

THEORETICAL RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CAREER MOBILITY AND ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT

Trofimov A., Bondar Y.

Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Ukraine

Trofimov A., Bondar Y. THEORETICAL RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CAREER MOBILITY AND ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT // ФУНДАМЕНТАЛЬНЫЕ И ПРИКЛАДНЫЕ ИССЛЕДОВАНИЯ В ПРАКТИКАХ ВЕДУЩИХ НАУЧНЫХ ШКОЛ. – 2014. – № 6; URL: fund-issled-intern.esrae.ru/6-87

This article describes the influence of career mobility on organizational commitment through introduction of basic scientific studies and gives a theoretical model of how this phenomena's can be connected with positive psychologies approaches such as increasing the level of employees psychological capital.

Key words: *organizational commitment, career mobility, job satisfaction, psychological capital.*

Today's workplace is characterized by constant change, which has an impact on an individual's inter- and intra-organizational career mobility [3]. Due to globalization and the resultant increase in competition, the world of work as we know it is changing. Research on technological employees has identified that the high demand for employees due to labor market trends has led to increased career opportunities and, in turn, greater challenges in retaining these employees [4]. The link between a high demand for scarce skills and retention challenges highlights the connection between external career mobility and retention. Likewise, Vallabh and Donald interpret their findings of a positive relationship between job hopping and lower organizational commitment experienced by black managers in light of the view that managers might not allow themselves to become highly committed so that it would be easier to break away from the organization if new job offers arise. In addition to external career mobility, internal career mobility must also be taken into account, as internal career mobility may play an important role in retaining employees. The organizational fulfilment of intra-organizational career mobility preference may assist in retaining employees.

The preference to be mobile within the work environment forms part of the protean and boundary less career attitudes [5]. The protean career attitude, while related yet distinct from the boundary less career attitude, refers to a self-directed orientation to the career. More specifically, an individual's own values are utilized to define career success, and self-directed career management behaviors are practised. Briscoe measured the boundary less career attitude by focusing on the boundary less mindset, including a propensity and preference for working with other people and organizations across organizational boundaries, as well as an individual's mobility preference to work for multiple organizations. Awareness of protean and boundary less career attitudes, a shift to a more transactional psychological contract [2] and hence increased mobility, have resulted in the need for employees to take full ownership of their careers through career self-management activities and continuous learning. In addition, organizations need to offer career development practices, thus supporting career growth and employee satisfaction.

Employee satisfaction occurs when an individual's values and abilities correspond with the environmental requirements [20]. Individuals taking responsibility for their own career development may gain insight into their values and abilities and seek alternative job opportunities that fit their career goals and aspirations.

Employee satisfaction occurs when an individual's values and abilities correspond with the environmental requirements [19]. Individuals taking responsibility for their own career development may gain insight into their values and abilities and seek alternative job opportunities that fit their career goals and aspirations.

Organizations are presented with the challenge of providing career patterns facilitating organizational growth and profitability, and patterns facilitating employee growth and development. The decision regarding the provision of career patterns is further complicated by inconsistent views regarding the outcomes of mobility opportunities. Goffee proposes that career mobility expectations increase employee motivation, commitment and organizational loyalty. According to Murrell, frequent lateral moves have a negative impact on job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Briscoe and Finkelstein [2] found a negative correlation between organizational mobility preference and organizational commitment. Kondratuk found that the relationship between career mobility and organizational commitment differed for inter- and intra-organizational mobility and was dependent on the time (before or after the move).

External career mobility history is negatively related to normative commitment, and affective and continuance commitment are lower prior to an inter-organizational move [3]. On the other hand, continuance commitment is significantly lower prior to an inter-organizational move and affective commitment increases significantly after inter- and intra-organizational moves [3]. More longitudinal research may be required in order to better understand differences in the levels of organizational commitment prior and post career mobility. Kondratuk did not, however, find a relationship between continuance commitment and the overall career mobility rate. Individuals may have a history of high mobility, but may not perceive current mobility opportunities due to their situational factors (for example, a technical employee with outdated skills). It therefore is important to assess an individual's perception of his or her current career mobility opportunities (as opposed to their mobility history) and the relationship of this perception with organizational commitment. In light of the preceding findings, the measurement of preference for career mobility seems to be an important consideration in understanding the relationship between the constructs included in this study. Career mobility preference was included in this study as an individual's preference for career mobility may be important in understanding whether they would be committed or satisfied if they desired and perceived many career mobility opportunities within the organization or the labour market

It is clear that greater insight into the relationship between perceived career mobility, career mobility preference, job satisfaction and organizational commitment is required, as an individual with a high intra-organizational mobility preference may be more satisfied and committed within an organization that is perceived to offer the opportunity for career development, and hence intra-organizational mobility. Liu (2004) [1] identified that development opportunities within an organization have been shown to enhance knowledge workers' loyalty. Increased loyalty in response to perceived development opportunities can be understood in light of the idea that the provision of career development opportunities by organizations provides the impression of their willingness and effort to care for and support employees [15]. The perception that the organization is willing to invest in employees is important, as people want career progress and therefore become frustrated when they believe that their path is blocked [20]. The view that individuals want career progress and do not want

to be stagnant within their career is aligned with that of Rhoades and Eisenberger, who suggest that developmental opportunities increase employee motivation and confidence in their work, which may lead to increased self-fulfillment and, in turn, reduced turnover. Knowledge of the relationship between turnover and the provision of developmental opportunities by organizations is important for organization and workers alike, as the shortage of skilled workers (as is the case with accountants, auditors and financial staff) creates career instability [3].

To summarize, it is firstly put forward that the changing nature of work has led to increased mobility and decreased commitment within organizations. Increased mobility may be linked to increased job satisfaction for those individuals who have a preference for career mobility. Organizational commitment has been shown to be related to job satisfaction, and both organizational commitment and job satisfaction have been shown to be strongly related to the retention of employees.

The role of mobility and organizational commitment in talent retention.

There is a plethora of research regarding the role of job satisfaction and organizational commitment in yielding employee turnover. Job satisfaction and organizational commitment have been shown to be antecedents of turnover. Brown reports that job dissatisfaction is one of the major initiating factors in job transitions. Whilst the relationship between job satisfaction and turnover has received much support, recent studies have suggested that the relationship between employee satisfaction and intention to leave is weakening, as highly satisfied employees are increasingly leaving their organizations for new opportunities [17]. A lack of organizational commitment has been shown to be an important contributor to turnover intention and turnover behavior. A relationship has been found between career mobility and job satisfaction, as well as between career mobility and organizational commitment [3], and it therefore seems necessary to examine whether greater job satisfaction and a high perception of career mobility opportunities are related to lower organizational commitment.

The wealth of support for the significance of organizational commitment and job satisfaction in turnover intention and actual turnover behavior highlights the importance of this relationship for employee retention. Commitment appears to influence behavior independently of other motives or attitudes, and individuals experiencing commitment might therefore persist in a course of action despite conflicting motives or attitudes [18].

It is expected that individuals with a preference for intra-organizational career mobility may be more satisfied if they perceive that their organization provides career mobility opportunities. This expectation is formulated on the basis of a person-environment fit perspective, in terms of which the organizational fulfilment of an individual's needs and values results in job satisfaction. Employee perceptions that the organization cares for and supports them are related to increased job satisfaction and affective organizational commitment. [13] Higher perceived organizational support (which may include perceived mobility opportunities) is related to decreased likelihood in seeking out and accepting alternative employment opportunities (Eisenberger, Fasolo & Davis-LaMastro, 1990). From the preceding findings it seems that the perception of mobility opportunities by individuals experiencing a preference for career mobility and growth may result in perceived organizational support and, in turn, increased job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Researchers have found that perceived organizational support, job satisfaction and organizational commitment are negatively related to turnover [12].

Organizational commitment and job satisfaction are separate yet complementary concepts. Job satisfaction and organizational commitment have been proven to positively correlate with one another: the greater the job satisfaction and organizational commitment, the lower the predictive turnover intention [10]. Retention practices aimed at satisfying the

said preference may be utilized to decrease the turnover of talent. Likewise, employees who perceive the organizational fulfillment of the aforementioned preference may be more committed.

Research on technological employees has identified that a high demand for employees, due to labor market trends, has led to higher career opportunities and, in turn, greater challenges in retaining these employees. In order to reduce the high costs incurred in employee turnover and to maintain a competitive advantage, informed talent retention practices are required. Informed talent retention practices refer to the development of talent retention strategies based on insight into all phenomena related to employee turnover. From the preceding theoretical integration of the literature, it follows that research on the relationship between perceived career mobility, career mobility preference, job satisfaction and organizational commitment, as well as differences between biographical groups with regard to these constructs, may potentially inform talent retention practices.

Psychological capital and its influence on organizational commitment and job mobility

Positive psychology, the study of optimal human functioning, is an attempt to respond to the systematic bias inherent in psychology's historical emphasis on mental illness rather than on mental wellness [5] mainly by focusing on two, forgotten but classical psychological goals:

- Help ordinary people to live a more productive and meaningful life.
- A full realization of the potential that exists in the human being.

Fred Luthans is a researcher who is well-known by his researches in positive organizational behavior – psychological capital of employee, which will help him or her to increase their competences and be satisfied with the job they doing. Drawing from positive psychology constructs and empirical research, four psychological resources were determined to best meet the psychological capital criteria: Hope, Efficacy, Resilience, and Optimism and were termed by Luthans and colleagues as psychological Capital or PsyCap. In combination, the four constructs making up PsyCap were empirically determined to be a second-order, core construct that had a stronger relationship with satisfaction and performance than each of the components by itself. The four components are defined as follows: Hope – Is defined as a positive motivational state where two basic elements - successful feeling of agency (or goal oriented determination) and pathways (or proactively planning to achieve those goals) interact [7].

Self-efficacy – Is defined as people's confidence in their ability to achieve a specific goal in a specific situation.

Optimism – was defined by Seligman by Attribution theory (Fritz Heider, 1958). An Optimistic person is defined as one that makes "Internal" or "dispositional", fixed and global attributions for positive events and "External" or "situational", not fixed and specific attributions to negative events. Optimism in PsyCap is thought as a realistic construct that regards what an employee can or cannot do, as such, optimism reinforces efficacy and hope. [6]

Resilience – Is defined in Positive Psychology as a positive way of coping with adversity or distress. In organizational aspect, it is defined as an ability to recuperate from stress, conflict, failure, change or increase in responsibility.

We truly believe that such phenomena as psychological capital can influence on career mobility and employees attitude to the job. Organizational change is defined as a lack of fit with the environment which intensifies as a result of a gap between the organizational goals and its present outcomes. The employees have the responsibility to adjust and behave according to the new strategy dictated by the management, mostly with fewer resources. During change, different aspects of employees' PsyCap is put to the test – they have to learn new ways of behavior and be confident to do so, recover from the crisis, be motivated to cope efficiently

and to believe in a better future. PsyCap and positive emotions are examples of how personal factors facilitate organizational change. Positive change is defined as every change that the organization undergoes for its own benefit and has more positive psychological and behavioral consequences than negative ones. The role of positive emotions is that they help workers cope with the organizational change by broadening their point of view, encourage open decision making and giving them essential vitality for their coping. This interaction means that PsyCap, through positive emotions, influences the worker's attitudes and behavior, which in turn, influences the organizational change.

References:

1. Allen, N.J., & Meyer, J.P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63, 1-18.
2. Briscoe, J., & Hall, D. (2006). The interplay of boundaryless and protean careers: Combinations and implications. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 69, 4-18
3. Kondratuk, T.B., Hausdorf, P.A., Korabik, K., & Rosin, H.M. (2004). Linking career mobility with corporate loyalty: How does job change relate to organizational commitment? *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 65, 332-349.
4. Kouvas, A. (2007). Corporate governance: A paradigmatic look. *International Journal of Social Economics*, 34(8), 506-524.
5. Luthans F, Norman S., Avolio B. & Avey J.. (2008). The mediating role of psychological capital in the supportive organizational climate - employee performance relationship. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 29(2), 219.
6. Luthans F., & Youssef, C.M. (2004). Human, social, and now positive psychological capital management: Investing in people for competitive advantage, *Organizational Dynamics*, 33(2), 143-160.
7. Luthans, F., Youssef, C. M., Sweetman, D. S., & Harms, P. D. (2013). Meeting the leadership challenge of employee well-being through relationship PsyCap and health PsyCap. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 20(1), 118-133.
8. Martin, A. (2007). Employee perceptions of organisational commitment, job satisfaction and turnover intentions in a post-merger institution (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Johannesburg, Johannesburg.
9. Mayer, D.M., Nishii, L.H., Schneider, B., & Godstein, H. (2007). The precursors and products of justice climates: Group leader antecedents and employee attitudinal consequences. CAHRS Working Paper Series. Retrieved June 2, 2010, from <http://digitalcommons.ilr.cornell.edu/cahrswp/464/>
10. Meyer, J.P., & Allen, N.J. (1997). *Commitment in the workplace: Theory, research and application*. London: Sage Publications.
11. Mowday, R.T., Porter, L.W., & Steers, R.M. (1982). *Employee organizational linkage: The psychology of commitment, absenteeism and turnover*. New York: Academic Press.
12. Mowday, R.T., Steers, L.M., & Porter, R.W. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 14, 224-247.
13. Neuman, W.L. (2000). *Social research: Methods, qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
14. Schultz, D., & Schultz, S.E. (2010). *Psychology at work today* (10th ed.). Englewood Cliffs: Pearson.

15. Schwartz, S.H., & Bardi, A. (2001). Value hierarchies across cultures: Taking a similarities perspective. *Journal of Cross Cultural Psychology*, 32, 268-290.
16. Westerman, J., & Yamamora, J. (2007). Generational preferences for work environment fit. *Career Development International*, 12, 150-161.
17. Wiener, Y. (1982). Commitment in organizations: A normative view. *Academy of Management Review*, 7(3), 418-428.
18. Wiesenfeld, B.M., Swann, W.B., Brockner, J., & Bartel, C.A. (2007). Is more fairness always preferred? Self-esteem moderates reactions to procedural justice. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(5), 1235-1253.
19. Wolfe, D.M., & Kolb, D.A. (1980). Career development, personal growth, and experimental learning. In J.W. Springer (Ed.), *Issues in career and human resource development* (pp. 1-56). Madison: American Society for Training and Development.