

Career Stage Effect on Organizational Commitment: Empirical Evidence from Indian Banking Industry

Kanwaldeep Kaur

Head, PG. Deptt. of Commerce & Business Management
Hans Raj Mahila Mahavidyalaya, Jalandhar (Pb.), India
Tel: 91-98-7266-8421 E-mail: kkaurhmv@yahoo.co.in

H.S. Sandhu

Prof. Deptt. of Commerce & Business Management
Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar (Pb.), India
Tel: 91-94-1701-0864 E-mail: Sandhu_hs12@yahoo.com

Kanwaldeep Kaur (Corresponding author)

Head, PG. Deptt. of Commerce & Business Management
Hans Raj Mahila Mahavidyalaya, Jalandhar (Pb.), India
Tel: 91-98-7266-8421 E-mail: kkaurhmv@yahoo.co.in

Abstract

This study examines the career stage effect on organizational commitment of bank employees. The subjects included 660 clerical and managerial staff of Indian banks operating in the state of Punjab in northern India. Organizational commitment has been measured by Meyer et al.'s (1993) Organizational Commitment Scale. Career stages were identified by each respondent's self-reported age, and tenure in the organization. Results of the study revealed significant differences in organizational commitment across career stages of employees when career stages were categorized on the basis of chronological age but no significant difference in any dimension of organizational commitment has been found between employees in early-career stage (up to 2 years of experience), and employees in mid-career stage (3-10 years of experience). The findings of the study have positive and useful implications for HR systems in Indian banks to design more effective organizational career planning programs and procedures.

Keywords: Organizational commitment, Affective commitment, Continuance commitment, Normative commitment, Career stage

1. Introduction

Organizational commitment is a concept that has attracted a great deal of attention from scholars in many disciplines including industrial psychology, industrial sociology, management, business administration and public administration. In view of the potential importance of commitment to the sociology of organizational behaviour, it is not surprising that much effort has been directed towards identifying variables that may influence the level of commitment (Buchanan, 1974; Chughtai and Zafar, 2006; Cohen, 2007; Beck and Wilson, 2001; McElroy, 2001; Meyer, Herscovitch, and Topolnytsky, 2002; Mohapatra and Sharma, 2008; Steers, 1977). Age and tenure are considered the important antecedents of organizational commitment as they are the main indicators of "side-bets" (Becker, 1960), a term that describes accumulated investments like pension funds, work experience etc. which an individual has made by remaining in a given organization/or occupation. The threat of losing these investments, along with a perceived lack of alternatives to replace or make up for the loss, commits the person to the organization.

However, meta-analytical studies (e.g. Cohen and Lowenberg, 1990; Mathieu and Zajac; 1990; Meyer et al., 2002) have reported weak correlation between organizational commitment and age, and organizational commitment and tenure. The reason for this is that both age and tenure have been considered in the organizational commitment literature as time related variables representing similar effects and processes in their

relation with organizational commitment and linear correlation analysis has been done to study this relationship (Cohen, 1993). Researchers (e.g. Cohen, 1993; Gregersen, 1993; Morrow and McElroy, 1987; Winter, Taylor, and Sarros 2000; Kumar and Giri, 2009) have found different patterns of relations between organizational commitment and age, and organizational commitment and tenure across employment stages. A number of studies have shown that employee work attitudes differ across career stages (e.g. Allen and Meyer, 1993; Cohen, 1991; Cron and Slocum, 1986; Guthrie and Schwoerer, 1996; Kumar and Giri, 2009; Lynn, Cao and Horn, 1996; Mathieu and Zajac, 1990; Mehta, Anderson, and Dubinsky, 2000; Suliman and Iles, 2000).

This research continues and extends this line of inquiry by examining career stage effects on organizational commitment, using sample of bank employees in India, with the hope that findings will enable the HR management of banks to design more effective organizational career planning programs and procedures, commensurate with the needs of employees.

2. Literature review and research hypotheses

2.1 Organizational commitment

There exists a considerable degree of diversity and controversy within the literature regarding how the construct of organizational commitment should be defined and subsequently measured. Most researchers conceive of commitment as involving some form of psychological bond between people and the organization. The most widely accepted definition of this psychological approach called attitudinal commitment is that of Porter, Steers, Mowday, and Boulian (1974, p.604) who defined commitment as 'the relative strength of an individual's identification and involvement in a particular organization.' Mowday, Porter, and Steer (1982) viewed attitudinal commitment as an individual's identification with and involvement in a particular organization, that can be characterized by a strong belief in and acceptance of the organization's goals and values. This perspective has been operationalized with a scale known as the OCQ developed by Porter and his colleagues (Porter et al., 1974; Mowday et al., 1982).

Drawing on the early works of Porter and his colleagues (Porter et al., 1974; Mowday et al., 1982) and Becker (1960), Meyer and Allen (1984) first conceptualized OC as bi-dimensional construct. The first dimension termed as affective commitment, was defined as 'positive feelings of identification with, attachment to, and involvement in the work organization' (Meyer and Allen, 1984, p.375). The second dimension of organizational commitment (based on Becker's *side-bet* theory) called continuance commitment, was defined as 'the extent to which employees feel committed to their organizations by virtue of the costs that they feel are associated with leaving (e.g., investments or lack of attractive alternatives)' (Meyer and Allen, 1984, p. 375). Later, they added a third dimension, normative commitment (Allen and Meyer, 1990) which was defined as the employees' feelings of obligation to remain with the organization (Weiner, 1982). They viewed these three components as separate and distinguishable components, rather than types of attitudinal commitment. This means that employees can experience each of these psychological states to varying degrees. For example, some employees may feel both a strong need and a strong obligation to stay within the organization but may have no desire to stay on. Some others may feel neither a strong need nor a strong obligation to stay within the organization, but not may have a strong desire to remain in the organization. Thus, net sum of an employee's commitment to the organization would reflect each of the three separable psychological states.

Meyer and Allen (1997) argued that one can achieve a better understanding of an employee's relationship with an organization when all three forms of commitment are considered together. These components have also been found to correlate differentially with variables purported to be antecedents of commitment (Allen and Meyer, 1993; Lok and Crawford, 2004; Meyer et al., 2002; Park and Rainey, 2007; Shore and Tetrick, 1991). Each component develops as the result of different experiences and has different implications for on-the-job behavior and performance (Hackett et al., 1994; Meyer and Allen, 1997; Randall et al., 1990; Park and Rainey, 2007; Shore and Barksdale; 1998, Wasti, 2003; Wasti and Can, 2008). Employees, whose experiences within the organization are consistent with their expectations and satisfy their basic needs, tend to develop a stronger affective attachment to the organization. Continuance commitment presumably develops as employees recognize that they have accumulated investments or side-bets that would be lost if they were to leave the organization or as they recognize that the availability of comparable alternatives is limited. Finally, normative commitment develops in response to various pre-entry experiences, and as the result of socialization experiences that emphasize the appropriateness of remaining loyal to one's employer.

The development of commitment is based on the general theories of life development which provide a framework for the study of changes in individual physiology, behaviour, and personality as a person moves from conception to death, including transactions associated with work (Beck and Wilson, 2001).

2.2 Career stages

Working life of every individual passes through typical evolutionary phases called career stages. Super (1957, 1984) proposed a theory that people pass through specific career stages during their life span. These stages are characterized by various crucial activities and psychological adjustments which people have to make, no matter what their occupation or background is (Arthur, Hall, and Lawrence, 1989; Brown and Brooks, 1996; Ornstein, Cron, and Slocum 1989; Levinson, 1986; Levinson, Darrow, Klein, Levinson, and Mckee, 1978; Lynn et al., 1996; Super, Savickas, and Super, 1996). Levinson et al. (1978, 1986), on the basis of their study of careers of a group of individuals from different occupational groups posit that every five to seven years, the individuals have to pass through some kind of personal or career related decisions with apparently a fairly predictive sequence. An individual before entering a particular organization or occupation passes through a 'pre-employment stage' during which he/she seeks out an occupation or organization that will cater to his or her needs, values, and aspirations. There is then an entry or 'socialization stage' during which individuals experience all aspects of the organization. Finally, there is an advancement stage during which individuals act to enhance, and then maintain their position or status.

These career stages can be, and usually are, based on chronological age. Attitude and behaviour of individuals are influenced by their experiences of the environment and by changes in these experiences as they grow older (Beck and Wilson, 2001). According to Super's (1957) theory, there are three stages in a person's vocational career over age 25-65 years: exploration, establishment, and maintenance. These career stages are based on the qualitatively different psychological task of each stage. Levinson et al. (1978) identified four "life areas": Childhood (0-20 yrs.), early adulthood (20-40 yrs.), middle adulthood (40-60 yrs.), and late adulthood (over 60 yrs.). Brooks and Seers (1991) considered five (18-21, 22-27, 28-32, 33-40, 41 and older). The age ranges assigned for each stage have varied considerably between empirical studies, but usually the early-career stage is considered to range from the ages of 20 to 34 years, the mid-career from 35 to 50 years and the late-career from 50 to 65 years.

Organizational commitment development models (Mowday et al., 1982; Reichers, 1986) also employ tenure as a career stage indicator. Tenure (i.e. the length of time an individual has lived in an organization or 'organizational age') is viewed as an index of experience with the organization, as 'age' is an index of experiences associated with living in general. Therefore, life-span theory suggests that age causes changes in behaviour and attitudes, while organizational commitment development models suggest that tenure causes changes in behaviour and attitudes towards work.

Mowday et al., (1982) proposed three stages in the development of organizational commitment: a) the pre-entry stage; b) the early employment stage; and c) the middle and late-career stages in the organization. A slightly different model was suggested by Reichers (1986), who excluded the pre-employment stage and concentrated on three stages of development: early, mid, and late-career stages. This category partially corresponds to the exploration, establishment, and maintenance stages of Super's (1957) theory, and similarly to the 'entering the adult world stage (early), 'thirties transition' and 'settling down' stages (mid), and 'middle adulthood' stages (late) of Levinson et al's (1978) typology (Cohen, 1991).

Ornstein, Cron, and Slocum (1989) argued that career stages can be based either on age or on organizational, positional or professional tenure. When tenure measures are used, the first two years are seen as a trial period. The period from two to ten years means establishment period in which an individual is concerned with career advancement and growth. After ten years comes the maintenance period in which the individual prefers to hold on to the accomplishments achieved. According to Greenhaus, Callanan, and Godshalk (2000), there are five stages in career development: (1) occupational choice: preparation for work, (2) organizational entry, (3) early-career: establishment and achievement, (4) mid-career, and (5) late-career. These career stages are characterized by some demographic variables like age, working experience and company tenure.

2.3 Age and Tenure as Antecedents of Organizational Commitment

Age and tenure are considered the important antecedents of organizational commitment as they are the main indicators of side-bets (Becker, 1960). Organizational commitment and age have been found to be positively related in a number of studies (Allen and Meyer, 1993; Glisson and Durick, 1988; Kushman, 1992; Mathieu and Zajac, 1990; Meyer and Allen, 1984; Meyer et al., 2002; Morris and Sherman, 1981; Newstrom, 2007; Salami, 2008; Sharma and Singh, 1991; Sommer et al., 1996; Suliman and Iles, 2000). However, not all studies have confirmed the relationship of age with organizational commitment (Camilleri, 2002; Chughtai and Zafar, 2006; Iqbal, 2010; Kwon and Banks, 2004).

Organizational Commitment-tenure relationship finds its basis in the perceived costs or exchange-based approach exemplified by Becker's (1960) side-bet theory. Increasing tenure is generally associated with increased side-bets which make staying in the organization more attractive. Older employees view their past years of service to the organization as an investment, and will have the psychological barrier that it would be more difficult for them to shift from one job to another. Long-service employees also develop affective attachment to their organization. Therefore they tend to be more committed to the organization (Bosman, Buitendach, and Laba, 2005; Iqbal, 2010; Mathieu and Zajac, 1990; Meyer and Allen 1984; Meyer et al., 1993; Meyer et al., 2002; Mottaz, 1988; Mowday et al., 1982; Newstrom, 2007; Reichers, 1985; Sommer et al, 1996; Suliman and Lles, 2000).

However, meta-analyses (Cohen and Lowenberg, 1990; Mathieu and Zajac, 1990; Meyer et al., 2002) have reported weaker correlations between organizational commitment and age, and organizational commitment and tenure. Due to relatively small magnitude of the relations between organizational commitment and age, and organizational commitment and tenure, some researchers (e.g. Cohen and Lowenberg, 1990; Meyer and Allen, 1984) even questioned the importance of age and tenure as determinants of organizational commitment. The major limitation of studies on these relations is that both age and tenure have been considered in the organizational commitment literature as time related variables representing similar effects and processes in their relation with organizational commitment (Cohen, 1991). However, researchers (e.g. Cohen 1993; Gregersen 1993; Morrow and McElroy, 1987; Winter et al., 2000; Kumar and Giri, 2009) have found different patterns of relations between organizational commitment and age, and organizational commitment and tenure across employment stages.

2.4 Career Stages and Organizational Commitment

Career development theories propounded by Levinson et al. (1978, 1986), and Super (1957) point out that development and maintenance of organizational commitment will differ across career stages as represented by age. Individuals' opportunities and the availability of attractive alternatives will determine the level of organizational commitment in the early-career stages (Mowday et al., 1982; Rusbult and Farrel, 1983). An individual in the early-career stage attempts to explore different jobs which interest him or her, but if that job proves inappropriate, he or she does not hesitate to choose another.

Employees in early-career stage have higher intention to leave their organization, and have greater willingness to relocate than those in other age groups (Ornstien, Cron, and Slocum, 1989; Ornstien and Isabella, 1990). Thus, age is expected to be an important determinant of organizational commitment in the early-career stage. The experiences and opportunities of employees at this stage vary significantly and result in different levels of organizational commitment depending on the availability of alternative employment opportunities. Stability of work and personal life assumes greater importance for the people in the mid-career stage. People in the late stage of their career are more oriented to settling down. Some individuals even don't hesitate to decline promotions at the late-career stage. Moreover, accumulated investments in the employing firm make it extremely difficult to find jobs elsewhere. The relative stability of commitment level along with increased difficulties in leaving the organization weaken the relation between age and organizational commitment in the mid and late-career stages. Thus, one would predict a weaker relation between age and organizational commitment in the mid and late-career stages than in the early stage. These propositions have been confirmed in number of studies (e.g. Cohen, 1991; Meyer and Allen, 1993; Morrow and McElroy, 1987; Winter et al., 2000; Kumar and Giri, 2009).

The effect of tenure on organizational commitment has also been found to vary across career stages. Reicher's (1986) experience model clearly explains the effect of tenure on organizational commitment across career stages. She holds the argument that employee in the early-career stage has weak behavioural and structural bonds with the organization. So, not tenure but psychological factors (expectations, challenges, conflict), may be the primary antecedents at the early-career stage. In later career stages, not only do psychological and behavioral factors play an important role in developing commitment, but sunk costs such as accumulated investment and lack of available opportunities also combine to cement the individual's attachment to the organization.

Morrow and McElroy (1987) found the relationship between commitment and tenure as U- shaped, with higher levels of commitment reported by employees with 2 or less years, or greater than 10 years of experience. In comparison, Gregersen (1993) reported a difference in the commitment levels of employees with less than 2 years of experience, and those with between 2 and 8 years of experience. He found that there was significant increase in the commitment levels of employees with more than 8 years of experience. Meyer and Allen (1993) indicated that organizational tenure generally showed a mild curvilinear relationship whereby middle-tenure employees possessed less measured commitment than new or senior level (by age) employees. Allen and

Meyer's study (1993) on two samples reported that affective commitment increased significantly across tenure (<2, 2-10, >10 years of service) and age (<31, 31-44, >44 years old) for a sample of university library workers and tended (not significantly) to increase in the second sample of hospital employees. Kumar and Giri's (2009) study of 380 employees working at junior, middle, and top level management from various public and private organizations, mostly banking and telecom in India reported that job satisfaction and organizational commitment differed significantly across three career stages.

Thus, all this evidence points to the need to examine whether the organizational commitment-age, and organizational commitment-tenure relation differs as a function of employment stage, in the context of bank employees. In the light of preceding review of literature, the following hypotheses are proposed:

Hypothesis 1: Affective, continuance, and normative organizational commitment will vary according to career stage, as measured by employee age.

Hypothesis 2: Older employees will exhibit higher affective, continuance, and normative organizational commitment than their younger colleagues.

Hypothesis 3: There will be significant difference in affective, continuance, and normative organizational commitment across career stages, classified by tenure of employees.

Hypothesis 4: Senior employees will score higher on affective, continuance, and normative organizational commitment than their junior colleagues.

3. Database and methodology

3.1 Sample Description

Data collection of a total of 660 subjects, who participated in the study, was undertaken from April to September, 2009. Data was collected on site on one to one basis. The subjects included clerical and managerial staff working in different branches and administrative offices of various private and public sector banks operating in the state of Punjab. 32 percent of the respondents were 30 years old or below, 22 per cent were between 31 and 44 years, and 46 per cent were 45 years old or above. The mean age of the respondents was (40.23, SD=11.76). The average years of service in the bank was (16.34 years, SD=12.11). 26 per cent respondents had 2 or less than 2 years of experience, 16 per cent of the total sample were employees with experience ranging between 3 to 10 yrs., and 58 per cent had spent more than 10 years in the bank.

3.2 Scale used

18-item Organizational Commitment Scale (Meyer et al., 1993) has been utilized in this study to measure the specific nature of organizational commitment. Responses to each item are made on a 7-point scale with anchors labeled (1=strongly disagree, and 7=strongly agree). The psychometric properties of the instrument make it a valid and reliable measure of the three-component structure of organizational commitment. Reliability coefficients for the affective, continuance, and normative commitment scales reported by the authors are 0.85, 0.79, and 0.73, respectively (Meyer and Allen, 1997).

3.3 Classified Variables

Two indicators of career stage, employee's age and tenure were used to define career stage. Age was divided into three time frame subgroups: (a) Up to 30 years, (b) 31-44 years, and (c) 45 years and above. The first subgroup represents the early-career stage, the second represents the mid-career, and the third represents the late-career stages (Allen and Meyer, 1993). Consistent with similar research on employee commitment by Morrow and McElory, (1987), and Allen and Meyer, (1993), organizational tenure was divided into three subgroups: (a) up to 2 years representing the early-stage, (b) 3-10 years representing the mid-stage, and (c) more than 10 years representing the late-career stage. The value one (1) was assigned to early-career stage, two (2) was assigned to mid-career stage, and three (3) was assigned to late-career stage.

3.4 Statistical Techniques

Descriptive statistics were employed to ascertain the level of affective, continuance, and normative organizational commitment across career stages. To test the internal consistency reliability of the organizational commitment scale, Cronbach alpha was calculated. One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was carried out to study the impact of career stages on different dimensions of organizational commitment. Although one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) resulted in the rejection of null hypothesis of equal means for the three career stages, this did not indicate where exactly the differences between the groups lie. To determine the precise nature of the differentiation between groups, Turkey's Honestly Significant Difference of multiple comparisons (post-hoc) has been employed (Hair et al., 2005). SPSS (15.01) version has been used for data processing.

4. Results and analysis

Internal consistency reliability of organizational commitment scale was assessed using Cronbach's alpha (α). The alpha coefficients in this study were found to be 0.80 for affective commitment, 0.73 for continuance commitment, and 0.77 for normative commitment scale. However, by deleting the item 'if I had not put so much of myself into this bank, I might have considered working elsewhere' from continuance commitment scale, reliability could improve to 0.77. Therefore, the said item was deleted from the scale. The alpha coefficients in this study exceed 0.60 criterions which, according to Nunnally and Bersnstein (1994) is an acceptable level of reliability for social sciences.

Table 1 presents the descriptive statistics for affective, continuance, and normative organizational commitment across career stages classified on the basis of chronological age. Employees in the early-career stage have lowest mean score on all the dimensions of organizational commitment. Level of commitment goes on increasing as they move from early to mid-career and then to late-career stage. The patterns are similar on all the dimensions of organizational commitment.

Insert Table 1 about here

In order to determine the significance of difference among the levels of affective, continuance and normative commitment across career stages, one-way ANOVA was undertaken. Examination of the results of the analysis (see Table 2a) indicates that there was significant difference in affective, continuance, and normative organizational commitment across career stages with F-ratio (39.22, $p < .01$), (86.85, $p < .01$), (84.72, $p < .01$), respectively. Thus, hypothesis one (1) was supported in the current study.

Insert Table 1a about here

Although one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) resulted in the rejection of null hypothesis of equal means for the three career stages, this did not indicate where exactly the differences between the groups lie. To determine the precise nature of the differentiation between groups, Turkey's Honestly Significant Difference test was undertaken as a post-hoc measure to determine the precise nature of the differentiation between the age groups. Pair-wise comparison (presented in Table 1b) indicated that employees in the late-career stage (age group 45years and above) with (mean = 5.60, SD= 1.19) were significantly more committed to the bank on all the dimensions of organizational commitment than those in mid (mean= 4.99, SD=1.19) or early-career stage (mean=4.68, SD=1.19), lending support to hypothesis 2.

Insert Table 1b about here

Table2 presents the descriptive statistics for affective, continuance, and normative organizational commitment across career stages classified by the number of years of service in the bank (organizational tenure).

Insert Table 2 about here

Examination of the results of the analysis (see Table 2a) indicates that there was significant difference in affective, continuance, and normative organizational commitment across career stages classified by tenure, as indicated by F ratio (43.74, $p < .01$), (98.69, $p < .01$), and (91.48, $p < .01$), respectively. Thus, hypothesis three (3) was also supported in the current study.

Insert Table 2a about here

Turkey's Honestly Significant Difference test was again undertaken as a post-hoc measure to determine the precise nature of the differentiation between groups. Pair-wise comparison (presented in Table2b) indicated that longer service employees with tenure exceeding 10 years i.e. the late-career stage with (mean =5.53, SD= 1.19) were significantly more committed to the bank than those in mid (mean=4.51, SD=1.08) or early -career stage (mean=4.76, SD=1.21). Their commitment score was the highest on all the dimensions of organizational commitment. However, no significant difference has been found between the shortest-tenured employees (two or less than two years of service) and mid-tenured employees on any dimension of commitment. Hypothesis 4 finds partial support in the current study.

Insert Table 2b about here

5. Discussion and implications

This study set out to explore the career stage effect on organizational commitment of bank employees. Organizational commitment was viewed as a multidimensional concept, and has been measured by Meyer et al.'s (1993) Organizational Commitment Scale. While life span theory suggests that the factors associated with chronological age cause changes in behaviour and attitudes, and organizational commitment models suggest that

factors associated with tenure cause changes in behaviour. So both the variables were used for the purpose of this study. Career stages were identified by each respondent's self-reported age, and tenure in the organization. The cut off points to each career stage have been established through a review of previous research.

It was hypothesized that there would be significant difference in affective, continuance, and normative commitment at each career stage of employees, and that mid, and late-career stage employees would exhibit higher affective, continuance, and normative commitment than employees in their early-career stage. Findings demonstrate that affective, continuance, and normative organizational commitment are, indeed, differently related to career stage. The present research finds significant difference in affective, continuance, and normative organizational commitment at each career stage of employees.

Employees at mid and late-career stage exhibited high affective, continuance, and normative commitment than early-career stage employees when career stages were categorized on the basis of chronological age. The results lend support to life development theory that attitude and behaviour of individuals are influenced by their experiences of the environment and by changes in these experiences as they grow older. Results are consistent with the findings of (Allen and Meyer, 1993; Cohen, 1991; Mathieu and Zajac, 1990; Suliman and Iles, 2000) that commitment will vary over the course of people's careers due to differences in their perceptions caused by life experiences. The study indicates that the mindset of the older employees is different from those of younger employees. Stability of work and personal life assumes greater importance for them. Older employees are more likely to adapt to norms and procedures of the organization and make themselves comfortable in their job.

Not only age but longevity of the employment relationship also affects the level of organizational commitment at each career stage. The expectations of employees change with experience, and this might be the reason which makes them perceive organizational commitment differently. Not only sunk costs such as pension funds but also lack of available opportunities might have resulted in higher level of organizational commitment of senior employees. Moreover, higher positions, greater prestige and importance are associated with longer age and experience which may have been the reason for their higher affective, continuance, and normative organizational commitment. On the other hand, new-comers' low investments, low professional skills and, low prestige may result in their lack of commitment to the organization.

The findings do not support the Meyer and Allen (1984) argument that younger employees might have more commitment because they are aware of the fact that with less work experience, they often have fewer job opportunities elsewhere. As they get more experience, however, alternate employment opportunities may increase, thus decreasing the magnitude of one important cost of leaving, that of having no job. No significant difference in any dimension of organizational commitment has been found between employees in early-career stage (up to 2 years of experience), and employees in mid-career stage (3-10 years of experience). Thus, ten years point appeared to be pivotal in terms of changes in career related attitudes among bank employees, which invariably implies that they are taking more time to settle and acclimatize to the organization.

The findings of the study have significant implications for the management of commitment among bank employees in India. Only recruiting good employees is not enough. It is equally important that their level of commitment is built and enhanced with right kinds of policies. The management of employee experiences across career stages can be usefully considered by the human resource management teams in the banking industry to foster high commitment among employees to face the challenges brought by the globalised environment.

References

- Allen, N.J., & Meyer, J.P. (1993). Organizational commitment: Evidence of career stage effect. *Journal of Business Research*, 26,49-61.
- Arthur, M. B., Hall, T., & Lawrence, B. S. (1989). *Handbook of career theory*. NewYork: Cambridge University Press.
- Beck, K., & Wilson, C. (2001). Have we studied, should we study, and can we study the development of commitment? Methodological issues and the development study of work-related commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 11, 257-278.
- Becker, H.S. (1960). Notes on the concept of commitment. *American Journal of Sociology*, 66,32-42.
- Bosman, J.H., Buitendach, & Laba, K. (2005). Job insecurity, burnout and organizational commitment among employees of a financial institution in Gauteng. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 31 (4), 32-40.
- Brooks, J.L., & Sears, A. (1991). Predictors of organizational commitment: Variations across career stages. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 38, 53-64.

- Brown, D., & Brooks, L. (1996). Introduction to theories of career development and choice: Origins, evolution, and current efforts. In D. Brown, L. Brooks, & Associates (Eds.). *Career choice and development* (3rd ed., pp. 1-30). San-FranciscoSan Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Buchanan, B. (1974). Building organizational commitment: the socialization of managers in work organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 19, 533-546.
- Camilleri, E. (2002). Some antecedents of organizational commitment: Result from an information systems public sector organization. *Bank of Valletta Review*, 25, 1-29.
- Chughtai, A., & Zafar, S. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of organizational commitment among pakistani university teachers. *Applied H.R.M. Research*, 11, 39-64.
- Cohen, A. (1991). Career stage as a moderator of the relationships between organizational commitment and its outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Organizational Psychology*, 64, 253-268.
- Cohen, A. (1993). Age and tenure in relation to organizational commitment: A meta-analysis. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 14, 143-159.
- Cohen, A., & Lowenberg, G. (1990). A Reexamination of the side-bet theory as applied to organizational commitment: A meta-analysis. *Human Relations*, 43, 1015 -1050.
- Cohen, A. (2007). Commitment before and after: An evaluation and reconceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 17, 336-354.
- Cron, W. L., & Slocum, J. W. (1986). The influence of career stages on salespeople's job attitudes, work perceptions, and performance. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 23(2), 119-129.
- Glisson, C., & Durick, M. (1988). Predictors of job satisfaction and organizational commitment in human service organizations *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 33(1), 61-81.
- Greenhaus, J. H., Callanan, G. A., & Godshalk, V. M. (2000). *Career management* (3rd ed.). Fort Worth, TX: Dryden Press.
- Guthrie, J. P. & Schwoerer, C.E. (1996). Older dogs and new tricks: career stage and self-assessed need for training. *Public Personnel Management*, 25 (1), 59-72.
- Gregersen, H.B. (1993). Multiple commitments at work and extra role behaviour during three stages of organizational tenure. *Journal of Business Research*, 26, 31-47.
- Hackett, R.D., Bycio, P., & Hausdorf, P.A. (1994). Further assessments of Meyer and Allen's (1991) three-component model of organisational commitment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79, 15-23.
- Hair, J.F., Anderson, R., Tatham, R., & Black (2005). *Multivariate data analysis*. New Delhi: Pearson Education.
- Hall, D.T., & Mansfield, R. (1975). Relationships of age and seniority with career variables of engineers and scientists. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 60, 201-210.
- Hall, D.T., & Schneider, B. (1972). Correlates of organizational identification as a function of career pattern and organizational type. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 17,340 -350.
- Iqbal Adnan. (2010). An empirical assessment of demographic factors, organizational ranks and organizational commitment. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 5(3), 16-27.
- Kumar, B. P., & Giri, V. N. (2009). Effect of age and experience on job satisfaction and organizational commitment. *The Icfai Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 8, 28-36.
- Kushman, J.W. (1992). The organisational dynamics of teacher workplace commitment: A study of urban elementary and middle schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 28, 5-4.
- Kwon, I., & Banks, D. (2004). Factors related to the organizational and professional commitment of internal auditors. *Managerial Auditing Journal*, 19, 606-622.
- Levinson, D. J. (1986). A conception of adult development. *American Psychologist*, 41, 3-13.
- Levinson, D.J. (1978). *The Seasons of a man's life*. New York: Knopf.
- Levinson, D.J., Darrow, C.N., Klein, E.B., Levinson, M. H., & Mckee, B. (1978). *The season of man's life*. New Yourk: Alfred A. Knopf.

- Lok, P., & Crawford, J. (2004). The effect of organisational culture and leadership style on job satisfaction and organizational commitment: A cross cultural comparison. *The Journal of Management Development*, 23(4), 320-338.
- Lynn, S. A., Cao, L. T., & Horn, B. C. (1996). The influence of career stage on the work attitudes of male and female accounting professionals. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 17(2), 135-149.
- Mathieu, J.E., & Zajac, D.M. (1990). Review and meta-analysis of the antecedents, correlates, and consequences of organizational commitment. *Psychological Bulletin*, 108, 171-194.
- McElory, J.C. (2001). Managing workplace commitment by putting people first. *Human Resources Management Review*, 11, 327-335.
- Mehta, R., Anderson, R. E., & Dubinsky, A. J. (2000). The perceived importance of sales managers' rewards: a career stage perspective. *Journal of Business and Industrial Marketing*, 15 (7), 507-524.
- 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.
- Meyer, J. P., Stanley, D. J., Herscovitch, L., & Topolnytsky, L. (2002). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: A meta-analysis of antecedents, correlates, and consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 61, 20-52.
- Meyer, J.P., & Allen, N.J. (1984). Testing the side-bet theory of organizational commitment: Some methodological considerations, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 69, 372-378.
- Meyer, J.P., & Allen, N.J. (1997). *Commitment in the workplace: Theory, research, and application*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Mohapatra, M., & Sharma, B.R. (2008). Drivers of organizational commitment among managers of industrial organizations: A case study. *Global Business Review*, 9 (1), 51-63.
- Morris, J.H., & Sherman, J.D. (1981). Generalizability of an organizational commitment model. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 24, 512-526.
- Morrow, P.C., & McElory, J. C. (1987). Work commitment and job satisfaction over three career stages. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 30, 330-346.
- Mowday, R., Porter, L.W., & Steer, R.M. (1982). *Employee- organization linkages: The psychology of commitment, absenteeism, and turnover*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Newstrom, J. W. (2007). *Organizational Behaviour-Human Behaviour at work* (12th ed). New York: McGraw Hill International Edition.
- Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). *Psychometric theory* (3rd ed.). London: McGraw-Hill.
- Ornstein, S., & Cron, W. L., & Slocum, J.W. (1989). Life stages versus career stage: A comparative test of the theories of Levinson and Super. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 10, 117-133.
- Ornstein, S., & Isabella, L. (1990). Age vs. stage models of career attitudes of women: A partial replication and extension. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 36, 1-19.
- Park, S. M., & Rainey, H. G. (2007). Antecedents, mediators and consequences of affective, normative and continuance commitment: Empirical tests of commitment effects of federal agencies. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*. 27(3), 197-226.
- Porter, L. W., Steers, R. M., Mowday, R. T., & Boulian, P. (1974). Organizational commitment, job satisfaction and turnover among psychiatric technicians. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 59, 603-609.
- Randall, D. M. (1990). The Consequences of Organizational Commitment : Methodological Investigation. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 11, 361-378.
- Reichers, A. E. (1986). Conflict and organizational commitment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71,508-514.
- Rusti, J.C., Peacock, A.C., & Milkovich, G.T. (1980). Career stages: a partial test of levinson's model of life/career stages. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 16, 347-359.
- Salami, S. O. (2008). Demographic and psychological factors predicting organizational commitment among. Industrial workers. *Anthropologist*, 10, 31-38.
- Sharma, B.R., & Singh, S. (1991). Determinants of organisational commitment, *Management and Labour Studies*, 16, 63-75.

- Shore, L. M., & Barksdale, K. (1998). Examining degree of balance and level of obligation in the employment relationship: A social exchange approach. *Journal of Organisational Behaviour*, 19, 731-744.
- Shore, L. M., & Tetrick, L. E. (1991). A construct validity study of the survey of perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76, 637-643.
- Slocum, J.W., & Cron, W.L. (1985). Job attitudes and performance during three career stages. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 26,126-145.
- Sommer, S.M., Bac, S.H., & Luthans, F. (1996). Organizational commitment across cultures: The impact of antecedents on Korean employees. *Human Relations*, 49(7), 977-993.
- Steers, R.M. (1977). Antecedents and outcomes of organizational commitment. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 22, 46-56.
- Suliman, A., & Iles, P. (2000). Is continuance commitment beneficial to organizations? commitment-performance relationship: A new look. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 15, 407-422.
- Super, D. (1957). *The psychology of careers*. New York: Harper.
- Super, D. E. (1984). Career and life development. In D. Brown & L. Brooks (Eds.), *Career choice and development* (pp. 192-234). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Super, D. E., Savickas, M. L., & Super, C. M. (1996). The life-span, life-space approach to careers. In D. Brown & L. Brooks (Eds.), *Career choice and development* (3rd ed., pp. 121-178). San-Francisco:Jossey-Bass.
- Wasti, A., & Can, O. (2008). Affective and normative commitment to organization, supervisor, and coworkers: Do collectivist values matter? *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 73, 404-413.
- Wasti, S.A. (2003). Organizational commitment, turnover intentions and the influence of cultural values. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 76, 303-321.
- Wiener, Y. (1982). Commitment in organizations: A normative view. *Academy of Management Review*, 7: 418-428.
- Winter, R., Taylor, T., & Sarros, J. (2000). Trouble at mill: quality of academic work issues within a comprehensive australian university. *Studies in Higher Education*, 25, 279-294.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics of Organizational Commitment according to Career Stages (Age-wise)

Dimensions of Organizational Commitment	Age Groups (Yrs.)	N	Mean	S. D.
Affective commitment	Up to 30	207	4.68	1.19
	31-44	147	4.99	1.19
	45 and above	306	5.60	1.18
Continuance commitment	Up to 30	207	4.14	1.15
	31-44	147	4.69	1.12
	45 and above	306	5.46	1.12
Normative commitment	Up to 30	207	4.42	1.16
	31-44	147	4.83	1.17
	45 and above	306	5.66	.99

Table 1a. Analysis of Variance Results

Dimensions of Organizational Commitment	Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F
Affective commitment	Between Groups	110.81	55.40	39.22***
	Within Groups	927.98	1.41	
Continuance commitment	Between Groups	222.26	111.13	86.85***
	Within Groups	840.68	1.28	
Normative commitment	Between Groups	201.59	100.79	84.72***
	Within Groups	781.65	1.19	

*** Significant at $p < 0.001$

Table 1b. Turkey's Honestly Significant Difference Test of Multiple Comparisons in respect of Organizational Commitment and Age Groups

Dimensions of Organizational Commitment	(I) Age Group (yrs.)	(J) (J)Age Group (yrs.)	Mean Difference (I-J)
Affective commitment	Up to 30	31-44	-.30**
		45 and above	-.92***
	31-44	Up to 30	.30**
		45 and above	-.61***
	45 and above	Up to 30	.92***
		31-44	.61***
Continuance commitment	Up to 30	31-44	-.54***
		45 and above	-1.32***
	31-44	Up to 30	.54***
		45 and above	-.77***
	45 and above	Up to 30	1.32***
		31-44	.77***
Normative commitment	Up to 30	31-44	-.42**
		45 and above	-1.42***
	31-44	Up to 30	.42**
		45 and above	-.82***
	45 and above	Up to 30	1.24***
		31-44	.82***

** Significant at $p < .05$, *** Significant at $p < .001$

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics of Organizational Commitment according to Career Stages (Tenure-wise)

Variables	Tenure Groups (Yrs)	N	Mean	S. D.
Affective commitment	Up to 2	169	4.76	1.21
	3-10	102	4.51	1.08
	More than 10	389	5.53	1.19
		660	5.18	1.25
Continuance commitment	Up to 2	169	4.23	1.15
	3-10	102	4.02	1.02
	More than 10	389	5.38	1.12
		660	4.88	1.27
Normative commitment	Up to 2	169	4.48	1.17
	3-10	102	4.28	1.09
	More than 10	389	5.56	1.04
		660	5.08	1.22

Table 2a. Analysis of Variance Results

Variables	Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F
Affective commitment	Between Groups	122.08	61.04	43.74***
	Within Groups	916.71	1.39	
Continuance commitment	Between Groups	245.57	122.78	98.69***
	Within Groups	817.38	1.24	
Normative commitment	Between Groups	214.18	107.09	91.48***
	Within Groups	769.07	1.17	

*** Significant at $p < .001$

Table 2b. Turkey's Honestly Significant Difference Test of Multiple Comparisons in respect of Organizational Commitment and Career Stages (Tenure-wise)

Variables	Tenure group (yrs.)	Tenure group(yrs.)	Mean Difference
Affective commitment	Up to 2	3-10	.25
		More than 10	-.76***
	3-10	Up to 2	-.25
		More than 10	-1.02***
	More than 10	Up to 2	.76***
		3-10	1.02***
Continuance commitment	Up to 2	3-10	.21
		More than 10	-1.15***
	3-10	Up to 2	-.21
		More than 10	-1.36***
	More than 10	Up to 2	1.15***
		3-10	1.36***
Normative commitment	Up to 2	3-10	.20
		More than 10	-1.07***
	3-10	Up to 2	-.20
		More than 10	-1.28***
	More than 10	Up to 2	1.07***
		3-10	1.28***

*** Significant at $p < .001$