

THE EXTENT TO WHICH THEORIES OF JOB DESIGN,
MOTIVATION TO WORK AND ORGANISATIONAL
COMMITMENT CAN CULTURALLY BE EMBEDDED IN
DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

Tsatsu MacCarthy [MIH]*

Abstract

Most of the research into job design, the motivation to work and organizational commitment originated in the USA or Western Europe. The focus of this article will be to discuss the extent to which research or theories focusing on job design, the motivation to work and organizational commitment are culturally embedded in the way of life and worldview of the people of the USA or Western Europe, and the extent to which the theories are applicable to other countries. Examples will be given from different countries to illustrate the answers with particular emphasis on Ghana. The discussion commences with a brief background of some few researchers with academic work on theories on job design, motivation to work and organizational commitment. It continues by looking at the complex nature cultures of different countries. The discussion goes on to examine the theories of motivation to work and job design. The article draws a conclusion that, as globalization is bringing all closer together and increasingly causing managers to attend to issues of culture and diversity, training for expatriate managers in the values and culture of their host country has become increasingly important, and helps managers better understand which ideas and practices fit well and which do not

Keywords: Culture, Job Design, Motivation, Enrichment, Organisational Commitment, Embedded and Theories

* School of Applied Sciences and Arts, Department of Hotel, Catering and Institutional Management, Cape Coast Polytechnic, P.O. Box AD50

Research clearly shows that the background of the following scholars: Edgar H. Schein (United States of America), Charles Handy (Ireland), Peter Ferdinand Drucker (Austria), Henry Mintzberg (Montreal, Canada), Arthur F. Carmazzi (Nevada, U.S.A.), Frederick Irving Herzberg (United States of America), Abraham Maslow (United States of America), Clayton Alderfer (Pennsylvania, America) and many others prove the fact that most academic work on the theories on job design, motivation to work and organizational commitment originated from the West (Encyclopaedia Britannica 2010).

The paper will first discuss culture, since it is a very key concept in this essay. Culture is “broadly defined as the characteristic ways of thinking, feeling and behaving shared among members of an identifiable group” (Gibson and Gibbs, 2006, p. 460). While some elements of culture are visible and observable (e.g., accent, religious apparel), others are subtle due to varying degrees of acculturation (e.g., a second or third generation Italian immigrant who holds cultural attributes from his or her family along with attributes acquired from a variety of cultures while dwelling in the United States. Also, Hofstede (1991: 5) defined culture as ‘the collective programming of the mind which distinguishes the members of one group or category of people from another’. His study attempted to discriminate cultures, designated as nations, from each other on universal dimensions. His emphasis is on the *typical members of cultures*: ‘Rightly or wrongly, collective properties are ascribed to the citizens of certain countries: people refer to “typical American”, “typical German”, or “typical Japanese” behaviour’ (Hofstede 1991: 12). A typical member is the best representation and ‘central tendency’ of the culture. Therefore, a typical member is operationalized by the *cultural mean* of this particular characteristic. In other words, researchers take a sample of individuals from a culture and average their scores, say, on job satisfaction, role ambiguity, and job autonomy to become the cultural mean (e.g. Blanchflower and Freeman 1997; Huang and van de Vliert 2002). This cultural characteristic is compared across cultures to reveal cultural differences.

In his seminal book titled *Culture's Consequences*, Hofstede (1980) identifies four universal dimensions of culture that are largely independent of each other. The dimensions are power distance, individualism-collectivism, masculinity-femininity and uncertainty avoidance. Later, a fifth dimension was added – the Confucian dynamic (Hofstede and Bond, 1988) or long-term orientation (Hofstede, 1991).

Below is a brief discussion of each one of the five cultural dimensions identified by Hofstede (1980, 1991, 2001). "Power distance" is defined as "the extent to which the less powerful members of institutions and organizations within a country expect and accept that power is distributed unequally" (Hofstede 1991, p. 27). Institutions and organizations are the basic elements of society, such as the family, school, workplaces, and the community. Power distance also reflects general human inequality in areas such as prestige, wealth, power, and law. People of high power distance show great reliance on centralization and formalization of authority and great tolerance for the lack of autonomy, which fosters inequalities in power and wealth (Hofstede, 1980). Furthermore, they show tolerance in accepting power hierarchy, tight control, vertical top-down communication, and even discrimination by age, gender, family background, education level, race, and occupation. In summary, showing more power works well among high power distance people, because of their familiarity with, and tolerance of, inequalities in power. Examples of countries showing high power distance are Belgium, France, Spain, Portugal, Mexico, Venezuela, Pakistan and India; whereas examples of countries showing low power distance are Britain, Ireland, USA, Germany, Sweden, Switzerland, The Netherlands, and Norway (Mullins, 2002).

"Uncertainty avoidance" is defined as "the extent to which the members of a culture feel threatened by uncertain or unknown situations" (Hofstede, 1991, p. 113). That feeling is communicated through anxiety and manifested in a need for predictability: a need for explicit, clear rules or structured situations. Uncertainty avoidance reflects the level of tolerance for uncertainty and ambiguities embedded in everyday life (Hofstede, 1980). People of low uncertainty avoidance tend to accept uncertainty without much discomfort, take risks easily, and show tolerance for opinions and behaviours different from their own. They do not need precise and explicit rules such as job descriptions. Example of such countries with low uncertainty avoidance are India, Singapore, Hong Kong, Thailand and Pakistan. People of high uncertainty avoidance have a strong need to control environments, events, and situations; and examples of such countries are Germany, Austria, Italy, Japan, Israel, Switzerland and South Africa (Mullins, 2002).

"Individualism," "pertains to "societies in which the ties between individuals are loose; everyone is expected to look after himself or herself and his or her immediate family." "Collectivism" (the opposite of individualism) "pertains to societies in which people from birth onwards are integrated into strong, cohesive groups, which throughout people's lifetime continue to protect them in exchange for unquestioning loyalty" (Hofstede, 1991, p. 51). Example of collectivist countries are

Ghana (Beugré and Offodile, 2001), India, Greece, Turkey, Colombia, Mexico, and Philippines (Mullins, 2002). Individualistic people prefer to act as individuals rather than members of groups. “I” exists by itself rather than as part of “we”. In individualistic societies, such as Britain, Ireland, USA, Canada, and Australia, where self-concept and free will or freedom prevail, people develop a great sense of autonomy and personal achievement as opposed to a sense of collectivism and importance of social and security needs (Hofstede, 1980). Individualistic cultures emphasize job specialization, individual rewards, competitive climate, and individual and nuclear family independence.

“Masculinity” and “femininity” represent “the dominant sex role pattern in the vast majority of both traditional and modern societies” (Hofstede, 1980, p. 277). Masculine societies value male assertiveness, and feminine societies value female nurturance. Masculine customers emphasize differentiated gender roles, performance, ambition, and independence, whereas feminine ones value fluid gender roles, quality of life, service, and interdependence. Examples of highly Masculine countries are Japan, Israel, Italy, Germany, Austria and South Africa; whereas examples of highly feminine countries are Britain, Ireland, Canada, USA, and Australia (Mullins, 2002).

The “Confucian dynamic (or long-term versus short-term orientation) dimension” originated in a study of cultural values involving students from 23 countries (*Chinese Culture Connection*, 1987). Long-term orientation is represented by values such as perseverance, ordering relationships by status and having a sense of shame. Short-term orientation is represented by values such as personal steadiness and stability, saving face, respect for tradition, and reciprocation of greetings, favours, and gifts (Hofstede, 1991, p. 165). The dimension of long-term versus short-term orientation in life can be viewed as Eastern versus Western, dynamic versus static, and virtue versus truth. Confucius, whose ideas are not a religion that advocates absolutes, has influenced Eastern cultures. Huat (1989) found that the Confucian ethics of hard work and thrift were a key driver of the economic success of Korea, Japan, and other newly-industrialized East Asian countries. Confucian ethics include hard work, thrift, non-materialism, benevolence, social consciousness, and morality.

From the foregoing, we can clearly see that culture is the typical way of life of a group of people, and that it has several dimensions as explained by Hofstede (1980) and that it differs across different societies, communities, peoples, or nations. The fact that culture differs from society to society is also supported by Meyer and Allen (1991) who have made the point that, as businesses

have transcended national boundaries, organizations face the challenge of conflicting requirements from global standardization and local customization, which has crucial implications for HR functions. Prior cross-cultural studies also show that people from different cultural backgrounds tend to have different values leading to different behaviours (Adler, 1997; Hofstede, 2001; Hofstede and Hofstede, 2005; Triandis, 1989, 2003). For example, marketing research has found that consumers respond more positively to advertising messages that are congruent with their cultural values (Zhang and Gelb, 1996). In addition, advertisements are more persuasive to consumers when firms take cultural differences into consideration (Gregory and Munch, 1997; Han and Shavitt, 1994). One possible explanation for why cultural differences might continue to persist is given by Meyer and Allen (2001) who made the point that national culture suggests that it is a multi-level construct incorporating values, beliefs, and assumptions shared by a group (Hofstede, 2001; Hofstede and Hofstede, 2005). And values, defined as “a broad tendency to prefer certain states of affairs over others” (Hofstede, 2001: p.5), are the most deeply-rooted core of national culture that are socially constructed from the very early years of an individual's life. Therefore, it is very difficult to change people's values after they have been formed (Hofstede and Hofstede, 2005).

Having defined “culture” and established its universal dimensions as posited by Hofstede (1980) and clearly shown that cultures differ across societies, may we proceed to address the question of the extent to which research into job design, the motivation to work and organizational commitment are culturally embedded in the USA or, Western Europe, I would say they are certainly embedded within the Western culture from which most of their proposers or researchers originated from, as can be deduced from any historical account about how they were proposed. However, they could be applied in other countries when the context within which the theory was developed is similar to the cultural context of that other country. Thus, we cannot say that the theories developed concerning job design, the motivation to work and organizational commitment within a Western Culture has universal application to other countries without considering the cultural context of that country as to whether it is similar to the Western Culture. The following portion of the essay will attempt to support the argument made in this paragraph, with possible illustrations from different countries.

First, some of the researchers who have carried out studies on job design are Frederick Taylor and Henry Fayol (*the classical approach to job design*, often referred to as *scientific management*) both of whom lived in the beginning of the 20th century (Harris, 2000: 370); Frederick Herzberg (*the two-factor theory*, 1950s); Richard Hackman and Greg Oldham (*the job characteristics model*,

1970s); Michael Hammer and James Champy (*Reengineering*, 1993) and so on. The classical approach to work design rests on several basic principles, which are as follows: (i) specialization and simplification—each job consists of a few simple tasks; (ii) repetitiveness—each job involves repeating the same tasks over and over again; (iii) mechanical pacing—employees work at a speed determined by engineers who focus on the nature of the product rather than the employees' natural rhythm or pace; (iv) limited interpersonal interaction—there is limited need for job-related interaction between employees; and (v) pre-determined work techniques—staff specialists determine what tools to use, how to use them, and other work technique decisions; employees have little or no influence over these decisions (Harris, 2000: 370). A good example of an organization that uses the classical approach of work or job design would be a large automobile manufacturer, such as General Motors, particularly as it existed in the 20th century.

In terms of whether, for example, the *classical approach to job design* is applicable to all other countries, I would say 'no'. For example, in my country Ghana, where a majority of the traditional manufacturing industries are cottage-based, such as woodcarving, kente-weaving, pottery, oil palm and palm kernel oil production, and soap production, the principles of the approach would only have limited application because most jobs carried out, are unique and custom-made, for example, each carving or cloth woven is a unique work of art, even though there might be some common patterns such as adinkra symbols that might be incorporated in the jobs carried out; there might be no mechanical or minimal mechanical pacing in carrying out jobs; in spite of some pre-determined work techniques existing, they are not universally applied to all jobs carried out; and there is a lot of interpersonal interaction in carrying out jobs, because of the very small-sizes of cottage industries, which might be predominantly 2 to 15 persons, the apprenticeship means of recruitment, and the likely involvement of family members or relatives or a very homogeneous group of people, and the predominantly informal environment that prevails in the industries and society (Kiggundu, 1991; Akinnusi, 1991). The same could be said for the other approaches to job design that they might have limited application in countries with similar culture or characteristics like Ghana, as most developing countries, especially those in Sub-Saharan.

Second, some of the researchers who have developed theories on motivation to work are as follows: Douglas McGregor (Theory X and Theory Y), Frederick Herzberg (two-factor motivation hygiene theory,) Abraham Maslow (hierarchy of needs theory), Elton Mayo (Hawthorne Experiments), Chris Argyris Rensis Likert and David McClelland (achievement motivation). There is no doubt

that a list of these notable researchers in motivation theory supports the assertion that, these theories are embedded within Western Culture, as it provided the milieu within which they were developed. The question still, however, is to which extent are these theories universally applicable. Before, we address the foregoing question, I would want to present a brief history of motivation theory, which has been predominantly influenced by Western Society (Latham and Ernst, 2006):

The history of workplace motivation has been described in detail by Latham (2006) and Latham and Budworth (2006). Motivational research conducted during the first 50 years of the 20th century was, for the most part, atheoretical. In the first two decades, the study of motivation was left largely to engineers. They believed that money was the primary, if not sole, source of an employee's motivation (Taylor, 1911). But this has proven, not to be true, because research has shown that, the happiest people on earth are not necessarily the people who are paid the highest salaries.

The foregoing was revealed in the third decade of motivation research in attitude surveys conducted by industrial–organizational psychologists (I/O) such as Viteles (1932), who found out that it took a lot more than money to make people happy (e.g., job security, recognition, status). The resulting premise of I/O psychologists was that job satisfaction predicts job performance. Hence they, as did the engineers before them, reached an over-simplified conclusion, namely, that the happy worker is a productive worker. Attitude surveys conducted in that time period made comparisons among, or generalizations to other firms difficult as they were for the most part tailored to the organization where they were administered. Dust-bowl empiricism, the adage that “if it works, use it” reigned as the primary heuristic guiding research on what motivates employees. And this research was showing that people can be happy for non-job performance reasons (e.g., happy with one's co-workers, fringe benefits, physical work conditions) which have little or no bearing on their subsequent productivity (Brayfield and Crockett, 1955).

Theories for predicting, explaining, and influencing a person's motivation in work settings blossomed in the 1960s. Credibility was given to Maslow's (1943) need hierarchy theory by McGregor (1960). This theory states that people have five needs; their goal is to satisfy their lower order needs, physiological and security, before they focus on satisfying their higher order needs for affiliation, esteem, and self-actualization. The theory was based on Maslow's observations of people who came to see him in his role as a clinical psychologist. McGregor provided no data to support his endorsement of Maslow's theory for the workplace. This was left to Porter. Using Maslow's

theory as a framework for developing survey items, Porter's (1961, 1962, 1963a,b,c) studies showed that people in low level jobs were concerned with satisfying lower order needs such as job security; people did not become concerned with their higher order needs until they had progressed to higher level jobs where their lower level needs had been well satisfied. The implications of this theory for organizational decision makers are straightforward. First, provide pay and benefits which ensure that an employee's physiological (e.g., food) and security (e.g., medical insurance) needs are met.

Second, hire people who are compatible with one another. If these lower needs are satisfied, the theory states that the likelihood increases that a person will focus on self-esteem through achievement as well as self-actualization, that is, finding ways to maximize one's knowledge and skills. In addition to need hierarchy, McGregor (1960) also endorsed the relevance of a second theory of motivation. This theory, developed by Herzberg (Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman, 1959) identified situational factors that facilitate or inhibit the "growth" of an employee.

As a graduate student at the University of Pittsburgh, Herzberg was torn between becoming a clinical or an I/O psychologist. In choosing to become an I/O psychologist, Herzberg decided to focus on the mental-health of the worker. His interviews with employees led him to conclude that one cannot motivate others per se, but one can enrich a work environment so that it becomes conducive to self-motivation. Using his mentor's methodology for conducting a job analysis, Herzberg adapted Flanagan's (1954) critical incident technique for collecting data on what satisfies and what dissatisfies employees. He concluded that the sources of an enriched job that lead to job satisfaction (feedback, recognition, task variety, autonomy) form one continuum while the sources of job dissatisfaction (supervisors, coworkers, pay, fringe benefits, physical work conditions) form another. Thus the opposite of job satisfaction is not job dissatisfaction, but rather no job satisfaction. Hence, two interchangeable names were used as labels for Herzberg's theory, namely, job enrichment and the two-factor theory (i.e., job satisfaction vs. job dissatisfaction).

Hackman and Oldham elaborated on Herzberg's theory regarding important characteristics of jobs, so as to take into account differences among individuals regarding their needs (Hackman and Oldham, 1976). Two key differences between their job characteristics theory and that of Herzberg's job enrichment theory is that they did not posit two distinctly different factors as sources of satisfaction versus dissatisfaction, and, more importantly, they did not advocate enriching jobs for

everyone. Instead, their theory states that job enrichment only motivates employees who have higher order growth needs for autonomy, responsibility, task variety, feedback, and recognition.

Similar to McGregor's advocacy of Maslow's need hierarchy theory, Nord (1969) wrote a compelling essay endorsing another person's body of work, namely, Skinner's. Skinner was an experimental psychologist who studied the behaviour of rats and pigeons in laboratory settings. Nord argued that there are many similarities between Maslow's theory, McGregor's translation of Maslow's theory, and Skinner's research on operant conditioning. The latter was known as behaviour modification in clinical psychology and subsequently as contingency theory in I/O psychology. But unlike Maslow, Skinner's research was based on the philosophy of behaviourism. Both Herzberg and Skinner emphasized the importance of the environment on a person's behaviour; even though they did so from very different perspectives. By controlling environmental contingencies, behaviourists such as Skinner showed how a person's behaviour can be easily modified by someone else.

Herzberg's job enrichment theory said that money can be a source of a person's dissatisfaction, but that it has no effect on a person's motivation. Skinner was agnostic. What constitutes a reinforcer is an empirical issue; if money that is made contingent upon a response increases the probability that the response is repeated (i.e., "reinforced/strengthened"), it is by definition a reinforcer. Yukl, Wexley, and Seymore (1972) were among the first to show that this is indeed the case. In a laboratory setting, people paid on a variable ratio schedule performed at a higher rate than those paid on a continuous schedule. In a field experiment involving unionized employees, Latham and Dossett (1978) found, consistent with Skinner's work with rats and pigeons, that inexperienced unionized employees had higher performance when a bonus was paid on a continuous rather than on a variable ratio schedule. The opposite was true with those who were experienced.

In summary to this point in time, psychologists now knew the importance of (1) taking into account a person's needs (Maslow's need hierarchy theory, Hackman and Oldham's job characteristics theory), (2) creating a job environment that is likely to facilitate self-motivation (Herzberg's job enrichment theory, Hackman and Oldham's job characteristics theory), and (3) ways to directly modify, that is, to directly increase or decrease another person's behaviour by administering environmental reinforcers and punishers contingent upon a person's response (Skinner's contingency theory).

The 1960s was the decade that heralded in the cognitive revolution in psychology; people were now viewed by psychologists as immersed in thought. No one deserves more credit for fostering this revolution within I/O psychology and organizational behaviour (OB) than Vroom. Vroom's (1964) expectancy theory is expressed in a mathematical equation that serves as a heuristic for predicting a person's choice, effort and persistence, the three pillars of motivation. In conceptual terms, this heuristic shows that people who choose to engage in a given behaviour based on their subjective probability estimate that (1) their effort will lead to effective performance, (2) multiplied by their subjective probability estimate that their performance will lead to various outcomes, (3) all of which is multiplied by their valence, that is, the degree to which these outcomes are valued. Thus expectancy theory casts a person's motivation to apply one's knowledge and skills (ability) as a thoughtful rational decision making process. A person's motivation can be influenced by others to the extent that they can provide outcomes that are valued by the person, and create situations whereby the person's two probability estimates (i.e., subjective expective utility) are high. Drawing upon expectancy theory, money, Lawler (1970) argued, can indeed motivate employees if (a) they value the amount that is offered, (b) if they believe that their performance will lead to the attainment of a desired amount, and (c) if they believe their effort will result in them performing effectively. Other researchers have also contributed immensely to the development of theory to motivation to work including Locke (1968); Latham and Kinne (1974); Ronan, Latham, and Kinne (1973); Locke and Latham (1984, 2002, 2005); Ronen (2001); Kluger and Tikochinsky (2001); and Van-Dijk and Kluger (2004) and so on.

With respect to what extent theories on work motivation developed predominantly from a Western perspective are universally applicable, I would state again that, to the extent that a country or culture is similar to that of the Western context or culture within which the theory was developed, the theories could be applicable, and vice versa. In the middle could be the situation where the theory could be applied when it is modified. Also, one other factor which would make the theory universally applicable is when it is not sensitive to culture generally, but is basically consistent with basic human nature. For example, a resurgence of interest in Maslow's need hierarchy theory has come about due largely to the research of Ronen (2001) and Kluger and Tikochinsky (2001) to the effect that Maslow's taxonomy of needs is essentially correct across several countries. They arrived at this conclusion working independently of each other in different countries. Van-Dijk and Kluger (2004) also found support for the theory that threats to lower needs such as safety overwhelm

individual differences. Finding ways to satisfy lower needs take precedent over seeking ways to satisfy one's higher order needs such as self-actualization. Only this latter variable is affected by individual differences.

Van-Dijk and Kluger (2004) drew upon need hierarchy theory to answer the question as to whether people raise their goal upon attaining it. They concluded that once lower order needs are satisfied, an individual's goal for food or safety is not increased. But, when a higher order goal for self-esteem or actualization is attained, an even higher goal is set for the satisfaction of these two needs.

Working in Nigeria, Ajila (1997) found that the satisfaction of lower order needs on the part of employees take precedence over the satisfaction of their higher order needs. Consistent with Porter's research conducted in the 1960s, Kamalanabhan, Uma, and Vasanthi (1999) reported that bank clerks in India stated that the satisfaction of their need for job security was most important to them, while bank officers were more concerned with the satisfaction of their higher order than they were with their lower order needs. Also, in Ghana, as with other developing countries, where poverty is pandemic, workers are more interested in bread and butter issues than with high ideals, such as the need to be against corruption of their managers or superiors (Budhwar and Debrah 2001).

Another example will be how different countries or cultures would apply Vroom's (1964) expectancy theory which among, other things casts a person's motivation to apply their knowledge and skills (ability) as a thoughtful rational decision making unit. A person's motivation can be influenced by others to the extent that they can provide outcomes that are valued by the person, and create situations whereby the person's two probability estimates (i.e., subjective expective utility) are high. However, this may not hold true in different cultures. For example, Cox et al. (1991) argued that Asian, Hispanic, and Black Americans and Beugré and Offodile (2001) says Africans belong to a collectivist culture, whereas Anglo Americans belong to an individualist culture. Based on this logic, Cox et al.. hypothesized and found that Asian, Hispanic, and Black Americans, including Africans (Beugré and Offodile, 2001) would engage in higher levels of cooperative behaviour than Anglo Americans. Thus, we can realise that Vroom's (1964) expectancy theory will work out differently between the Asian, Hispanic, and Black Americans, including Africans, on one hand, and Anglo Americans, typical of Western Society, on the other hand.

Now that the theories of job design and motivation to work have been looked at, in terms of the extent to which they are embedded in Western Culture and the circumstances affecting their applicability in other cultures, we want to finally look at the concept of organizational commitment and the extent to which it is culturally embedded.

Commitment is about generating human energy and activating the human mind. Without it, the implementation of any new initiative or idea would be seriously compromised. Commitment from top management is like a framework for change. Top management decides the organizational policies to establish, the level of training and communication required. Management commitment must include a culture that encourages innovation and risk-taking. Values, norms, attitudes, and behaviours that promote environmental improvement efforts have to be supported (Ramus, 2001). According to Wilms et al. (1994, p. 108) cited in Govindarajulu and Daily (2004), People will follow management's direction. Whatever management does, and in what direction they push, and how hard they push dictates where this company eventually goes. Three major components of organizational commitment are, "a strong belief in and acceptance of the organization's goals, a willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization, and a definite desire to maintain organizational membership." Sheldon (1971) defines commitments as being a positive evaluation of the organization and the organization's goals; whereas Buchanan (1974) made the point that most scholars define commitment as being a bond between an individual (the employee) and the organization (the employer).

Meyer and Allen (1991) and Dunham et al. (1994) identified three types of commitment: affective commitment, continuance commitment, and normative commitment. Normative commitment is a relatively new aspect of organizational commitment having been defined by Bolon in 1993. Affective commitment is defined as the emotional attachment, identification, and involvement that an employee has with his or her organization and its goals (Mowday et al., 1979; O'Reily and Chatman 1986). Porter et al. (1974) further characterize affective commitment by three factors (1) "belief in and acceptance of the organization's goals and values, (2) a willingness to focus effort on helping the organization achieve its goals, and (3) a desire to maintain organizational membership". Mowday et al. (1979) further states that affective communication is "when the employee identifies with a particular organization and its goals in order to maintain membership to facilitate the goal" (p.225). Meyer and Allen (1997) continue to say that employees retain membership out of choice and this is their commitment to the organization.

Meyer et al. (1993) and Baugh and Roberts (1994) both find that committed employees had high expectations of their performance and therefore performed better. However, Meyer and Allen (1997) continue to describe reasons why performance and commitment may not be related. Some of the factors include the seriousness with which supervisors value the appraisal process, the value of job performance by an organization and the amount of employee control over outcomes. Research has also found that those employees who are committed to their profession also have higher levels of commitment to the organization. Baugh and Roberts (1994) found that those employees who were committed to both their organization and their profession had high levels of job performance.

Also, management styles can influence the commitment level of employees. Koopman (1991) studied how leadership styles affected employees and found those employees who favoured their manager's style also favoured the organization more. Though there was no direct connection. Bateman and Strasser (1984), state that organizational commitment has been operationally-defined as "multidimensional in nature, involving an employee's loyalty to the organization, willingness to exert effort on behalf of the organization, degree of goal and value congruency with the organization, and desire to maintain membership" (p.95). Mowday, Steers and Porter (1979) identified two components of commitment namely, commitment-related attitudes and commitment-related behaviours. Nierhoff et al. (1990) found that the "overall management culture and style driven by the top management actions are strongly related to the degree of employee commitment" (p. 344). These correlations bring to light the importance of having strong managers and their roles in the overall organization.

Furthermore, it is well-established that there are international difference in the extent to which societies value a more collective or a more individualistic approach to life. In individualistic societies, examples, USA, Canada, UK, Australia), people tend to value individual initiatives, privacy, and taking care of oneself. In more collective societies, examples, Mexico, Singapore, Pakistan, more closely knit social bonds are observed, in which members of one's ingroup, examples, family, clan, or organization, are expected to take care of each other in exchange for strong loyalty to the group. This suggests that there might be no orientation to self-actualisation as a motive in more collective cultures. For example, the Ghanaian culture encourages people to be concerned about others and places importance on relationships (Budhwar and Debrah 2001).

Finally, we can say that, an examination of research into job design, the motivation to work and organization commitment has clearly revealed that they are predominantly originated in the USA or Western Europe, and that they are clearly embedded in Western Culture. However, they are applicable to other cultures to the extent that those cultures had a similarity with Western Culture, in terms of the universal dimensions of culture that Hofstede (1980) espoused, namely, power distance, individualism-collectivism, masculinity-femininity and uncertainty avoidance and the Confucian dynamic (Hofstede and Bond, 1988) or long-term orientation (Hofstede 1991). Also, as globalization is bringing all closer together and increasingly causing managers to attend to issues of culture and diversity, Western managers are faced with the task of assessing the applicability of traditionally Western management styles and human resources practices in other cultures. Training for expatriate managers in the values and culture of their host country has become increasingly important, and helps managers better understand which ideas and practices fit well and which do not (Paine and Organ, 2000).

References

Adler, N. J., 1997. *International dimensions of organizational behavior*, (3rd ed.). Cincinnati, OH: South-Western College Publishing.

Ajila, C.O., 1997. *Job Motivation and Attitude to Work as Correlates of Productivity among Workers in Manufacturing Companies in Lagos State, Nigeria*. **Unpublished** Ph.D. Thesis submitted to the Department of Psychology O.A.U Ile-Ife Osun State, Nigeria.

Akinnusi, D. M., 1991. 'Personnel Management in Africa: A Comparative Analysis of Ghana, Kenya and Nigeria' in C. Brewster and S. Tyson (eds) *International Comparisons in Human Resource Management*, London: Pitman, pp. 72-76.

Bateman, T. S., & Strasser, S., 1984. A longitudinal analysis of the antecedents of organizational commitment. *Academy of Management Journal*, 27, 95 (112).

Baugh, S. & Roberts, R., 1994. "Professional and organizational commitment among engineers: conflicting or complementing?" *Engineering Management*, 41, 2, 108-114.

Beugré, C. D. and Offodile, O. F., 2001. 'Managing for organizational effectiveness in sub-Saharan Africa: a culture-fit model', *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 12: 4, 535 — 550

Blanchflower, D.G. and, Freeman, R.B., 1997. 'The attitudinal legacy of Communist labour relations', *Industrial and Labour Relations Review*, 50(3), pp. 483-459.

Bolon, D.S., 1993. "Organizational Citizenship Behaviour Among Hospital Employees: A Multidimensional Analysis Involving job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment". *Hospital and Health Services Administration*, 42, 2, 221-241.

Buchanan, B., II., 1974. "Building organizational commitment: The socialization of managers in work organizations". *Administrative Science Quarterly*. 19, 533-546.

Brayfield, A. H., & Crockett, W. H., 1955. Employee attitudes and employee performance. *Psychological Bulletin*, 52, 396–424.

Budhwar, P. S. and Debrah, Y. A. eds., 2001. *Human Resource Management in Developing Countries*, London: Routledge.

Cox, T., Lobel, S. A., & McLeod, P. L., 1991. Effects of ethnic group cultural differences on cooperative and competitive behavior on a group task. *Academy of Management Journal*, 4, 827–847.

Dunham, R. B., Grube, J. A., & Castaneda, M. B., 1994. Organizational commitment: The utility of an integrative definition. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79, 370±380.

Durbin, R., Mowday, R., and Porter, L., 1974. Unit performance, situational factors and employee attitudes in spatially separated work units. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Performance*, 12, 231-248.

Encyclopedia Britannica., 2007. *History of Anthropologist*. [Online]. Available from:

<http://www.britannica.com/bsp/search?query=anthropologist>. [Accessed 17 April 2010]

Ernst, C., & Latham, G. P., 2003. Leadership across differences: Reconciling ethnicity, religion, gender and culture. *Istanbul Global Leadership Forum*. June

Govindaraju, N., and Daily, F. B., 2004. Emerald: Motivating Employees for environmental improvement [Online] *Industrial management and Data Systems*, 104(4), 364-372. Available from: <http://www.emeraldinsight.com/Insight/ViewContentServlet?contentType=ArticleandFilename=Published/EmeraldFullTextArticle/Articles/0291040408.html> [Accessed on 11 March 2010]

Gibson, C. B., & Gibbs, J. L., 2006. Unpacking the concept of virtuality: the effects of geographic dispersion, electronic dependence, dynamic structure, and national diversity on team innovation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 51(3), 451-495.

Gregory, G.D. Munch, J.M. (1997). Cultural Values in International Advertising: an Examination of Familial Norms and Roles in Mexico, *Psychology and Marketing*, 14 (2), pp. 99-119.

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

Han, S.P. Shavitt, S., 1994. Persuasion and Culture: Advertising Appeals in Individualistic and Collectivistic Societies, *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 30, pp. 326-50.

Harris, M., 2000. *Human Resource Management: A Practical Approach*, 2nd ed. Mason: Thomson.

Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. B., 1959. *The motivation to work*. New York Wiley

Hofstede, G., 1980. *Cultures and consequences*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Hofstede, G., 1991. *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind*. London: McGraw-Hill.

Hofstede, G., 2001. *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviours, institutions, and organizations across nations*. Thousand Oaks CA: Sage Publications.

Hofstede, G., & Hofstede, G. J., 2005. *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind*. London, UK: McGraw-Hill.

Huang, X., & Van de Vliert, E., 2002. Intrinsic job rewards at country-level and individual-level codetermine job satisfaction: Intrinsic job satisfaction in 46 countries. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 33, 385-394.

Huat, T. C., 1989. "Confucianism and Nation Building in Singapore". *International Journal of Social Economics*, 16 (8), 5-16.

Kamalanabhan, T. J., Uma J., & Vasanthi, M., 1999. A Delphi study of motivational profile of scientists in research and development organizations. *Psychological Reports*, 85, 743-749.

Kiggundu, M. N., 1991. "The Challenges of Management Development in Sub-Saharan Africa", *Journal of Management Development*, Vol. 10 Iss: 6, pp.32 – 47

Kluger, A. N., & Tikochinsky, J., 2001. The error of accepting the "theoretical" null hypothesis: The rise, fall, and resurrection of commonsense hypotheses in psychology. *Psychological Bulletin*, 127, 408–423.

Koopman, P.L., 1991. "Between control and commitment: Management and change as the art of balancing". *Leadership and OD Journal*, 12, 3-7.

Latham, G. P., & Kinne, S. B., 1974. Improving job performance through training in goal setting. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 59, 187–191.

Latham, G. P., Mitchell, T. R., & Dossett, D. L., 1978. The importance of participative goal setting and anticipated rewards on goal difficulty and job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 63, 163–171.

Latham, G. P., 2006. *Work motivation: History, theory research and practice*. Sage.

Latham, G. P., & Budworth, M. H., 2006. The study of employee motivation in the 20th Century. In L. Koppes (Ed.), *Historical perspectives in industrial–organizational psychology: The first hundred years*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Latham, G. P., & Ernst, C. T., 2006. Keys to motivating tomorrow's workforce. *Human Resource Management Review*, 16, 181-198.

Lawler, E. E., 1970. *Pay and organizational effectiveness: A psychological view*. New York McGraw Hill.

Locke, E. A., 1968. Toward a theory of task motivation and incentives. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 3, 157–189.

Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P., 1984. *Goal setting: A motivational technique that works*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ Prentice Hall.

Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P., 2005. Goal setting theory: Theory by induction. In K. Smith, & M. Hitt (Eds.), *Great Minds in Management: The Process of Theory Development* (pp. 128–150). Oxford Press.

Maslow, A. H., 1943. A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, 50, 370–396.

Mc Gregor, D., 1960. *The Human side of Enterprise*. New York: McGraw Hill.

Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J., 1991. A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1, 64–89.

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., & Allen, N. J., 1997. *Commitment in the workplace: Theory, research, and application*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications

Mowday, R., Steers, R., and Porter, L., 1979. The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 14, 224-247.

Mullins, L. J., 2002. *Management and Organizational Behaviour*, 6th ed. Harlow: Pearson Education.

Nord, W. R., 1969. Beyond the teaching machine: The neglected area of operant conditioning in the theory and practice of management. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 4, 375–401

Niehoff, B.P., Enz, C.A., & Grover, R.A., 1990. The impact of top-management actions on employee attitudes and perceptions. *Group & Organization Studies*, 15, 3, 337- 352.

O'Reilly, C. A., & Chatman, J. A., 1986. Organizational commitment and psychological attachment: The effects of compliance, identification, and internalization on prosocial behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71, 492–499

Paine, J. B., & Organ, D. W., 2000. The cultural matrix of organizational citizenship behavior: some preliminary conceptual and empirical observations. *Human Resource Management Review*, 10, 45-59.

Porter, L. W., 1961. A study of perceived need satisfaction in bottom and middle management jobs. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 45, 1–10.

Porter, L. W., 1962. Job attitudes in management: I. Perceived deficiencies in need fulfillment as a function of job level. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 46, 375–384.

Porter, L. W., 1963(a). Job attitudes in management: II. Perceived importance of needs as a function of job level. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 46, 375–384.

Porter, L. W., 1963(b). Job attitudes in management: III. Perceived deficiencies in need fulfillment as a function of line versus type of job. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 47, 267–275.

Porter, L.W., 1963(c). Job attitudes in management: IV. Perceived deficiencies in need fulfillment as a function of size of company. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 47, 386–397.

Porter, L.W.; Steers, R.M.; Mowday, R.T.; & Boulian, P.V., 1974. Organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover among psychiatric technicians. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1974, 59, 603-609.

Ramus, C., 2001. "Organizational support for employees: encouraging creative ideas for environmental sustainability", *California Management Review*, pp.85-105.

Ronen, S., 2001. Self-actualization versus collectualization: Implications for motivation theories. In M. Erez, U. Klenbeck, & H. K. Thierry (Eds.), *Work motivation in the context of a globalizing economy* (pp. 341–368). Hillsdale, NJ Lawrence Erlbaum.

Ronan, W. W., Latham, G. P., & Kinne S. B., 1973. The Effects of Goal Setting and Supervision on Worker Behavior in an Industrial Situation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 57: 302-307.

Sheldon, M., 1971. Investments and involvements as mechanisms producing commitment to the organization. *Administrative Science Quarterly*. 16; 143-150.

Taylor, F.W., 1911. *The Principles of Scientific Management*. New York. Harper Bros.

Triandis, H. C., 1989. The self and social behaviour in differing cultural contexts. *Psychological Review*, 96(3), 506–520.

Triandis, H., 2003. Forty-five years of researching the culture and behaviour link. In D. Tjosvold & K. Leung (Eds.), *Cross-cultural management: Foundations and future Burlington, VT: Ashgate Press*.

Van Dijk, D., & Kluger, A. N. 2004. Feedback sign effect on motivation: Is it moderated by regulatory focus? *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 53: 113–135.

Viteles, M.S. (1932). *Industrial psychology*. New York, NY: Norton.

Vroom, V.H., (1964) *Work and Motivation*. New York: John Wiley.

Wilms, W.W., Hardcastle, A.J., Zell, D.M. (1994), "Cultural transformation at NUMMI", *Sloan Management Review*, pp.99-113.

Yukl, G., Wexley, K. N., & Seymore, J. D., 1972. Effectiveness of pay incentives under variable ratio and continuous reinforcement schedules. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 56, 13–23.

Zhang, Y., & Gelb, B. D., 1996. Matching advertising appeals to culture: The influence of products' use conditions. *Journal of Advertising*, 25(3), 29–46.