The Relationship between Perceived Organizational Support, Organizational Commitment, and Quality of Work Life and Productivity

[1]Alireza Ghasemizad, [2]Kamran Mohammadkhani

[1]Department of Educational science, Kazerun Branch, Islamic Azad University, Kazerun, Iran.
[2]Department of Higher Education Administration, science and Research Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran.

Abstract: The purpose of this study was to identify the relationship between perceived organizational support, organizational commitment, and quality of work life with productivity of primary school teachers and administrators of Fars province in Iran. The population of the study was primary school teachers and administrators. According to the multi-stage cluster sampling, seven townships were randomly selected in which some schools were picked out. The research method was correlation and the research instrument was questionnaire. Cronbach's alpha method was used to calculate the reliability. The Item analysis and expert consensus were applied to calculate the validity of instruments. Findings indicated that there was significant positive relationship between quality of work life and administrators' and teachers' productivity. Results also displayed a significant positive relationship between perceived organizational support and administrators' and teachers' productivity. A significant positive relationship between organizational commitment and administrators and teachers' productivity was also concluded. Stepwise regression revealed that only quality of work life and organizational support were able to significantly predict the productivity of administrators and teachers. Out of those two variables, quality of work life enjoys higher β (0.32) than the partnership (0.27), It, therefore can be considered a stronger predictor of productivity.

Key words: Perceived organizational support, organizational commitment, quality of work life, productivity, tea

INTRODUCTION

Organizations are composed of people who enjoy common purposes and achieving these goals would be feasible through appropriate utilization of human sources. However, the organizational structure has and can make a dramatic effect on the members of the organization. Moreover, given the organizational structure the employees' behavior can be explained or predicted. Generally in designing the organizational structure the main elements; division of work, work groups, the chain of command, control domain and centralization or decentralization and formalizing the works should be taken into consideration. Available evidence also suggests that division of work will increase staff productivity and individual differences such as experience, character and type of work that must be done by workers should it be more taken in to account (Robbins and Judge, 2012). One of the key indicators to evaluate the performance and efficiency of an organization's activities is its productivity.

The organization's efficiency can be calculated through productivity in terms of the products and services and their proportion to the resources consumed. Implementation of productivity concepts and studying the factors affecting productivity increase, will lead to modifications in the body of any organization due to its mutable, development-oriented and evolutionary nature. In fact, it is an intellectual vision, trying to improve continuously what it was, and states quo and with this vision and mentality to do things and work today better than yesterday and tomorrow better than today. Productivity improvement depends upon how successfully we identify and use the factors of socio-production systems. Three main productivity factors concerning; Job-related, resource-related and environmental-related play an important role in organizational productivity (Prokopenko,2008).

As for the literature review of the present research, there are many factors that play important roles in relation to productivity, including staff's perceived organizational support of managers. In this respect, Akroyd *et al*. (2009) asserted that there was a significant positive relationship between organizational support and supervisors' behavior with affective and continuous commitment of the staff. According to Eisenberger *et al*., (1997) organizational support theory; fairness and equality, supervisor's support, organizational rewards, and job contexts will lead to acceptable behavior of individuals in organizations. And an increase in employees' perceptions of organizational support, on the one hand, will increase the employees' performance and their desire to stay in the company and on the other hand, will cause job tensions reduction and attitudinal behaviors (such as the desire to leave the service). According to his assertion, available evidence suggests that the

Corresponding Author: Alireza Ghasemizad, Department of Educational science, Kazerun Branch, Islamic Azad University, Kazerun, Iran.
E-mail: Alirezaghasemizad@gmail.com

organizational support has a positive effect on organizational commitment and job security (Lee *et al.*, 2007). And in its own right it will increase productivity, performance, helping colleagues, emotional organizational commitment, and affective organizational behavior (LaMastro, 1999; Berman, 2006.) Enjoying high organizational commitment also will increase productivity and services and efficiency of employees and its deficiency will be followed by a lack of job satisfaction, low work ethics, frequent absences, and mental health disorders (Chompookum and Derr, 2004). Allen and Meyer (1990) displayed that people who enjoy higher emotional commitment to the organization, have higher productivity as well.

Studies indicated that the employees' psychological needs in organizations can be met through application of quality of work life techniques (Pollock, 2003). The quality of work life is considered as an extensive and comprehensive program that will increases employee's satisfaction, strengthens their learning environment and will help them in managing tasks. Employee's dissatisfaction with the quality of work life is a kind of problem that will hurt almost all employees regardless of their position. The main purpose of many organizations is to enhance employee's satisfaction at all levels, meanwhile, this is a complex issue since the separating the features and determining what characteristics are associated with quality of work life is somehow inexplicable

The value system of quality of work life estimates people investment as the most important variable in strategic management equation; this means that providing the employee's needs will lead to improvement, efficiency and long-term productivity of the organization (Shareef, 1990). Productivity serves as the main reason behind the fundamental responsibility and existence of managers and the managers' supervisory role in organizations; therefore it can promote efficiency, and with effective and efficient leadership, it will lead to firm decisions upon more effective and productive resources such material, financial, and particularly human resources.The ideas presented by many scholars in the context of productivity have led management toward organizational efforts and productivity enhancement, and has provided such a belief that more productivity is perceived alongside quality of work life (Lewis, *et al.*, 2001). Through the application of appropriate measures, management can be considered a factor creating quality of work life and at the same time it could be considered an effective factor in productivity enhancement; hence, this study examined the relationship between perceived organizational support, organizational commitment, and productivity, and quality of work life of primary school principals and teachers of Fars province in Iran.

Research Objectives:

The main purpose of the present study was to evaluate the relationship between perceived organizational support, organizational commitment, and quality of work life with productivity of primary school principals and teachers of Fars province. This study also examined the following minor objectives:

- Explaining the relationship of perceived organizational support through productivity.
- Explaining the relationship of organizational commitment through productivity.
- Explaining the relationship of quality of work life through productivity.
- Predicting the productivity of teachers and administrators through perceived organizational support, organizational commitment, and work life quality.

To achieve the research goals following questions were posed:

- Is there any significant relationship between perceived organizational support, organizational commitment, working life quality and administrators and teachers' productivity?
- Which of the perceived organizational support variables, organizational commitment, and quality of work life has more predictability in principals and teachers productivity

MATERIAL AND METHOD

The research method in this study was descriptive–correlation, which initially compared the variables and the relationship between them. The population in this study included the primary school teachers and administrators in Fars province. According to multi-stage cluster sampling seven townships were randomly selected in which some schools were picked out among them. Totally 340 questionnaires were distributed to the teachers and administrators among which 262 analyzable questionnaires were obtained. Among organization office of district 1 from Shiraz city 60 samples, district four 44 samples, Firouzabad city 49 samples, Zarghan city 29 samples, Pasargadae city 21 samples, Eghlid city 36 samples, and from Lamerd 23 samples (teachers) and 32 samples among school principals were selected. In addition, 174 of the participants were female and 81 were male, while seven others were unknown.

Instruments:
Organizational Support:

This questionnaire has been applied by (Eisenberger *et al.*, 1997). it consists of 36 items and the aim of the test is to obtain the perceived organizational support of the participants.

Organizational Commitment:
The samples were asked to response to 15 items of the questionnaire in a seven-point scale from "completely agree" to completely disagree" format based on Mowday *et al*., (1979).

Productivity:
In order to assess the productivity, the questionnaire of Hersey and Goldsmith (1980) was used which contained five components of Ability,Clarity,Help,Incentive,Evaluation,Validity and Environment and totally was comprised of 32 items.

*Quality Of Work Life***:**
In order to assess quality of work life, Walton's (1975) questionnaire was used which was revised with some modifications for teachers. The questionnaire contained 32 statements using a 5 point Likert scale to evaluate teachers and principals' quality of work life.

The validity of the questionnaires was obtained based on expert consensus and then through item analysis. In this case, the correlation coefficients for each item was calculated with total scores and all of the coefficients at the level of (P <. 05) or lower than this scale were meaningful as all correlation coefficients in this scale were higher than 0.25. Also the reliability of the questionnaires was obtained based on Cronbach's alpha including organizational support, 0.90, organizational commitment, 0.86; work life quality, 0.92 and Productivity 0.72; respectively.

Results:
Is there any significant relationship between perceived organizational support, organizational commitment and quality of work life of administrators and teachers' productivity? In order to answer above question, descriptive statistics, mean, standard deviation and Pearson correlation coefficient were used.

Table 1: Pearson correlation coefficient for the research variable

Variables	1	2	3	4
QWL	1			
Organizational support	**0.57	1		
Organizational commitment	0.35**	0/21**	1	
Productivity	0.47**	0.45**	0.23**	1
Note. **P<.05				

*=P<0/1

According to the table1, it can be saied that there is a significant positive relationship between the quality of work life and productivity of administrators and teachers with coefficient of 0.47, it can also be said that there is a significant relationship between perceived organizational support and the productivity of administrators and teachers, with a coefficient of 0.45,and also we can say that, there is a significant relationship between organizational commitment and productivity of principals and teachers with the coefficient of 0.23.

Table 2: Stepvise Regression Results

Variable	ΔR^2	SE(B)	B	B	F
Step1					
Quality of work life	0.22**	0.06	0.56	0.47**	8.62**
Step2					
Quality of work life		0.07	0.38	0.32**	4.91**
Organizational support	0.27**	0.07	0.30	0.27**	4.18**
Note. n=268. **P<05 Dependnt Variable: Productivity					

According to Table 2, only quality of work life and organizational support significantly influence the productivity of administrators and teachers. Out of those two variables the quality of work life has more coefficients (β=0.32) than variable of the partnership (β=0.27); therefore it can be considered a stronger predictor of teachers and principals' productivity.

Discussion:
In line with Spearman correlation coefficients of the quality of work life, perceived organizational support, and organizational commitment variables, with coefficients of 0.47, 0.45 and 0.23 respectively, the mentioned variables are significantly correlated with productivity. Since there is a significant positive relationship between the quality of work life and productivity, we can say that the value system of the quality of work life estimates people investment as the most important variable in strategic management equation. This means, providing the

employee's needs will lead to improvement, efficiency and long-term productivity of the organization (Ghasemizad *et al*.,2012;Shareef, 1990).

Productivity plays a significant role in accountability and existence of managers and their supervisory role in organizations, therefore it can promote efficiency and with effective and efficient leadership, more effective and better productivity of material resources and financial resources particularly human resources can be determined. The ideas presented by many scholars in the context of productivity have led management toward organizational efforts, productivity enhancement, and provided such belief that more productivity is perceived alongside quality of work life (Lewis, *et al*., 2001). Management through the application of appropriate management on the one hand can be considered as a factor of creating quality of work life and on the other hand as a factor of productivity enhancement (Lau and May, 1998).

There is also a meaningful relationship between perceived organizational support and productivity of administrators and teachers. This finding is consistent with findings of the related studies (Bell & Menguc, 2002; Lynch *et al*., 1999; Rhoades and Eisenberger, 2002). The results of the present study can be explained as follows: once the employees encounter supervisors' support the organizational support will increase, and paying attention to human resources (organizational rewards and job contexts) is an absolutely important factor in employees' positive reactions and the effects and consequences of perceived organizational support will lead to organizational commitment, employees' job satisfaction, involvement with work-related interests, and an increase of employees' perceptions of organizational support, on the one hand, increases the employees' performance and their desire to retain. The company and on the other hand, will cause job tension reduction and employees' efficiency enhancement (Eisenberger *et al*., 2001). Also the productivity of human resources depends on knowledge endowment and human financial encouragements of human resources. Encouragements and motivations of human resources play a determining role in organizational efficiency, so taking into consideration of the employees' material and spiritual needs as an effective motivation will lead to productivity enhancement (Berman, 2006). Hence, most likely, it can be concluded that if the employees do not have the ability to do the job (it means that the organization has not provided their promotion) even if they have been financially supported, since their fundamental needs at high levels have not been met, it cannot be expected that they have high productivity. Therefore, it is necessary for mangers to take into account their employees' high level needs (social needs, respect, and self-actualization) and try to distribute the resources in justice and fairness and inform their employees about their related responsibilities and in this situation, employees reassure that the organization is concerned about their future and prosperity. This issue will lead to job satisfaction and finally to productivity enhancement in organizations.

There is also a significant relationship between organizational commitment and productivity of principals and teachers. This finding is in line with the findings of the related studies in the literature (Chiok Foong Loke, 2001; Patel and Conklin, 2010; Dunham-Taylor, 2000; Meyer *et al*., 1989). The findings of this study revealed that organizational commitment is a process in which the members account on purpose of the organization as their representative and wish to remain members of the organization. The employees thus do their best and make selfless efforts in realizing the goals of the organization (Robbins and Judge, 2012).

It is necessary for the individuals who enjoy organizational commitment to stay in organization: Such people always believe that it is their duty to continue their activities and even some times think that they are indebted to their job (Allen and Meyer, 1999). Such employees are known as organized people in their job, spend more time in organization and work more than other employees and if the job continues steadily, the employee's efficiency and productivity will promote. It can be concluded that if educators have high emotional dependence to the organization and accept the values and goals of the organizations, they will have more associations and involvement in line with organization affaires and feel they are indebted to stay with the organization and the they believe that it is their duty to continue their activities in the organization, hence, they make an uninterrupted efforts in order to achieve the organizational goals and in its own it will lead to more efficiency and effectiveness and productivity in organization. The results also indicated that only two variables of quality of work life and perceived organizational support have a significant effect on the productivity of administrators and teachers. Cunningham and Eberle (1990) argue that it is possible to affect productivity and quality of products, motivation and job satisfaction, meeting learning needs, challenges, diversity, responsibility and success by quality of work life. The implicit reasons for these findings, suggested that those managers who have high productivity, enjoy better quality of work life as well and are likely to present desired management behaviors in which productivity is considered the prime outcome. The findings are in accordance with the organizational behavior theorists who believe that the quality of work life is an essential factor for productivity enhancement. Mintzberg (1993) argues that the quality of work life is an outstanding issue. Increasing welfare and elevated levels of education caused industrial society to climb up on Maslow's hierarchy. Thus the employees' growing needs to the process of self-discovery can be satisfied only in developed jobs.

Conclusion:

Findings of the study showed that there was a positive and meaningful relation between perceived organizational support, organizational commitment, and quality of work life with productivity of primary school teachers and administrators. Only perceived organizational support and quality of work life can predict productivity of primary school teachers and administrators. In case of support from educational organization side and improvement of their work life, the employees' productivity, most probably, will increase. Based on findings, quality of work life is a stronger predictor of primary school teachers and administrators' productivity. Future researchers are recommended to conduct the same studies using such methods as structural equation models.

REFERENCES

Akroyd, D., J. Legg, M.B. Jackowski and R.D. Adams, 2009. The impact of selected organizational variables and managerial leadership on radiation therapists' organizational commitment. Radiography, 15: 113-120.

Allen, N.T. and J.P. Meyer, 1990. The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuous and normative commitment to the organization. Journal of occupational Psychology, 63: 1-18.

Bell, S.J., & B. Menguc, 2002. The employee-organization relationship, organizational citizenship behaviors, and superior service quality. Journal of retailing, 78(2): 131-146.

Berman, E.M., 2006. Performance and productivity in public and nonprofit organizations. (2nd ed.). Armonk: M E Sharpe Inc.

Chiok Foong Loke, J., 2001. Leadership behaviours: effects on job satisfaction, productivity and organizational commitment. Journal of nursing management, 9(4): 191-204.

Chompookum, D. and C.B. Derr, 2004. The effects of internal career orientations on organizational citizenship behavior in Thailand". Career Development International, 9(4): 406-423.

Cunningham, J.B., and T. Eberle, 1990. A Guide to Job Enrichment and Redesign. Personnel (AMA), 67(2): 56-61.

Dunham-Taylor, J., 2000. Nurse executive transformational leadership found in participative organizations. Journal of Nursing Administration, 30(5): 241-250.

Eisenberger, R., S. Armeli, B. Rexwinkel, P.D. Lynch and L. Rhoades, 2001. Reciprocation of perceived organizational support. Journal of applied psychology, 86(1): 42-51.

Eisenberger, R., J. Cummings, S. Armeli and P. Lynch, 1997. Perceived organizational support, discretionary treatment, and job satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 82(5): 812.

Eisenberger, R., P. Fasolo and V. Davis-LaMastro, 1990. Perceived organizational support and employee diligence, commitment, and innovation. Journal of applied psychology, 75(1): 51-59.

Ghasemizad, A., M. Amirianzadeh and S. Bagheri, 2012. Study of the Relationship between Teachers and Principals' Spiritual Leadership, Quality of Work Life, Job Satisfaction and Productivity. American Journal of Scientific Research, 49: 11-20.

LaMastro, V., 1999. Commitment and perceived organizational support. National Forum of applied educational research journal, 12: 3.

Hersey, P., and M. Goldsmith, 1980. A situational approach to performance planning. Training and Development Journal, 34(11): 38-46.

Lau, R.S.M. and B.E. May, 1998. A win-win paradigm for quality of work life and business performance. Human Resource Development Quarterly, 9(3): 211-226.

Lee, Jaewon, and Riccardo Peccei, 2007. Perceived Organizational Support and Affective Commitment: The Mediating Role of Organization-Based Self-Esteem in the Context of Job Insecurity." Journal of Organizational Behavior., 28: 661-685.

Lewis, D., K. Brazil, P. Krueger, L. Lohfeld and E. Tjam, 2001. Extrinsic and intrinsic determinants of quality of work life. Leadership in Health Services,14(2): 9-15.

Lynch, P.D., R. Eisenberger and S. Armeli, 1999. Perceived organizational support: Inferior versus superior performance by wary employees. Journal of Applied Psychology, 84: 467-483.

Meyer, J.P., S.V. Paunonen, I.R. Gellatly, R.D. Goffin and D.N. Jackson, 1989. Organizational commitment and job performance: It's the nature of the commitment that counts. Journal of applied Psychology, 74(1): 152.

Mintzberg, H., 1993. Structure in fives, designing effective organizations. Prentice Hall.

Mowday, R.T., R.M. Steers and L.W. Porter, 1979. The measurement of organizational commitment. Journal of vocational behavior, 14(2): 224-247.

Patel, P.C., and B. Conklin, 2012. Perceived Labor Productivity in Small Firms—The Effects of High-Performance Work Systems and Group Culture Through Employee Retention. Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 36(2): 205-235.

Pollock, S., 1993. Overcoming navigational neurosis with an effective steering committee Doing Organizational effectiveness, effectively. Journal for Quality and Participation, 16(5).

Prokopenko, P., 2008. Productivity management: a practical handbook. (2nd ed.). Geneva: International Labour Organization.

Robbins, S.P., and T.A. Judge, 2012. Organizational behavior, student value edition. (15 ed.). Boston: Pearson.

Shareef, R., and J. Crabtree, 1990. QWL Programs Facilitate Change. Personnel Journal, 69(9).

Walton, R.E., 1975. Criteria for Quality of Working Life, in The quality of working life (Eds.) L. E. Davis and A. b. Cherns, The Free Press, New york, pp: 99-104.