, why should managers want it in their workforce and is their any cost effective way to secure it. *SMC Working Paper*, 5.

Prager, Jeffry . (1981). "Moral integration and political inclusion: A comparison of Durkheim's and Weber's theories of democracy." *Social Forces*, 59: 918-950.

Rainey,H.G. (2003) *Understanding &managing public organizations.* Jossey-bass.

Stone, E. F. & Gueutal, H. G. (1985). An empirical derivation of the dimensions along which characteristics of jobs are perceived. *Academy of Management Journal*. 28. 376-396.

Weber, Max . (1968). Sciences. New York: Free Press. Economy and Society, reprint ed.

Guenther Roth and Claus Wittich, eds. New York:Bed- minster.

Yazdani, N. (2006). Organizational Democracy and Organization Structure Link: Role of

Strategic Leadership & Environmental Uncertainty, *Business Review: Research Journal of The*

Institute of Business Administration Karachi, 5(2), 51-73.