



INDIAN INSTITUTE OF MANAGEMENT CALCUTTA

WORKING PAPER SERIES

WPS No. 635/ March 2009

Influence of Positive Characteristics on Organizational Commitment and Job Satisfaction of Indian Middle Managers

by

Neharika Vohra

Professor, Indian Institute of Management Ahmedabad, Vastrapur, Ahmedabad – 380015

&

Abhishek Goel

Assistant Professor, Indian Institute of Management Calcutta, Joka, Kolkata 700104

**Influence of Positive Characteristics on Organizational Commitment and Job
Satisfaction of Indian Middle Managers**

Neharika Vohra

Wing 12, Indian Institute of Management

Vastrapur, Ahmedabad – 380015 INDIA

Tel: +91-79-66324918

neharika@iimahd.ernet.in

Abhishek Goel

E-203, New Teaching Block, Indian Institute of Management Calcutta,

D H Road, Joka, Kolkata – 700104 INDIA

Tel: +91-33-24678300 (Ext. 523)

agoel@iimcal.ac.in

(Submitted to Journal of Positive Psychology for publication. Do not quote without
permission.)

Abstract

It has been proposed that some organizationally relevant positive psychology constructs such as hope, resilience, optimism, subjective well being, and self-efficacy would be able to explain positive outcomes such as positive attitudes and positive behaviors among employees in organizations. However, empirical validity of the claim is yet to be established. Hypotheses for relationships between positive characteristics and organizational commitment and job satisfaction were postulated. The hypotheses were tested on mid-level managers working in Indian organizations. All positive characteristics showed significant positive relationship with affective commitment, normative commitment and job satisfaction. The findings and implications are discussed.

KEYWORDS: Positive characteristics, Hope, Optimism, Self-efficacy, Resilience, Subjective well-being, Job satisfaction, Organizational commitment, Middle managers

Influence of Positive Characteristics on Organizational Commitment and Job Satisfaction of Indian Middle Managers

Recent discussions on positive psychology have generated interest in the academic and practice communities to verify the age-old claims of the benefits of being positive, thinking positive, and staying positive. Positive psychology (PP) proposes that a non-negative approach be taken towards studying people (Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000), organizations (Cameron, Dutton, Quinn, 2003) and their combinations (Luthans, 2005). The ideas and arguments in PP and its applications in organizations are considered promising and interesting among both practitioners and academicians. However, the exact nature of relationship between positive characteristics and attitudes of organizational importance is yet to be established. This study attempts to bridge this gap.

From organizational viewpoint organizational commitment and job satisfaction are two commonly studied attitudes that influence performance on the job and loyalty to the organization. Despite a lot of research on both antecedents and consequences of satisfaction and commitment, little is known about their relationships with positive dispositional characteristics. It is proposed here that test of organizationally relevant positive characteristics suggested by Luthans (2005) in relation to satisfaction and commitment would highlight the utility of studying such constructs and build scientific credence of the claims of positive constructs. The next section introduces briefly organizational commitment, job satisfaction and organizationally relevant positive characteristics.

Organizational commitment

Commitment is a psychological state more representative of an attitude (Meyer & Allen, 1991, 1997). Organizational commitment in recent research and thought is viewed as a three dimensional construct (Meyer & Allen, 1997; Meyer, Allen, & Smith, 1993; Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982; O'Reily & Chatman, 1986; O'Reily, Chatman, & Caldwell, 1991;

Vandenberg, Self, & Seo, 1994). *Affective* commitment refers to emotional attachment, identification with and involvement of an employee in the organization; i.e. an employee intrinsically desires to continue in the organization. *Continuance* commitment arises out of knowledge about costs associated with leaving the organization; i.e. the employee thinks that it is his or her need to continue working in the organization. Finally, *normative* commitment reflects a feeling of obligation to give back to the organization and an employee high on normative commitment would continue because he or she ought to do so.

Research has mainly focused on controllable external factors influencing organizational commitment such as modification of HRM policies and practices (Paul & Anantharaman, 2004), increasing socialization (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990), improving compensation (Mowday et al., 1982; O'Reilly & Chatman, 1986), leadership and interpersonal dynamics (Tu, Raghunathan, & Raghunathan, 2001), and hygiene factors (Balaji, 1985; Khokle, 1998). Very few dispositional characteristics have been tested for their influence on an individual's organizational commitment. The Big-5 personality characteristics (openness to experience, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness, neuroticism) has been found to explain small but significant variance in commitment (Erdheim, Wang, & Zickar, 2006; Raja, Johns, & Ntallianis, 2004). Interestingly, dispositional characteristics were found to influence affective, normative and continuance commitments differently. For example extraversion and agreeableness influenced normative commitment; continuance commitment was influenced by extraversion, conscientiousness, neuroticism and openness to experience; and affective commitment was influenced by extraversion and conscientiousness (Erdheim et al., 2006; Raja et al., 2004). In addition, self-monitoring, equity sensitivity, locus of control, and self-esteem were found to influence affective commitment (Jenkins, 1993, Raja et al., 2004), and dispositional affectivity has been found to impact organizational commitment (Cropanzano, James, & Konvosky, 1993).

Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction is a function of expectations and achieved outcomes on the job. It is understood to be a sum of cognitive, affective and evaluative reactions resulting from experiences at work (Locke, 1976), job characteristics (Judge, Bono, & Locke, 2000), and work environment (Judge & Watanabe, 1993; Shalley, Gilsom, & Blum, 2000). It has been found to be strongly associated with disposition of individuals in a meta analysis ($r = .41$, Judge, Heller, & Mount, 2002). The “core self-evaluation traits” (Judge, Locke, & Durham, 1997) comprising of self-efficacy, locus of control, self-esteem and neuroticism showed a consistently high correlation with job satisfaction (Judge, Locke, Durham, & Kluger, 1998) across samples with varied profiles. Generalized self-efficacy strongly predicted job satisfaction in a meta-analysis ($\rho = .45$, Judge & Bono, 2001). It is not clear, however, that if these differences are specific to US context. In a cross-cultural study, US sample showed a significant and positive relation between job satisfaction and generalized self-efficacy, while the South East Asian sample’s results were positive but not significant (Luthans, Zhu, & Avolio, 2006).

Job satisfaction has been found to positively influence organizationally relevant outcomes. For example, more satisfied school employees also showed better performance that resulted in improved organizational performance (Ostroff, 1992). Meta-analysis of satisfaction-performance hypothesis at organizational level has showed significant impact of job satisfaction on customer satisfaction, productivity, employee turnover, and following safety norms in organizations (Harter, Schmidt, & Hayes, 2002). Job satisfaction showed a strong relationship with work place performance in a meta-analysis ($r = .30$, Judge, Bono, Thoresen, & Patton, 2001).

Hope

Hope has been conceptualized as “the sum of perceived capabilities to produce routes to desired goals, along with the perceived motivation to use those routes (Snyder, 2000: 8).” Accordingly, a more hopeful person would mentally find more routes and be motivated to tread these routes to reach the desired goal than a less hopeful person.

Hope has been found to be helpful in predicting positive outcomes in stressful situations (Mishra & Spreitzer, 1998) and has led to increased satisfaction, profitability, and lesser turnover (Luthans & Jensen, 2002; Peterson & Luthans, 2003). The findings have been verified in different contexts that include sports, leadership, entrepreneurship, and labor intensive work situations. It was also found to have a moderating effect on burnout (Rodriguez-Hanley & Snyder, 2000) and handling pressure to secure jobs (Snyder, 1994). In the context of mergers and acquisitions, feeling hopeful about the situation was found to be positively related to normative and continuance organizational commitment (Ozag, 2006). Hopefulness was found to be positively related to organizational commitment (a unidimensional construct) and job satisfaction (Youssef & Luthans, 2007). Based on Youssef and Luthans (2007) study it is not possible to explain how hopefulness influences affective, normative and continuance commitment individually.

Relationship between Hopefulness and Organizational Commitment and Job Satisfaction

When faced with a difficulty, hopeful people would be able to think of different alternatives to their present job situations and possibly move away to another job. Hence, a negative relationship would be expected between hopefulness and continuance commitment. Moreover, being able to find alternative jobs would also mean that more hopeful individuals would stay only if they like their stay in the current organization, i.e. a positive relationship is to be expected with affective commitment. Moreover, a stronger desire to continue working in their current organization would implicitly mean staying out of volition thus indicating a

positive relationship between hopefulness and normative commitment of an individual.

Therefore it is hypothesized that,

Hypothesis 1(a) Hopefulness and affective commitment of an individual would be positively related.

Hypothesis 1(b) Hopefulness and normative commitment of an individual would be positively related.

Hypothesis 1(c) Hopefulness and continuance commitment of an individual would be negatively related.

As more hopeful employees would be able to find ways and are motivated to complete organizational tasks and meet various demands of their superiors or peers, they are likely to report higher job satisfaction (Peterson & Luthans, 2003). Therefore,

Hypothesis 1(d) Hopefulness and job satisfaction of an individual would be positively related.

Optimism

Optimism is a global expectation of an individual that future holds more of good than bad (Scheier & Carver, 1992). Consequently optimists are people who expect good things to happen to them (Carver & Scheier, 2003). They also persevere more in pursuit of their goals. Carver and Scheier (2003) posited that optimism is more than personal control

“...because they [optimists] believe they are immensely talented, because they are hard-working, because they are blessed, because they are lucky, because they have friends in the right places, or any combination of these or other factors that produce good outcomes” (p. 77).

In longitudinal studies, optimism has been found to impact well being of individuals (Scheier, Carver, & Bridges, 2001), physical and psychological well being of coronary bypass patients (e.g., Scheier et al., 1989) and college students (Aspinwall and Taylor, 1992).

Optimists have also been found to treat personal failures as temporary (Carver & Scheier, 2003; Peterson, 2000). In organizational setting, dispositional optimism has been found to influence coping with change, better planning and focus on problems (Scheier, Weintraube, & Carver, 1986); performance and stay in the organization (Seligman, 1998); positive leadership (Wunderley, Reddy, & Dember, 1998).

Relationship between Optimism and Organizational Commitment and Job Satisfaction

Optimists would expect best outcomes in all situations because of their disposition. Thus, they are likely to show high commitment because of their feelings attached to the organization, tendency to give their best. They would show optimism in continuing with the same job even if there are no other alternatives or even if they have to make large sacrifices in the present organization. Therefore, it is hypothesized that,

Hypothesis 2(a) Optimism of an individual would be positively related to all forms of organizational commitment

Optimism of individuals has been found to have a positive relationship with job satisfaction (Luthans, Avolio, Avey, & Norman, 2007; Youssef & Luthans, 2007). It is argued that because of their disposition optimists would remain positive about their interactions with peers and superiors and expect equitable reward in return for their services to the organization. Therefore it is hypothesized that,

Hypothesis 2(b) Optimism of an individual would be positively related to his or her job satisfaction.

Subjective Well-Being

Subjective well-being (SWB) is an individual's emotional and cognitive interpretation and evaluation of one's own life. It comprises of satisfaction with life events, satisfaction with external but relevant factors like work, family, friends, etc., and presence of feelings of joy along with absence of negative affect (Diener, 1984; Diener, Suh, Lucas, & Smith, 1999).

It has been found that SWB is largely determined by dispositional characteristics of a person and is stable over time (Diener, 2000; DeNeve & Cooper, 1998)

Few studies have looked at SWB in the workplace. A meta-analysis of 34 studies covering nearly 20,000 data points reported that job-satisfaction and life-satisfaction are positively related ($r = .44$) (Tait, Padgett, & Baldwin, 1989). Judge and Hulin (1993) and Judge and Wantanabe (1993) concluded that SWB could predict job satisfaction five years later. It has also been found to influence efforts made to attain an agreed upon goal (Diener, Oishi, & Lucas, 2003).

Relationship between SWB and Organizational Commitment and Job Satisfaction

Given that studies in the past have shown a relationship between subjective well being and job satisfaction (Tait et al., 1989), this relation would confirm the same in Indian context in this study. Also, satisfaction with life is expected to result in stronger affective and normative commitment since satisfaction with life would mean staying in the organization out of volition (Meyer et al., 1993). Therefore while there would be low positive relationship with affective and normative forms of organizational commitment, continuance commitment is expected to show negative relationship with subjective well being. It is hypothesized that,

Hypothesis 3(a) SWB of an individual would be positively related to affective and normative forms of organizational commitment.

Hypothesis 3(b) SWB of an individual would negatively related to continuance commitment of an individual.

Hypothesis 3(c) SWB of an individual would be positively related to his or her job satisfaction.

Generalized Self-efficacy

Generalized self-efficacy (GSE) is understood to be a belief about oneself in executing some course of action to deal with future situations (Bandura, 1982:122). It can

also be defined as “individuals’ perception of their ability to perform across a variety of different situations” (Judge, Erez, & Bono, 1998, p. 170). In this study the generalized form of self-efficacy is meant as reflecting people’s belief in successfully accomplishing tasks across a wide variety of achievement situations (Chen, Gully, & Eden, 2001; Sherer, Maddux, Mercadante, Prentice-Dunn, Jacobs, & Rogers, 1982). This generalized form is a more stable, trait-like form that could be viewed as a dispositional characteristic.

Relationship between GSE and Organizational Commitment and Job Satisfaction

Clear positive linkages have been found between generalized self-efficacy and task performance and coping with change (Judge, Thoresen, Pucik, & Welbourne, 1999; Stajkovic & Luthans, 1998); job satisfaction (Erez & Judge, 2001; Judge et al., 2000; Luthans et al., 2006); and organizational commitment (Judge et al., 1999; Luthans et al., 2006).

Individuals high on generalized self-efficacy are likely to see themselves as competent and able to do well at any task at hand. Hence, their desire to stay in the organization because of lack of alternatives or due to high sacrifice required to change the job would be low. Therefore, a negative relationship would be expected between generalized self efficacy of an individual and his or her continuance commitment. It is hypothesized that,

Hypothesis 4(a) Generalized self-efficacy of an individual would be positively related to affective and normative forms of organizational commitment.

Hypothesis 4(b) Generalized self-efficacy of an individual would be negatively related to continuance commitment of an individual.

Hypothesis 4(c) Generalized self-efficacy of an individual would be positively related to his or her job satisfaction.

Resilience

Resilience could be best understood as adaptability (Block & Kremen, 1996), or the tendency to bounce back from adverse situations as individuals adaptively encounter

environmental vagaries in long and short term (Klohn, 1996). It is therefore, “a class of phenomena characterized by patterns of positive adaptation in the context of significant adversity or risk” (Masten & Reed, 2002, p.75). Resilient people are seen as resourceful and capable of understanding a situation and solving a problem (Block & Kremen, 1996).

Resilience of individual members has been found to impact resilience of the family (Hawley & Deehan, 1996, as cited in Greeff & Ritman, 2005), found to be an important characteristic of positive leadership (Avolio, Gardner, Walumbwa, Luthans, & May, 2004), influential in increasing commitment to leadership and organization (McCarthy, 2003), and playing a role in an organizations’ growth (Luthans, 2005).

Relationship between Resilience and Organizational Commitment and Job Satisfaction

Resilience is characterized by adaptability to different situations, trying out new things and maintaining good relationships. Such adaptability is expected to help individuals to meet the expectations of the organization and its members. If resilient people get equitable returns they would be satisfied, but if they don’t they would adapt quickly to the situation and wait for the next cycle for more equitable rewards. Therefore, more resilient individuals are likely to show higher job satisfaction.

Similarly, Youssef and Luthans (2007) speculated and empirically found a relationship between resilience and organizational commitment of an individual. Conceptually, it is argued that once resilient individuals find out that they need to stay in the organization because there is lack of alternatives or high sacrifice involved in changing a job they would adapt to the situation and increase their efforts to find out alternatives and/or surpass their feeling of sacrifice involved in changing the job. Thus it is proposed that there would be a negative relationship between resilience and continuance commitment. Subsequently, more resilient individuals would like to stay in the organization if they feel like doing so, consequently there would be a positive relationship between resilience of an

individual and his or her affective and normative forms of commitment. Following hypotheses are proposed for resilience of an individual,

Hypothesis 5(a) Resilience of an individual would be positively related to affective and normative forms of organizational commitment.

Hypothesis 5(b) Resilience of an individual would be negatively related to continuance commitment of an individual.

Hypothesis 5(c) Resilience of an individual would be positively related to his or her job satisfaction.

Method

Respondents

Respondents were practicing middle managers attending different management development programs over two months in a management institute in western India. The respondent's participation was voluntary and they did not receive any credit in their coursework for participation. A total of 159 usable responses were collected. 91% respondents (146) were males. One respondent did not provide information about gender. Average age of the respondents was 41.1 years with average work experience of 18.47 years of which an average of 11.3 years were spent in the current organization. All respondents were Indian nationals from manufacturing and service activities.

Procedure

At the end of a session participants were asked if they would like to participate in a study that would require about 20 minutes of their time. Volunteering participants were asked to sit on alternate chairs to ensure personal space. The instructions for the two part questionnaire in English were read out to them by either author. They were explained the scoring scheme. To ensure that mid-point response was not a reflection of lack of

understanding about the item, the participants were urged to mark 6 (Can't say) only after ensuring that they understood the item clearly and could not choose any other rating.

Measures

A larger scoring scheme is reported to be better able to capture variations in respondent scores (Snyder, Rand, & Digmon, 2002). Therefore, an 11-point scale ranging from 1 (Not at all applicable to me) to 11 (Completely applicable to me) was used to measure all the variables with 6 being the mid-point (Can't say).

Organizational commitment

Organizational commitment was measured using the 22-item revised Meyer and Allen (1997) scale for commitment. Continuance commitment was further split into low alternative and high sacrifice dimensions as suggested by Meyer et al. (1997). All items were positively worded. Alpha reliability coefficients for affective, normative, low-alternative, and high sacrifice subscales were .839, .690, .701 and .812 respectively.

Job satisfaction

Job satisfaction was measured using six item Job Satisfaction Index (Tsui, Egan, & O'Reilly, 1992). Cohen (1997) and Tsui et al. (1992) have reported its validity. All six statements loaded on a single dimension. Reliability score for the sample was .742.

Positive characteristics

The adult dispositional hope scale (Snyder et al., 1991) was used to measure hope. The validity of the scale has been well established (Snyder et al., 1991, Lopez, Snyder, & Pedrotti, 2003). The reliability coefficient for this sample was .791. The validated version (Carver & Scheier, 2003) of life orientation test – revised (LOTS-R) was used to measure dispositional optimism of an individual (Scheier, Carver, & Bridges, 1994). The negative items indicating pessimism were reworded to represent positive valence and therefore, optimism. Cronbach's alpha for this sample was .690. New General Self-efficacy (NGSE)

scale was used for measuring generalized self-efficacy (Chen et al., 2001). Chen et al. (2001) have reported discriminant and convergent validity of the NGSE scale. Cronbach's alpha for the scale was .857. Resilience was measured using 14-item Ego Resiliency Scale (ER-89, Block & Kremen, 1996). The scale was used as a single construct. Cronbach's alpha for the resilience scale was .807. Satisfaction with life scale (SWLS, Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin, 1985) was used to measure SWB of the respondents. The scale has been validated (*see*, Pavot & Diener, 1993). Cronbach's alpha for the scale was .765.

Regression analysis was done to test for relationships between positive characteristics and job satisfaction and organizational commitment. The data was checked for assumptions of linearity and normality and was found to satisfactorily meet the standards.

Results

Table 1 presents the mean, standard deviations, correlations and reliability values for various constructs and scales.

Insert Table 1 about here

Table 2 shows the Adj. R^2 value and the significance level for the regression coefficient.

Insert Table 2 about here

Hope and Attitudes

Hopefulness of an individual showed a significantly positive relationship with affective commitment ($r = .327, p < .001$) and normative commitment ($r = .213, p < .01$)

with explained variance being 10.1% and 3.9% in affective and normative commitment respectively. The correlation coefficients between hope and LoAlt and HiSac forms of continuance commitment were nearly zero indicating that there is no relationship between hopefulness and continuance commitment. These results therefore supported hypotheses 1(a), 1(b) and 1(c). Job satisfaction of an individual showed a positive and significant relationship with hopefulness of the person ($r = .349, p < .001$). Hope could explain nearly 12% variance in job satisfaction, indicating support for hypothesis 1(d).

Optimism and Attitudes

It was hypothesized that optimism would be positively related to all forms of organizational commitment and job satisfaction of an individual. Results in Tables 1 and 2 show a significant and positive relationship of optimism with affective commitment ($r = .230, p < .01, \text{Adj. } R^2 = 4.7\%$), normative commitment ($r = .270, p < .001, \text{Adj. } R^2 = 6.7\%$), continuance commitment due to lack of alternatives ($r = .211, p < .01, \text{Adj. } R^2 = 3.8\%$), and high sacrifice involved in change of job ($r = .222, p < .01, \text{Adj. } R^2 = 4.9\%$). The results therefore supported hypothesis 2 (a).

Optimism was also positively and significantly related to job satisfaction ($r = .169, p < .05, \text{Adj. } R^2 = 2.8\%$). The results however supported hypothesis 2 (b).

Subjective Well-being and Attitudes

Results showed that SWB of an individual was positively related to affective commitment of an individual ($r = .344, p < .001, \text{Adj. } R^2 = 11.3\%$) and his or her normative commitment ($r = .276, p < .001, \text{Adj. } R^2 = 7.0\%$). The results therefore supported hypothesis 3(a) completely. Both continuance commitment dimensions of lower alternatives and high sacrifice involved in changing the job showed somewhat positive but nearly zero correlation with SWB. The correlation coefficient between SWB and LoAlt was .099 (*ns*) and between SWB and HiSac was .022 (*ns*). The results therefore partially supported hypothesis 3(b).

SWB of an individual showed positive and significant relationship with job satisfaction ($r = .347, p < .001, \text{Adj. } R^2 = 11.5\%$) lending support to hypothesis 3(c).

Generalized Self-efficacy and Attitudes

GSE of an individual showed positive and significant relationships with affective commitment ($r = .176, p < .05, \text{Adj. } R^2 = 2.5\%$) and normative commitment ($r = .158, p < .05, \text{Adj. } R^2 = 2.5\%$) of an individual indicating support for hypothesis 4 (a). Continuance commitment due to lack of alternatives showed somewhat positive but not significant relationship with GSE ($r = .083, ns$), and so did continuance commitment due to high sacrifice ($r = .053, ns$). As a negative relationship was expected to be found, the results showed only partial support to hypothesis 4 (b). GSE showed a positive and significant relationship with job satisfaction of an individual ($r = .193, p < .05, \text{Adj. } R^2 = 3.1\%$) in support of hypothesis 4 (c).

Resilience and Attitudes

The results showed that resilience of an individual was related positively to his or her affective commitment ($r = .284, p < .001, \text{Adj. } R^2 = 7.5\%$) and normative commitment ($r = .257, p < .001, \text{Adj. } R^2 = 6.0\%$). Thus, hypothesis 5(a) was fully supported. The correlation between resilience and the two continuance commitment dimensions were nearly zero in magnitude indicating no relationship between resilience and continuance commitment. The results therefore did not support hypothesis 5(b) of expecting a negative relationship between resilience of an individual and his or her continuance commitment. As expected, resilience showed a positive and significant relationship with job satisfaction of an individual ($r = .283, p < .001, \text{Adj. } R^2 = 7.4\%$) indicating support for hypothesis 5(c).

Discussion

Hope, optimism, GSE, SWB, and resilience were found to positively influence two important work attitudes – organizational commitment and job satisfaction. The affective and

normative commitment were positively related to all five positive characteristics while continuance commitment showed a positive relationship only with optimism of an individual. Thus, this study takes the understanding of relationship of types of commitment and positive characteristics, as compared to organizational commitment as a single construct (Youssef & Luthans, 2007) to the next level of conceptual improvement. This is expected to contribute to theory building attempts in this area of study.

The results indicated that higher hopefulness impacted the ability to handle diverse situations at work and they did not continue within an organization because of inability to find alternatives. Consequently, more hopefuls would likely stay longer in the organization because they inherently felt like it.

Optimists displayed a strong tendency to continue within an organization because they identified with it at the feeling level. A positive relationship between optimism and both dimensions of continuance commitment indicated that optimists are likely to continue probably with the expectation that the situation would improve in the same job and therefore there was no need to look for alternatives. Their optimism also contributed to the feeling of high sacrifice involved in changing a job even though their job satisfaction was comparatively lower.

Overall satisfaction with life (SWB) also contributed to feeling good towards the organization and work, reflected in positive affective and normative commitment and no relationship with continuance commitment. SWB showed a strong relationship with job satisfaction (Judge & Watanabe, 1993) comparable to affective commitment.

Earlier research in South East Asian context that is culturally similar to India (Brodbeck, Chhokar, & House, 2007), has found positive but not significant relationship between generalized self-efficacy and job satisfaction (Luthans et al., 2006). Here, the relationship of job satisfaction with GSE was found to be weaker than Luthans' et al.'s study

on comparatively similar South East Asian sample. As Luthans and colleagues reported commitment as a single score, the results of this study for organizational commitment are not directly comparable. The confidence of an individual in his or her ability is a contributor to his or her innate desire to continue with the organization rather than continue under pressure or duress is evident from this study. The results of this study also support the finding that GSE is positively and significantly related to job satisfaction (Judge & Bono, 2001).

Ability to adapt (resilience) indicated greater ability in handling diverse situations at the job and meeting demands from various quarters of the organization, peers and superiors. This adaptability was reflected in higher job satisfaction and no relationship with continuance commitment of either form. Also, affective and normative commitment was high for more resilient people.

The results therefore supported the conjecture that positive characteristics would be related to organizationally relevant positive attitudes like commitment and satisfaction. Conceptually, employees who are more hopeful, or are confident of their ability to excel in the work taken up, or have a capacity to adapt to different situations, or are satisfied with their life, or see themselves coping with any difficulty would not obviously perceive as stuck with a job for lack of opportunity elsewhere. Any lack of opportunity is quite likely to be seen as a challenge and therefore as an opportunity to put more efforts to find alternatives. Continuing the same line of thought, once such people take a decision to change a job, the costs of leaving the organization might not deter from taking up a new job. This has implications for the organizations because positive people would make it necessary for the organization to improve on the affective and normative components of commitment, rather than try and work on increasing exit barriers for employees (e.g., Cunningham, 2006).

These findings establish that there is indeed a positive influence of positive characteristics on organizational commitment and job satisfaction. Past research on the

consequences of commitment and satisfaction found that these attitudes result in higher in-role performance in some contexts (DeCotiis & Summers, 1987; Shim & Steers, 2001; Satjkovic & Luthans, 1998). Thus organizations may be well-advised to look for positive people as employees. Though this appears common-sense in hindsight this study is among the first few to empirically established this link.

Implications, Limitations and Future Research

Primary implication of this study is about the utility of studying positive-positive combinations in organizational context. This study establishes the utility of personality characteristics in determining attitudes like commitment and satisfaction. This relationship is meaningful given that these two attitudes are related to positive outcome for the organization (e.g., Raja et al., 2004; Satjkovic & Luthans, 1998). The studies on positive traits and their relationships with positive outcomes have often been criticized as being a fad and lacking substance to stand on its own or explain relevant outcomes for individuals and organizations (e.g., Lazarus, 2003). In contrast to such claims, the results of this study have shown that study of positive characteristics is able to withstand the rigor of research and are stable predictors of relevant attitudes. This is however, just the beginning. Their advantage could be better established by designing studies and longer term programs that can compare and contrast between the strength of relationship between variables such as conscientiousness, neuroticism, agreeableness etc., and positive characteristics with commitment, job satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors.

There were a few limitations of this study. As respondents were attending programs for obtaining advanced training for upgrading their skill set, they are likely to represent a group of people who are more committed to their organization. This could have therefore been responsible for high levels of expressed affective commitment. It might help to collect data from all people within the same organization and then study these relationships. This

would also allow for control of situational variables that could have influenced attitudes within the sample.

Another concern is that data on independent and dependent variables was collected for the same person. This could have resulted in common source variance and therefore the observed relationships may be artifactually high (Podsakoff & Organ, 1986). However, it is difficult to measure personality traits and attitudes using others report. Segregation in time could be a useful method to reduce the effects of common source and is suggested for future studies.

A positive relationship between affective and normative forms of commitment indicated a sense of obligation among employees that may arise out of identification and emotional attachment with the organization, i.e. it is plausible that normative commitment arises out of high affective commitment. This causal relationship could also be explored in future.

Another area of exploration in the future could be to study to compare the differences between attitudes of people who are high and those who are low on the positive characteristic. It is plausible that individuals with high generalized self-efficacy may show lower job satisfaction or organizational commitment because they perceive that they are capable of doing more and the present organization is not able to make best use of their skills and therefore not rewarding them to their desired levels. In contrast, low GSE individuals might be very satisfied with the returns from the organization because they know that they are not capable enough of doing more than current levels. Such, contrasts would add to the richness of positive characteristics and highlight clearly their role in determining better outcomes in the form of satisfaction, commitment, positive behaviors, and performance.

References

Aspinwall, L. G., & Taylor, S. E. (1992). Modeling cognitive adaptation: A longitudinal

- investigation of the impact of individual differences and coping on college adjustment and performance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 63, 989-1003.
- Avolio, B. J., Gardner, W. L., Walumbwa, F. O., Luthans, F., & May, D. R. (2004).
Unlocking the mask: A look at the process by which authentic leaders impact follower attitudes and behaviors. *Leadership Quarterly*, 15, 801-823.
- Balaji, C. (1985). *Organizational commitment and human resource management: A study of managers in cooperatives*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Indian Institute of Management Ahmedabad, Ahmedabad.
- Bandura, A. (1982). Self-efficacy mechanism in human agency. *American Psychologist*, 37, 122-147.
- Block, J., & Kremen, A. M. (1996). IQ and ego-resiliency: Conceptual and empirical connections and separateness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70, 349-361.
- Brodbeck, F. C., Chhokar, J. S., & House, R. J. (2007). Culture and leadership in 25 societies: Integration, conclusions, and future directions. In J. S. Chhokar, F. C. Brodbeck & R. J. House (Eds.), *Culture and leadership across the world: The globe book of in-depth studies of 25 societies*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Cameron, K. S., Dutton, J. E., & Quinn, R. E. (2003). *Positive organizational scholarship*. San Francisco CA: Berrett-Koehler.
- Carver, C. S., & Scheier, M. F. (2003). Optimism. In S. J. Lopez & C. R. Snyder (Eds.), *Positive psychological assessment: A handbook of models and measures*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Chen, G., Gully, S. M., & Eden, D. (2001). Validation of a new general self-efficacy scale. *Organizational Research Methods*, 4, 62-83.
- Cohen, A. (1997). Non-work influences on withdrawal cognitions: An empirical examination

- of an overlooked issue. *Human Relations*, 50, 1511-1537.
- Cropanzano, R., James, K., & Konovsky, M. A. (1993). Dispositional affectivity as a predictor of work attitudes and job performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 14, 595-606.
- Cunningham, G. B. (2006). The relationships among commitment to change, coping with change, and turnover intentions. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 15, 29-45.
- DeCotiis, T. A., & Summers, T. P. (1987). A path analysis of a model of the antecedents and consequences of organizational commitment. *Human Relations*, 40, 445-470.
- DeNeve, K. M., & Cooper, H. (1998). The happy personality: A meta-analysis of 137 personality traits and subjective well-being. *Psychological Bulletin*, 124, 197-229.
- Diener, E. (1984). Subjective well-being. *Psychological Bulletin*, 93, 542-575.
- Diener, E. (2000). Subjective well-being: The science of happiness and a proposal for a national index. *American Psychologist*, 55, 34-43.
- Diener, E., Emmons, R. A., Larsen, R. J., & Griffin, S. (1985). The satisfaction with life scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 49, 71-75.
- Diener, E., Oishi, S., & Lucas, R. E. (2003). Personality, culture, and subjective well-being: Emotional and cognitive evaluations of life. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 54, 403-425.
- Diener, E., Suh, E., Lucas, R. E., & Smith, H. L. (1999). Subjective well-being: Three decades of progress. *Psychological Bulletin*, 125, 276-302.
- Erdheim, J., Wang, M., & Zickar, M. J. (2006). Linking the big five personality constructs to organizational commitment. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 41, 959-970.
- Erez, A., & Judge, T. A. (2001). Relationship of core self-evaluations to goal setting, motivation, and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 1270-1279.

- Greeff, A. P., & Ritman, I. N. (2005). Individual characteristics associated with resilience in single parent families. *Psychological Reports, 96*, 36-42.
- Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F. L., & Hayes, T. L. (2002). Business-unit-level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and business outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*, 268-279.
- Jenkins, J. M. (1993). Self-monitoring and turnover: The impact of personality on intent to leave. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 14*, 83-91.
- Judge, T. A., & Bono, J. E. (2001). Relationship of core self-evaluation traits - self-esteem, generalized self-efficacy, locus of control, and emotional stability - with job satisfaction and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*, 80-92.
- Judge, T. A., Bono, J. E., & Locke, E. A. (2000). Personality and job satisfaction: The mediating role of job characteristics. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85*, 237-249.
- Judge, T. A., Bono, J. E., Thoresen, C. J., & Patton, G. K. (2001). The job satisfaction-job performance relationship: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Psychological Bulletin, 127*, 376-407.
- Judge, T. A., Erez, A., & Bono, J. E. (1998). The power of being positive: The relation between positive self-concept and job performance. *Human Performance, 11*, 167-187.
- Judge, T. A., Heller, D., & Mount, M. K. (2002). Five-factor model of personality and job satisfaction: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*, 530-541.
- Judge, T. A., & Hulin, C. L. (1993). Job satisfaction as a reflection of disposition: A multiple causal source analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Process, 56*, 388-421.
- Judge, T. A., Locke, E. A., & Durham, C. C. (1997). The dispositional causes of job

- satisfaction: A core evaluations approach. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 19, 151-188.
- Judge, T. A., Locke, E. A., Durham, C. C., & Kluger, A. N. (1998). Disposition effects on job and life satisfaction: The role of core evaluations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83, 17-34.
- Judge, T. A., Thoresen, C. J., Pucik, V., & Welbourne, T. M. (1999). Managerial coping with organizational change: A dispositional perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84, 107-122.
- Judge, T. A., & Watanabe, S. (1993). Another look at the job satisfaction - life satisfaction relationship. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78, 939-948.
- Khokle, P. W. (1998). *Factors influencing commitment of key individuals towards and organizational transformation*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Indian Institute of Management Ahmedabad, Ahmedabad.
- Klohn, E. C. (1996). Conceptualization and measurement of the construct of ego-resiliency. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70, 1067-1079.
- Lazarus, R. S. (2003). Does the positive psychology movement have legs? *Psychological Inquiry*, 14, 93-109.
- Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 1297-1343). Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Lopez, S. J., Snyder, C. R., & Pedrotti, J. T. (2003). Hope: Many definitions, many measures. In S. J. Lopez & C. R. Snyder (Eds.), *Positive psychological assessment: A handbook of models and measures* (pp. 91-107). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Luthans, F. (2005). *Organizational behavior* (10th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

- Luthans, F., Avolio, B. J., Avey, J. B., & Norman, S. M. (2007). Positive psychological capital: Measurement and relationship with performance and satisfaction. *Personnel Psychology, 60*, 541-572.
- Luthans, F., & Jensen, S. M. (2002). Positive organizational behavior: A new approach to global management. *Singapore Nanyang Business Review, 1*, 17-30.
- Luthans, F., Zhu, W., & Avolio, B. J. (2006). The impact of efficacy on work attitudes across cultures. *Journal of World Business, 41*, 121-132.
- Masten, A. S., & Reed, M. G. (2002). Resilience in development. In C. R. Snyder & S. J. Lopez (Eds.), *Handbook of positive psychology* (pp. 74-88). New York: Oxford.
- Mathieu, J. E., & Zajac, D. M. (1990). A review and meta-analysis of the antecedents, correlates, and consequences of organizational commitment. *Psychological Bulletin, 108*, 171-194.
- McCarthy, J. F. (2003). *Short stories at work: Organizational story telling as a leadership conduit during turbulent times*. Paper presented at the Academy of Management Proceedings.
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review, 1*, 61-89.
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1997). *Commitment in the workplace: Theory, research, and application*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Meyer, J. P., Allen, N. J., & Smith, C. A. (1993). Commitment to organizations and occupations: Extension and test of a three-component conceptualization. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 78*, 538-551.
- Mishra, A. K., & Spreitzer, G. M. (1998). Explaining how survivors respond to downsizing: The roles of trust, empowerment, justice, and work design. *Academy of Management Review, 23*, 567-588.

- Mowday, R. T., Porter, L. W., & Steers, R. M. (1982). *Employee organization linkages: The psychology of commitment, absenteeism, and turnover*. New York: Academic Press.
- O'Reilly, C. A. I., & Chatman, J. (1986). Organizational commitment and psychological attachment: The effects of compliance, identification, and internalization on prosocial behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 71*, 492-499.
- O'Reilly, C. A. I., Chatman, J., & Caldwell, D. F. (1991). People and organizational culture: A profile comparison approach to assessing person-organization fit. *Academy of Management Journal, 34*, 487-516.
- Ostroff, C. (1992). The relationship between satisfaction, attitudes, and performance: An organizational level analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 77*, 963-974.
- Ozag, D. (2006). The relationship between the trust, hope, and normative and continuance commitment of merger survivors. *Journal of Management Development, 25*, 870-883.
- Paul, A. K., & Anantharaman, R. N. (2004). Influence of HRM practices on organizational commitment: A study among software professionals in India. *Human Resource Development Quarterly, 15*, 77-88.
- Pavot, W., & Diener, E. (1993). Review of the satisfaction with life scale. *Psychological Assessment, 5*, 164-172.
- Peterson, C. (2000). The future of optimism. *American Psychologist, 55*, 44-55.
- Peterson, S. J., & Luthans, F. (2003). The positive impact and development of hopeful leaders. *Leadership and Organizational Development, 24*, 26-31.
- Podsakoff, P. M., & Organ, D. W. (1986). Self reports in organizational research: Problems and prospects. *Journal of Management, 12*, 69-82.
- Raja, U., Johns, G., & Ntallianis, F. (2004). The impact of personality on psychological contracts. *Academy of Management Journal, 47*, 350-367.
- Rodriguez-Hanley, A., & Snyder, C. R. (2000). The demise of hope: On losing positive

- thinking. In C. R. Snyder (Ed.), *Handbook of hope: Theory, measures, and applications*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Scheier, M. F., & Carver, C. S. (1992). Effects of optimism on psychological and physical well-being: Theoretical overview and empirical update. *Cognitive Therapy and Research, 16*, 201-228.
- Scheier, M. F., Carver, C. S., & Bridges, M. W. (1994). Distinguishing optimism from neuroticism (and trait anxiety, self-mastery, and self-esteem): A reevaluation of the life orientation test. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 57*, 1024-1040.
- Scheier, M. F., Carver, C. S., & Bridges, M. W. (2001). Optimism, pessimism, and psychological well-being. In E. C. Chang (Ed.), *Optimism and pessimism: Implications for theory, research, and practice* (pp. 189-216). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Scheier, M. F., Matthews, K. A., Owens, J. F., Magovern, G. J., Lefebvre, R. C., Abbott, R. A., et al. (1989). Dispositional optimism and recovery from coronary artery bypass surgery: The beneficial effects on physical and psychological well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 57*, 1024-1040.
- Scheier, M. F., Weintraub, J. K., & Carver, C. S. (1986). Coping with stress: Divergent strategies of optimists and pessimists. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51*, 1257-1264.
- Seligman, M. E. P. (1998). *Learned optimism: How to change your mind and your life*. New York: Pocket Books.
- Seligman, M. E. P., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2000). Positive psychology: An introduction. *American Psychologist, 55*, 5-14.
- Shalley, C. E., Gilson, L. L., & Blum, T. C. (2000). Matching creativity requirements and the work environment: Effects on satisfaction and intentions to leave. *Academy of*

Management Journal, 43, 215-223.

- Sherer, M., Maddux, J. E., Mercadante, B., Prentice-Dunn, S., Jacobs, B., & Rogers, R. W. (1982). The self-efficacy scale: Construction and validation. *Psychological Reports*, 51, 663-671.
- Shim, W. S., & Steers, R. M. (2001). The entrepreneurial basis of Korean enterprise: Past accomplishments and future challenges. *Asia Pacific Business Review*, 7, 22-43.
- Snyder, C. R. (1994). *The psychology of hope: You can get there from here*. New York: Free Press.
- Snyder, C. R. (2000). Hypothesis: There is hope. In C. R. Snyder (Ed.), *Handbook of hope: Theory, measures, and applications* (pp. 3-21). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Snyder, C. R., Harris, C., Anderson, J. R., Holleran, S. A., Irving, L. M., Sigmon, S. T., et al. (1991). The will and the ways: Development and validation of an individual differences measure of hope. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 60, 570-585.
- Snyder, C. R., Rand, K. L., & Digmon, D. R. (2002). Hope theory: A member of the positive psychology family. In C. R. Snyder & S. J. Lopez (Eds.), *Handbook of positive psychology* (pp. 257-276). New York: Oxford.
- Stajkovic, A. D., & Luthans, F. (1998). Self-efficacy and work related performance: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 124, 240-261.
- Tait, M., Padgett, M. Y., & Baldwin, T. T. (1989). Job satisfaction and life satisfaction: A reexamination of the strength of the relationship and gender effects as a function of the date of the study. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74, 502-507.
- Tsui, A. S., Egan, T. D., & O'Reilly, C. A. I. (1992). Being different: Relational demography and organizational attachment. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 37, 549-580.
- Tu, Q., Raghunathan, B., & Raghunathan, T. S. (2001). A path analytic study of the

antecedents of organizational commitment of IS managers. *Information Resource Management Journal*, 14, 27-36.

Vandenberg, R. J., Self, R. M., & Seo, J. H. (1994). A critical examination of the internalization, identification, and compliance commitment measures. *Journal of Management*, 20, 12-140.

Wunderley, L. J., Reddy, W. P., & Dember, W. N. (1998). Optimism and pessimism in business leaders. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 28, 751-760.

Youssef, C. M., & Luthans, F. (2007). Positive organizational behavior in the workplace: The impact of hope, optimism, and resilience. *Journal of Management*, 33, 774-800.

Table 1

Mean, S. D. and Correlations of Variables (N = 159)

	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Affective	8.676	1.659	(0.84)									
Normative	7.475	1.935	.634**	(0.69)								
LoAlt	5.372	2.435	0.099	.350**	(0.70)							
HiSac	4.916	2.61	0.101	.363**	.793**	(0.81)						
JS	8.476	1.519	.752**	.533**	0.067	0.088	(0.74)					
Hope	8.925	1.111	.327**	.213**	0.044	-0.028	.349**	(0.79)				
Optimism	8.285	1.381	.230**	.270**	.211**	.222**	.169*	.438**	(0.69)			
SWB	8.04	1.548	.344**	.276**	0.099	0.022	.347**	.539**	.364**	(0.77)		
GSE	8.914	1.212	.176*	.158*	0.083	0.053	.193*	.783**	.471**	.525**	(0.86)	
Resilience	8.261	1.185	.284**	.257**	0.003	-0.009	.283**	.676**	.455**	.516**	.694**	(0.81)

Maximum score for all variables except for Tenure was 11.

Alpha reliability coefficient of the scale is shown in parentheses.

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

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

Table 2

Correlation, Adjusted R-Square and Significance of Relationships (N = 159)

		Hope	Optimism	SWB	GSE	Resilience
Affective	Adj. R Sq.	0.101	0.047	0.113	0.025	0.075
Commitment	Sig.	0.000	0.004	0.000	0.027	0.000
Normative	Adj. R Sq.	0.039	0.067	0.070	0.019	0.060
Commitment	Sig.	0.007	0.001	0.000	0.046	0.001
Continuance	Adj. R Sq.	-0.004	0.038	0.003	0.001	-0.006
Commitment (LoAlt)	Sig.	0.585	0.008	0.217	0.299	0.968
Continuance	Adj. R Sq.	0.001	0.049	-0.006	-0.004	-0.006
Commitment (HiSac)	Sig.	0.729	0.005	0.784	0.510	0.909
Job	Adj. R Sq.	0.117	0.028	0.115	0.031	0.074
Satisfaction	Sig.	0.000	0.033	0.000	0.015	0.000