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Abstract

Employee commitment is one of the most important aspects that help an organisation achieve its desired goals. This study investigates the possible effects of gender and age differences between managers and employees on organisational commitment among lower-level employees in selected factories in the Buffalo City Metropolitan area. The organisational commitment instrument used in this research is the Meyer and Allen (1997) organisational commitment questionnaire which contains 18 items (6 items for each scale: affective commitment, continuance commitment and normative commitment). For this purpose, a sample of 100 lower-level employees was used. The results indicated significant differences in the unexpected directions in affective commitment and continuance commitment between male employees supervised by male managers and male employees supervised by female managers; male employees were found to have higher levels of affective and continuance commitment when supervised by female managers. Female employees were found to have a higher level of normative commitment when supervised by male managers than when supervised by female managers which was also in the unexpected direction. In addition, the study showed surprising results in terms of the social or cultural hypothesis where employees supervised by male managers and older managers were not significantly different in organisational commitment to those managed by female and by younger or same-age managers.

Keywords: Organisational commitment, affective commitment, continuance commitment, normative commitment, gender differences, age differences.
Chapter 1: Introduction, Problem statement and Outline of the study

1.1. Introduction

Workplace diversity is a fact of modern organisational life, and the challenge of managing a diverse workforce is widely recognized as a key issue facing today’s managers (Williams, Parker, & Turner, 2007). Diversity has brought individuals of different generations and genders to work side by side on a regular basis thus altering the demographic relationship between managers and employees in two important respects. First, demographic differences have become a common feature of the manager-employee relationship. Second, this relationship is increasingly marked by demographic configurations that break traditional norms and hierarchies. An important question, then, is how these demographic differences (age and gender differences) between managers and employees affect organisational commitment.

1.2. Statement of the problem

Gender and age differences are ever-increasing and unavoidable features of the workplace among both managers and employees in the globalised world of today (Greenberg & Baron, 2010). It is therefore important to find out what the effects of such gender and age differences may be on the job performance and work attitudes of employees. This study therefore sets out to investigate what the effects of gender and age differences between managers and their employees may be on organisational commitment. It was mainly based on two theoretical approaches, namely (i) the similarity-attraction paradigm of Byrne (1971) and the social identity theory of Tajfel and Turner (1986), on the one hand, and (ii) the theories of social roles (Eagly, 1987), on the other.
The first set of theories argue, on the one hand, that similarity promotes compatibility, interpersonal attraction, and identity reinforcement; while on the other hand, dissimilarity creates incompatibility, disorder, and alienation. Based on this theory, this study therefore investigated whether similarity between managers and employees in gender and age is associated with high organisational commitment while dissimilarity between managers and employees in gender and age is associated with low organisational commitment.

The second set of theories, the theories of social roles (Eagly, 1987), on the other hand, argue that society prescribes different roles to members of different groups and that such roles generally coincide with power and status norms. As far as gender is concerned, society ascribes the managerial role to men while women are supposed to be subordinates. As far as age is concerned society generally ascribes the managerial role to older persons while younger persons are supposed to be subordinates. It can therefore be expected that members of society (including employees) will generally be happy if their managers are men and will accordingly show commitment to the organization they work for. If their managers are women, on the other hand, employees will generally feel uncomfortable and will accordingly not be committed to the organization they work for. It can likewise be expected that employees whose managers are older than them will be comfortable and therefore committed to the organization that employs them while those whose managers are younger will be uncomfortable and less committed to the organization that employs them. Based on these theories, this study investigated whether employees reporting to male or older managers showed a higher
level of organisational commitment than employees reporting to younger or female managers.

1.3. Objectives of the study

The main objective of the study was to determine whether the level of organisational commitment of an employee differed depending on the managers and employee's age and gender.

- A sub-objective was to test the validity of the similarity-attraction paradigm of Byrne (1971), the social identity theory of Tajfel and Turner (1986), and the social roles theories of Eagly (1987) in the Buffalo City Metropolitan Area.

- A further sub-objective was to provide guidelines that could aid in both the management of organizational commitment and the assignment of employees to work teams.

1.4. Significance of the study

This research intended to make a contribution to the body of knowledge regarding the effect of gender and age differences between managers and employees on employees’ organisational commitment. The study sought to help fill a still apparent gap in existing knowledge, namely how an employee’s organisational commitment level differs based on the difference or similarity between his or her gender and age, and the gender and age of his or her manager.

Furthermore, the study sought to show the nature of such effects, if any. This information should then be used to solve real-life problems in this regard. For example, if same gender managers seemed to have a positive effect on the organisational
commitment of their subordinates while different-gender managers had negative effect, this could be pointed out to trainee managers and ways devised to counteract the negative effect. Educational programmes could also be introduced in schools to eradicate any gender bias from the minds of the pupils and thus from the minds of the general population over a period of time.

Establishing the relationship between the managers’ and employees’ age and gender differences and the level of commitment of the employee could also be of benefit to the organisations in that these demographic differences could be used as predictors of employees’ organisational commitment. This research was relatively unique since it investigated this relationship in factories in Buffalo City Metropolitan Area in the Eastern Cape, which is fairly remote from more developed areas where businesses tend to be larger and more cosmopolitan.

1.5. Hypotheses

1.5.1. Similarity hypotheses

These three hypotheses are based on the similarity-attraction paradigm of Byrne (1971) and the social identity theory of Tajfel and Turner (1986).

Hypothesis 1

H₀: Male employees supervised by a male manager do not have a higher level of organisational commitment than male employees supervised by a female manager.
H_{1}: Male employees supervised by a male manager have a higher level of organisational commitment than male employees supervised by a female manager.

**Hypothesis 2**

H_{0}: Female employees supervised by a female manager do not have a higher level of organisational commitment than female employees supervised by a male manager.

H_{1}: Female employees supervised by a female manager have a higher level of organisational commitment than female employees supervised by a male manager.

**Hypothesis 3**

H_{0}: Employees who have a manager who is the same age as them do not have a higher level of organisational commitment than employees with a manager who is older or younger than them.

H_{1}: Employees who have a manager who is the same age as them have a higher level of organisational commitment than employees with a manager who is older or younger than them.
1.5.2. Social role or cultural hypotheses

These two hypotheses are based on the social roles theories of Eagly (1987).

Hypothesis 4

\( H_0 \): Employees managed by a male manager do not have a higher level of organisational commitment than employees managed by a female manager.

\( H_1 \): Employees managed by a male manager have a higher level of organisational commitment than employees managed by a female manager.

Hypothesis 5

\( H_0 \): Employees managed by an older manager do not have a higher level of organisational commitment than employees managed by younger or same age managers.

\( H_1 \): Employees managed by an older manager have a higher level of organisational commitment than employees managed by younger or same age managers.

1.6. Conceptual model of the study

For the sake of clarity, a diagrammatic representation of the present study appears in Figure 1.1, which shows that the independent variables are age and gender differences while the dependent variable is overall organisational commitment and its components: affective commitment, continuance commitment, and normative commitment.
1.7. Organisation of the study

Chapter one provides an introduction to the study, a statement of the problem, the objectives, significance and hypothesis, and ends with an outline of the study.

Chapter two provides a comprehensive overview of the literature relating to age and gender differences and organisational commitment with reference being made to the effect these two demographic differences have on organisational commitment. A brief review of the theories underpinning age and gender diversity and also organisational commitment will be explored.

Chapter three provides an overview of the research design utilised to execute the research. Aspects such as the population, sample, and sampling procedure, the data collection method, instruments used, data collection and data analysis.
Chapter four reports the results of the study in relation to the hypotheses. It also comments on the reliability of the Organisational Commitment Questionnaire as used in the study.

Chapter five discusses the results emanating from the study. Conclusions are drawn based on the obtained results and these are integrated with existing literature. Moreover, the practical implications of the research findings are highlighted. The shortcomings of the study are also highlighted and recommendations for future research are outlined.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

2.1. Introduction

Globalisation in the workplace has brought about more and more diverse individuals with different work ethics, deep-seated attitudes and opposing perspectives. There is no one definition of diversity; however, there has been considerable agreement on the components of diversity, i.e. diversity based on age, gender, religion and race which can all affect workplace relationships (Dessler, 2005; Fajana, 2009). With such great diversity within organisations now, one is left to wonder how these different individuals are to be managed and which manager would be ideal to manage them in a way that will encourage organisational commitment and the achievement of organisational objectives (Owoyemi, Elegbede & Gbajumo-Sheriff, 2011).

The current study focuses on age and gender differences as components of diversity which play a role in the quality of manager-employee relationships in an organisation. Studies done show that age and gender differences can affect the quality of an employee’s work and work attitudes and also the manager-employee relations. The main aim of this study therefore is specifically to examine the two relational demographic differences (age and gender differences) between manager and employee and the role they play on employee organisational commitment.

2.2. Theories underpinning age and gender diversity

Studies done on age and gender diversity have been rooted in three theories that enable one to understand the impact of age and gender diversity on organisational commitment as well as the organisation as a whole. These theories are: (i) the social roles theory of Eagly (1987); (ii) the social identity theory of Tajfel and Turner (1986) and
(iii) the similarity-attraction paradigm of Byrne (1971). The social identity theory and the similarity-attraction paradigm are all rooted in social psychology and they suggest that homogeneous team members work well together thus resulting in a positive effect on team performance and the organisation at large. The social roles theory (Eagly, 1987), on the other hand, holds a different point of view.

2.2.1. The Social Roles Theory

The social roles theory (Eagly, 1987) argues that society prescribes different roles to members of different groups and such roles generally coincide with power and status norms. Further, when work roles break with social roles or traditional hierarchies, this conflict can cause discomfort for both the employee and manager (Eagly, 1987). On the one hand, when employees are from an older group than their managers, such employees are more likely to resent and to disrespect their managers. On the other hand, younger managers may defer from older employees and may refrain from exercising their authority in order to avoid discomfort and disapproval. In the present study, two demographic relationships break with traditional roles and hierarchies: managers with subordinates older than themselves, and women managing men. Because subordinates may be less comfortable in these role-breaking relationships, their organisational commitment level may be affected as well.

2.2.2. The Social identity / categorizing theory

Previous research suggests that most researchers adopt the social identity theory to try to understand the effects of workplace diversity (Northcraft, Polzer, Nale & Kramer, 1995). In most cases the social identity theory has been used to predict and understand how age and gender diversity influence an employee’s attitude and behaviour (Jackson, Joshi, & Erhardt, 2003). In explaining the effects that age and gender diversity have on
an individual's behaviour, the basic argument could be that one’s similarity on visible and relatively immutable traits influences one’s feelings of identification (Tsui, Egan & O’Reilly, 1992). Particularly, gender is one obvious example used to illustrate how self-categorization may increase or decrease the attractiveness of a group to an individual (Hoffman & Hurst, 1990).

During the process of self-categorization, individuals classify themselves and others into social categories using attributes such as age, gender or race (Williams & O’Reilly, 1998). According to Tajfel and Turner (1986), this process allows a person to define him or herself in terms of social identity, and that leads to in-group or out-group distinctions (Kramer, 1991). Moreover, individuals desire to maintain a high level of self-esteem and a positive self-identity (Tajfel, 1981; Tajfel & Turner, 1986). According to Kramer (1991), individuals may seek to maximize intergroup distinctiveness in order to maintain a positive self-identity thus viewing individuals from other groups as less trustworthy, honest or even co-operative than members of their own group.

Previous studies based on social identity theory confirm the negative effects of age and gender differences on group processes (Triandis, Kurowski, & Gelfand, 1994). Group processes are related to group performance, which in turn, should be related to the organisation’s overall performance (Frink, Robinson, Reithel, Arthur, Ammeter, Ferris, Kaplan & Morrise, 2003). Overall, social identity theory tends to suggest that gender differences results in negative performance outcomes.
2.2.2. The similarity/attraction paradigm

The third common theoretical foundation for studies of age and gender differences rests on the similarity/attraction paradigm of Byrne (1971). Byrne (1971) developed the similarity/attraction paradigm through a review of previous literature related to similarity and dissimilarity. This paradigm argues that people are more attracted to similar others. “Birds of a feather flock together” is a proverb that best summarizes the similarity/attraction paradigm.

According to Byrne, Clore and Worchel (1966), similarity in personal attributes is a source of interpersonal attraction and these attributes range from attitudes, values, demographic variables, and socioeconomic background, to competence and leisure activities. Geddes and Konrad (2003) state that members of the same demographic group enjoy easier communication, have a faster development of rapport and have a greater perceived likelihood that values and opinions will be validated. If individuals can choose freely, there is a strong tendency for them to select a person that is similar to them (William & O’Reilly, 1998).

According to Byrne (1971), the similarity/attraction paradigm supports the view that when group members have similar attributes, stronger cohesiveness between them will result. The homogeneity of groups leads to increased satisfaction and cooperation, and to reduced emotional conflicts (Williams & O’Reilly, 1998). By contrast, when similarity between members is low, increased or intensified conflict may result, thus reducing individual satisfaction and increasing turnover and work pressure (Tsui & O’Reilly, 1989). In heterogamous groups, differences between members lead to decreased
communication, message distortion, and more errors in communication (Barnlund & Harland, 1963; Triandis, 1960). For example, Alagna, Reddy, and Collins (1982) demonstrated that mixed-gender groups reported higher levels of conflict and tension and less friendliness than same-sex groups.

Pfeffer (1983) states that the distribution of demographic differences in groups and organisations affect processes and commitment levels. According to Horwitz (2005), homogeneous teams are likely to be more productive than heterogeneous teams because of the mutual attraction between team members with similar characteristics thus, consistent with social identity/categorization theory, the similarity/attraction paradigm argues that gender diversity is associated with negative performance outcomes.

2.3. Demographic variables (age and gender differences)

Researchers have suggested that demographic differences (such as gender and age differences) can play an important role in the quality of manager–employee relationship. The managers in the study are first line supervisors or immediate supervisors. Tsui and O’Reilly (1989) have initiated the term relational demography to describe the differences in characteristics between manager and subordinate. Part of the conceptual basis for this research is the similarity-attraction paradigm (Byrne, 1971) which proposes that similarity between individuals on several dimensions, such as demographic variables, is related to interpersonal attraction (Liden, Wayne & Stilanwell, 1993). Since it has been argued in previous studies that relational demography can affect the quality of manager-employee relations and also employees’ work attitudes and well-being, the main aim of this study was to examine the two relational demographic differences that are discussed
below and to consider the role these may have on employee organisational commitment.

2.3.1. Age differences

Age has to do with the length of time that a person has lived. According to Itzin and Phillipson (1993), age diversity is a central theme in today’s complex, evolving workplace, and with the different generations working side by side, tensions and lost productivity may be inevitable. Some authors have gained a wide following by asserting that these workplace tensions result from profound age differences related to historical events and trends in the formative years of each generation. A generation is simply a group of people born in the same general time span who share some life experiences, such as big historical events, pastimes, heroes, and early work experiences (Weston, 2001).

A number of generational theorists (Blythe, Baumann, Zeytinoglu, Denton, Akhtar-Denesh, and Kolotylo, 2008) argue that shared life experiences generate shared assumptions, attitudes, and beliefs, as well as a cohesive group identity. While people clearly acquire skills and understanding as they mature, these theorists assert that youthful values and behaviours give rise to enduring generational traits and work patterns. Based largely on their own life experiences, single-case examples, and well known age stereotypes, popular theorists contend what they say are accurate descriptions of the different generations (Blythe et al., 2008).

According to Blauth, McDaniel, Perrin and Perrin (2011), there are four generations: (i) The Traditional Generation” (1925–1945) shaped by the Great Depression and World
War II. However, members of this generation are rare to come by since most have retired from active service or died. This generation is conservative and rule-oriented, prefers consistent top-down management and long-term employment, is loyal and self-sacrificing, values family and patriotism, and is respectful of authority and extremely loyal to employers.

(ii) The Baby-Boom Generation" (1946–1964) shaped by prosperity, 1960s youth culture, and the Vietnam War. This group according to Fajana (2009), tends to be idealistic, optimistic and driven, consists of diligent workers, value organisational power, is filled with excellent mentors, had access to mainframe computers, seek pragmatic solutions to problems, and when faced with challenges in an academic or work pursuit, they are likely to remain stuck to it.

(iii) Generation X (1964 -1980), shaped by dual-career and single-parent households, and by organisational change due to globalization and technology. This generation, according Blauth, McDaniel, Perrin, and Perrin (2011), is pessimistic and individualistic, is comfortable with change and diversity, but rarely remains loyal to a company, is independent and self-sufficient, is likely to search for more challenging work and better pay, bends the rules to get things done, is skeptical of authority and values personal and professional lives equally.

(iv) Generation Y or Millennial Children (1981- 1999), shaped by the personal computer, economic expansion, and the uncertainty. This group has the advantage of great advances in science and technology. They are comfortable with change and view job
security as unimportant, are self-centred and narcissistic, inherently social, value input into decisions and actions, have high expectations, high need for praise, demand creative opportunities, are job hoppers, abhor ethics scandals, prefer casual dress, and favour inclusive management (Lowe, Levitt, and Wilson, 2008). This generation, according to Fajana (2009) is the offspring of the baby boomers.

Generation Y, according to Cascio (2006), has grown amid sophisticated technologies and has been exposed to them earlier than members of Generation X ever were. The three generations most represented in the workplace today according to McShane and Von Glinow (2000) are baby boomers, Generation X, and Generation Y. Even though, each of these three generations most prevalent in businesses brings value to their chosen professions and environment, their members, however also value different things at work, which is important for managers to understand. For instance, due to their large numbers in the society, the baby boomers are able to make an impact in the societies in which they lived (Glass, 2007) and they perceive work and personal sacrifice as equal to financial success. These values, according to Glass (2007), greatly contrast those of Generation X, whose members are often more skeptical, less loyal, and fiercely independent.

Similarly, Rhodes (1983) reported that older workers were more committed to their organizations than younger workers. Although this study did not specify the generational groups, this research suggests a positive relationship between increased employee’s age and greater organisational commitment, indicating that younger Generation X employees may be less committed than their older counterparts, but they are more
concerned about work/life balance which is not the main concern of boomers. Furthermore, the Generation Y group is the most confident generation and they are the most wanted generation now in workplaces (Glass, 2007).

Looking at the manager-employee age differences, Vecchio (1993) found that employees who are older than their manager report better relations with the manager and evaluate him/her more favourably. On the other hand, Smith and Harrington (1994) suggested that the relationship between younger managers and older employees may be problematic because of age-based beliefs and stereotypes, thus affecting the way work is done and the commitment level of employees.

2.3.1.1. Antecedents and outcomes of age differences/diversity
A thorough literature review indicates that very little research examined the antecedents of age differences in the workplace. Unlike race or gender diversity, organisations rarely undertake initiatives to increase age diversity. According to Shore, Chung-Herrera, Dean, Ehrhart, Jung, Randel and Singh (2009), traditionally age distribution within an organisational structure (younger employees are at the bottom and older employees in the middle and top levels) was derived from hiring employees at a young age and retaining them through most of their working lives. Such distributions were based on societal expectations of orderly career progress, similarly aged work groups and appropriate age differences between employees and managers.

Presently, these traditional ideas or traditions have been eliminated due to the increased competition and expansion of the global economy, thus organisations have now become flatter and leaner. These environmental forces have undermined
traditional career paths and associated age norms in organisations, contributing to more potential for age diversity effects. According to Shore, Chung-Herrera, Dean, Ehrhart, Jung, Randel and Singh (2009), the other societal trend that relate to age composition in organisations is the impending retirement of the baby boom generation which is increasingly a cause for concern that the loss of more baby boomers will lead to a critical labour shortage in the long run. Thus organisational leaders are beginning to focus on the retention of older workers. According to Armstrong-Stassens and Templer (2005) however, there does not seem to be much evidence that organisations are proactively addressing this issue. At the same time though, there has been a recent trend of these baby boomers coming out of their retirement, and this trend represents an additional complicating factor in understanding age-related diversity in organisations.

Much of the research on age has focused mainly on outcomes such as selection, performance appraisal, training and development and lastly career opportunities. For selection, Finkelstein, Kulas and Dages (2003) suggest that when older and younger applicants are in the same applicant pool, younger applicants are preferred over older applicants. On the same note, while age is not associated with lower performance ratings, there is evidence that employees who are older than the norm for their career stage receive lower performance ratings as do employees who are older than their work group (Avolio, Waldman & McDaniel, 1990; Lawrence, 1988; Cleveland & Shore, 1992). Furthermore, Rupp, Vodanovich and Crede (2006) state that older employees receive more severe consequences for poor performance than their younger counterparts.
Based on the above literature, it is evident that research on age differences is much less developed than that on race and gender, hence this study of the possible effect of age differences between manager and employee on organisational commitment.

2.3.2. Gender differences

According to Weiten (2001), gender refers to culturally constructed distinctions between femininity and masculinity. Individuals are born female or male. However they become feminine or masculine through complex developmental processes that take years to unfold. Gender differences are disparities between the sexes in typical behaviour or average ability. Gender differences concern the way in which relations between women and men are socially constructed. Men and women play different roles in society, with their gender differences shaped by ideological, historical, religious, ethnic, economic and cultural determinants (Moser, 1993). According to Green, Anderson and Shivers (1996), gender differences have a significant effect on manager and employee relations especially when the manager and the subordinate are of different genders. Some people prefer to be managed by a male and others by a female based on who they believe to be a better manager.

2.4. Organisational commitment

Over the years organisational commitment has been conceptualized and measured in various ways. The lack of consensus in the definition of organisational commitment has contributed greatly to its treatment as a multidimensional construct (Meyer & Allen, 1991). To better understand what organisational commitment is all about, one has to look at the commonality of the following different existing conceptualizations:
According to Becker (1960), organisational commitment has to do with the side-bets the individual has with an organisation. The term side-bets refer to the accumulation of investments valued by the individual (Becker, 1960).

Mowday, Steers, and Porter (1979: 226) and Porter, Steers, Mowday and Boulian, (1974: 604) defined organisational commitment as “the relative strength of an individual’s identification with, and involvement in the particular organisation”. Conceptually, it can be characterized by at least three factors: (a) a strong belief in and acceptance of the organization’s goals and values; (b) a willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization; and (c) a strong desire to maintain membership in the organization” (Mowday et al., 1979:226). With the advent of Mowday, Porter and Steers (1982) theory, the focus of commitment shifted from tangible side-bets to the psychological attachment one had to the organization.

O’Reilly and Chatman (1986:493) defined commitment as “the psychological attachment felt by a person for the organization, reflecting the degree to which the individual internalizes or adopts the characteristics or perspectives of the organization”. They argued that one’s psychological attachment may be predicted by three independent factors: (a) Compliance or instrumental involvement with specific, extrinsic rewards, (b) Identification or involvement based on a desire for affiliation, and (c) Internalization or involvement predicated on the congruence between individual and organizational values. Conceptually, O’Reilly and Chatman (1986) made a clear distinction between two processes of commitment, the instrumental exchange and the psychological attachment. According to Allen and Meyer (1990:14) organisational commitment is defined as “a psychological state that binds the individual to the organisation”
According to Stewart, Bing, Gruys and Helfod (2007), organizational commitment has attracted considerable attention as an attempt to understand the intensity and stability of employee dedication to work organizations. Even though the concept of organisational commitment has received so much attention, however, there have only been two quite different definitions of organisational commitment that have been popular in the empirical literature; one provided by Mowday, Porter, and Steers, 1982; Porter, Steers, Mowday and Boulian, 1974 and the other by Becker (1960). Meyer and Allen (1984) and Allen & Meyer (1990) used the terms affective and continuance commitment respectively to characterize Porter et al. (1974) and Becker’s (1960) discrepant views of the construct.

Based on Porter et al.’s (1974) and Becker’s (1960) definition, Allen and Meyer (1990) described employees with a strong affective commitment as employees who remain with the organization because they want to and they identify with the organisation and are therefore, committed to maintaining membership of the organisation in order to pursue organizational goals. Employees with strong continuance commitment are those individuals that remain with the organisation because they need to do so and are bound to the organization through extraneous interests such as pensions, benefits, seniority and the cost of leaving the organisation rather than through a favorable affective connection with the organization.
2.4.1. The three-component model developed by Meyer and Allen

According to Meyer and Allen (1991), organisational commitment reflects three parts or types of commitment, namely affective, continuance and normative commitment hence it is called the three-component model of organisational commitment as shown in Figure 2.1. Each of these components will be subsequently discussed.

![Diagram of the three-component model of organisational commitment](image)

**Figure 2.1:** Meyer and Allen's (1991) three-component Organisational commitment (Adapted from Greenberg 2011: 232)

2.4.1.1. Affective commitment

Affective commitment refers to the strength of people’s desire to continue working for an organisation because they regard it positively and agree with its underlying goals and values (Greenberg, 2011). According to Allen and Meyer (1990) and Lee, Allen, Meyer and Rhee (2001), affective commitment refers to an employee continuing to work for an organisation because of the employee’s emotional attachment to, involvement in, and identification with that organisation.
Greenberg and Baron (2010) states that employees feeling a high degree of affective commitment desire to remain with their organisations because they endorse what the organisation stands for and are interested in supporting their missions. This means that employees with a strong affective commitment stay with the organisation because they want to (Meyer, Allen & Smith, 1993).

According to Wasti (2003), the majority of research done on commitment has focused mainly on the affective commitment perspective because it has the strongest and most consistent relationship with advantageous outcomes that all organisations strive for.

2.4.1.2. Continuance commitment

Continuance commitment refers to the strength of a person’s desire to remain working for an organisation due to the belief that it will be costly to leave (Greenberg; 2011). In short, the longer people remain in their organisations, the more they stand to lose what they have invested in them over the years in terms of retirement plans, and close friendships, to say the least. Many employees are committed to staying on their jobs simply because they are unwilling to risk losing these things. They also may be unwilling to forego any job security they might have based on their seniority in their current organisation (Greenberg & Baron, 2010).

Furthermore, Meyer and Allen (1997) explained that employees with continuance commitment are those that have non-transferable investment with their organisation and they often do not leave their organization easily, because they share continuance commitment with their employer. Thus, if an employee primarily exhibits this form of
commitment, then they stay with their organisation because they feel like they have to since leaving would cost too much (Meyer et al., 1993).

2.4.1.3. Normative commitment

Normative commitment is a partly new facet of organizational commitment which describes employees’ obligation to their workplace or commitment that they have to the organization (Bolon, 1997). According to Greenberg (2011) continuance commitment refers to employees’ feelings of obligation to stay with their organisation because of pressures from others. Employees who have high degrees of normative commitment are concerned greatly about what others would think of them for leaving and they would also be reluctant to disappoint their employers.

2.4.2. Levels of organisational commitment

As individuals are different so are their levels of development as well as their commitment levels in an organisation. According to Reichers (1985), there are three employee commitment levels in an organisation and they may vary from a higher level of organisational commitment to a lower level of commitment and vice versa.

2.4.2.1. Higher level of organisational commitment

Miller (2003, 73) defines higher level of commitment as "identifying with one’s employing organisation". Meaning individuals stay only because they want to. A higher level of commitment is characterised by a strong acceptance of the organisation’s values and commitment to achieving the organisation’s goals and exerting effort to stay with the organisation (Reichers, 1985).
2.4.2.2. Moderate level of organisational commitment

This level is viewed as partial or average commitment as individuals are reasonably committed. The individual stay with the organisation because they ought to as they feel obligated to their employers and the organisation. The moderate level of organisational commitment is characterised by a reasonable acceptance of the goals and values of the organisation they work for and they are also willing to exert some effort in order to stay with the organisation (Reichers, 1985).

2.4.2.3. Lower level of organisational commitment

Employees with a lower level of commitment are not committed to the values and goals of the organisation they are working for; they stay with the organisation because they need to as they are aware of the cost of leaving that organisation, and given an option they will leave the organisation. Employees in this level lack acceptance of the goals and values of the organisation and they are not willing in any way to exert any effort to stay with the organisation (Reichers, 1985).

2.4.3. The importance of having committed employees in an organisation

Greenberg and Baron (2010) believe that having employees with a high level of commitment has a positive effect on the organisation as a whole because they are less likely to resign or be absent from that organisation. On the other hand, when employees have an extremely low level of commitment, they are more likely not to arrive for work when they are supposed to, nor to retain their jobs.

Committed employees contribute positively to the organisation and show higher performance and productivity than less committed employees. They take greater effort
to perform and invest their resources into the organisation which results in a stable and capable workforce with the ultimate aim of engaging in and improving performance. Overall organisations with committed employees achieve more thus reach their goals (Morrow, 1993).

2.5. The impact of age and gender differences on organisational commitment

While researchers have long studied how age and gender affect organisational commitment and employment outcomes, very few have directly examined the effects of gender and age differences between managers and employees (Tsui & O’Reilly, 1989). The paragraphs below therefore refer mainly to age and gender differences among employees rather than between managers and employees. Such literature is examined here because it clearly has implications relating to the differences between managers and employees. The psychology of interpersonal liking and disliking also suggests that similar people tend to like each other more than dissimilar people do (Smith & Mackie, 2007).

2.5.1. The impact of age differences on organisational commitment

According to Dunham, Grube and Castaneda (1994) there is a significant relationship between organisational commitment and age differences. Similarly, researchers like Cramer, 1993; Loscocco, 1990; Luthans, 1992; Mowday, Porter and Steers, 1982; Sekaran; 2000; support the findings that the relationship between organisational commitment and age differences is significant. Some theorists postulate that, as individual’s age, alternative employment opportunities become limited, thereby making their current jobs more attractive. This helps them stay with the organisation they currently work for (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Mowday et al., 1982).
Other theorists though hypothesise that older individuals may be more committed to their organisations because they have a stronger investment and a greater history with the organisation than do younger employees (Harrison & Hubbard, 1998; Kacmar, Carlson, & Brymer, 1999). Therefore, younger employees are generally likely to be more mobile and have lower psychological investments in the organisation; thus their commitment level to the organisation may be lower as well while older employees are less willing to sacrifice the benefits and idiosyncratic credits that are associated with seniority in the organisation (Hellman, 1997). This, on its own, may increase the older employees’ level of commitment to the organisation.

2.5.2. The impact of gender differences on organisational commitment

The literature on the relationship between gender differences and organizational commitment has had mixed results. There are authors who suggest that women are less committed to their work than men (Karrasch, 2003; Schwartz, 1989; Yammarino & Dubinsky, 1988). Most of these contentions are rooted in the idea that women, as a result of their socialization, place greater emphasis on family roles than men (Dodd-McCue & Wright, 1996; Jensen, Christensen & Wilson, 1985; Loscocco, 1990). This in turn may result in women placing less importance on their work roles which may affect their commitment level to any organisation. This assertion also suggests that women establish their identity through their interdependent, nurturing relations with others, whereas men’s socialization process leads them to identify themselves as independent, assertive, and goal directed individuals (Cook, 1993). In support of this assertion, Aranya, Kushnir and Valency (1986); Graddick and Farr (1983) base their evidence in the accounting profession and in professional associations where women are said to be less affectively committed than men.
Researchers who are focused on the continuance component of organisational commitment, however, have often argued that women are more committed to organisations than men because they must overcome more obstacles in order to gain employment and have less inter-organisational mobility than men (Grusky, 1966; Hrebiniak & Alutto, 1972; Angle & Perry, 1981). This perspective is complemented by studies showing that workers who perceive limited employment options and higher costs associated with establishing their organisational membership display greater continuance commitment (Angle & Perry, 1981; McGee & Ford, 1987; O'Reilly & Caldwell, 1981; Grusky, 1966; Aven, Parker & McEvoy, 1993). A study by Wahn (1998) is a good example of studies supporting this theoretical perspective regarding gender differences in continuance commitment. In this study, women were found to be higher in continuance commitment than men.

Furthermore, several meta-analyses on organisational commitment have helped to clarify the theoretical and empirical controversy relating to gender differences in organisational commitment. According to Mathieu and Zajac’s (1990), meta-analysis of the antecedents, correlates and consequences of organizational commitment revealed that women are more organisationally committed than men, even though the difference was small. Additionally, they did not find a difference in the strength of the gender-commitment relationship across commitment types (i.e., affective and continuance commitment). In another meta-analysis done by Aven et al. (1993) there were no gender differences in affective commitment and these authors also stated that they were unable to address the effect of gender on continuance commitment because the
published research focused almost exclusively on affective commitment. However, their
meta-analysis included six studies that used the Hrebinik and Alutto (1972)
commitment instrument, which purportedly measures an employee’s calculative (i.e.,
continuance) involvement with an organisation (Stewart, Bing, Gruys & Hefort, 2007).

Meyer and Allen (1997) asserted that personal characteristics such as gender and age
differences would predict organisational commitment and that prior empirical studies
reported differences in organisational commitment between males and females. To be
more explicit, based on studies that examined gender differences in organisational
commitment, women show lower levels of organisational commitment than men
(Aranya, Kushnir & Valency, 1986). Also some researchers claimed that females are
more obligated to their organisation (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990). Marsden, Kalleberg and
Cook (1993) asserted that men and women present similar levels of organisational
commitment if they work under equivalent working conditions, while research by Dodd-
McCue and Wright (1996) suggests that men are more committed to their organisations.

Furthermore research done by Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch, and Topolnytsky, (2002)
and Riketta (2005) found that there were no gender differences in organizational
commitment. Seven additional studies found that even when there was a mean
difference in organisational commitment between men and women, there was no
gender effect when predicting organizational commitment (i.e., via multiple regression)
when control variables such as age, job level, educational level, job and organizational
tenure were included in the analyses (e.g., Abdulla & Shaw, 1999; Van der Velde,
Bossink, & Jansen, 2003; Ngo & Tsang, 1998). This suggests that certain
characteristics that might be correlated with gender (for instance job level as women are more likely to have lower level jobs) may explain the difference in organizational commitment more so than gender itself.

2.5. Summary

This chapter has provided an overview of the findings of previous research relating to the topic of this investigation. It has shown that previous research has had mixed findings and has not always carefully distinguished between the different types of organisational commitment (affective, continuance and normative commitment). The present study therefore sought to investigate the topic further and to distinguish between the types of organisational commitment. The next chapter describes the research methodology followed in the study.
Chapter 3: Research Methodology

3.1. Introduction

The previous chapter explored the literature relating to relationships among the variables; age, gender differences and organisational commitment. This chapter focuses on the research methodology employed in this study. Research methodology focuses on research design, the population of the study, the sample and sampling method, the research instruments, data collection, and data analysis.

3.2. Research design

Research design refers to the plans that guide “the arrangement of conditions for collection and analysis of data in a manner that aims to combine relevance to the research purpose with economy in procedure” (Terre Blanche & Durrhein, 1999: 52). It is the design and planned nature of observations that distinguishes research from any other forms of observation. Design decisions in the present study will be made according to principles of coherence and validity. The research design to be used for the proposed research will be quantitative research. Quantitative research can be defined as “a formal, objective, systematic process in which numerical data are utilised to obtain information” (Babbie & Mouton, 2006). The quantitative research will be in the form of a non-experimental field survey.

3.3. Population of the study

Bless and Higson-Smith (2006) state that a population is the complete set of events, people or things to which the research findings are to be applied. The population entails the specification of the survey group which will be studied. In the present study the target population is all line-workers in Buffalo City Metropolitan Area. The population
size for the factories is approximately 1000 male and female full-time lower-level employees.

3.4. Sample and sampling procedures

Sampling is the process of selecting observations (Babbie & Mouton; 2006). A sample is the individuals included in the study (Nesbary, 2000). In the present study, the sample was selected from Johnson & Johnson (Pty) Ltd, FloorWorx Africa (Pty) Ltd, Independent concrete supplies (Pty) Ltd, Nestle, Belly Sweets, Meyer Motors and Motorland factories in Buffalo City Metropolitan Area. The representative sample size of the study was \( n = 100 \). According to Patten (2004) the quality of the sample affects the quality of the research generalizations. Nesbary (2000) suggests the larger the sample size, the greater the probability the sample will reflect the general population. A small, but carefully chosen sample however can be as representative as, or more representative than a larger but carelessly chosen sample (Walonick, 2003). The Raosoft sample size calculator was used to calculate the recommended sample size and this was determined by using a 5% margin of error; 95% confidence level and 50% response distribution. Using a population size of 1000, the recommended minimum sample size obtained was 278 and because of time and expense constrains, the sample size of 278 was not used but a 10% of the sample of the population was used, which makes it fairly large. Patten (2004), states that lack of bias is the main criterion when evaluating the adequacy of a sample. Patten (2004) also identifies an unbiased sample as one in which every member of a population has an equal opportunity of being selected into the sample.
Therefore, an interval or systematic random sampling was used in the proposed study to help ensure the selection of an unbiased sample. To obtain an interval or systematic random sample, employees were selected at equal intervals, starting with a randomly selected employee on the population list. The population list was obtained from the Human Resource Department of each of the factories concerned. In selecting 100 sample size out of a population of 1000, the length $k$ of the intervals was determined by the following ratio.

$$k = \frac{\text{Size of population}}{\text{Size of sample}}$$

$$k = \frac{N}{n}$$

$$k = \frac{1000}{100} = 10$$

As $k = 10$, every tenth unit was selected for the sample till the sample size of 100 was reached. Below is the description of the sample of this study.
3.4.1. Descriptive statistics on demographic variables

3.4.1.1. Age

The mode of the distribution is 44%, (n = 44) in the age group 26-35 years, while 23% (n=23) are in the age group 36-45 years. Seventeen respondents (17%) fall in the age category 18-25 years, fourteen respondents (14%) fall in the age category 46-55 years, and a further 2% (n = 2) of the respondents are in the age group of 56-65 years old.

Figure 3.1: Age distribution of respondents
Figure 3.2 shows the ages of immediate supervisors in the study. The majority of the supervisors (69 % or n=69) were older than their subordinates, while 21% (21 supervisors) of them were younger than their subordinates. Lastly 10% (n=10) of the supervisors were of the same age group with their subordinates.
3.4.1.2. Gender

Figure 3.3: Gender distributions of respondents

Figure 3.3 depicts the gender of respondents. The majority of the respondents (54%, n=54) are male employees, while female employees comprised 46% of the respondents (n = 46).

Figure 3.4: Gender distributions of supervisors

Figure 3.4 shows the gender distribution of supervisors. Male supervisors comprised 52% (n=52) of the respondents, while female supervisors comprised 48% (n = 48).
Figure 3.4 presents the gender distribution of the supervisors. The sample was representative of a larger number of male supervisors to that of female supervisors. Male supervisors comprised of 52% (n = 52) compared to 48% (n = 48) female supervisors.

3.4.1.3. Marital status

Figure 3.5 illustrates that of the 100 respondents who participated, 50 (50%) are married, thirty-six (36%) are single, six (6%) are divorced, 5 (5%) are widowed and three (3%) are separated.
3.4.1.4. Highest educational qualification

Figure 3.6 illustrates the education level of the sample. The graph shows modal number of the respondents, 38% (n = 38) has an educational level of Grade 12, whilst 27% (n = 27) have a diploma educational level. Thirteen respondents (13%) have a degree and 5% (n = 5) have a Grade 9 education level. Four respondents (4%) have a Grade 10 education level and another four respondents (4%) have an honours degree. Three respondents (3%) have a B.Tech qualification, and 14% respondents have under grade 12 educational qualification.
3.4.1.5. Home language

Figure 3.7: Home language of respondent’s distribution

Figure 3.7 shows that the modal number of the respondents 33% (n=33) have English as their home language, 32% (n=32) have Xhosa as their home language, 26% (n=26) have Afrikaans their home language while 7% (n=7) have Zulu as their home language. One respondent (1%) has Sotho as his or her home language and another one respondents (1%) has Ndebele as his or her home language.
3.4.1.6. Company

Figure 3.8: Distribution of respondents according to their employing companies

Figure 3.8 show the different organisations the respondents work for. The modal number of the employees in this study (30% or n=30) works at Johnson and Johnson Company, 30% (n=30) of the respondents work at FloorWorx while 24% (n=24) work at Nestle. Seven respondents (7%) work at Motorland, 4 % (n=4) of the respondents work at independent concrete and another 4% (n=4) work at Meyer Motors. Three respondents (3%) work at Belly Sweets.
Figure 3.9: Distribution of respondents according to the departments in which they are employed.

Figure 3.9 show the different departments the respondents work in. The modal number of the employees (27%, n=27) works in the production department while 26% (n=26) of respondents works in the sales department. 9% (n=9) of the respondents works in the packaging department, 8% (n=8) works in the human resource department, 7% (n=7) in the logistics department, 5% (n=5) in finished goods department, 4% (n=4) in the distribution department and 3% (n=3) in the quality assurance department. Two respondents (2%) work in the factory operations department, 2% in the procurement,
2% in each of the call centre, flooring and marketing departments, and one respondent (1%) work in the drug room department.

3.4.1.8. Job title

![Graph showing distribution of respondents by job titles]

Figure 3.10: Distribution of respondents by job titles

Figure 3.10 shows the job titles held by respondents. Twenty-one percent ($n = 21$) of the respondents were sales representatives, 19% ($n = 19$) logistics operatives, 17% ($n = 17$) production, 8% ($n = 8$) packaging operatives, 7% ($n = 7$) labourers, 7% ($n = 18$)
personnel officers, 7% (n = 11) coordinators, 5% (n = 5) departmental trainers, 4% (n = 4) lab technician, 3% (n=3) trainee, 2% (n=2) stock controllers, 2% (n=2) reception, 2% (n=2) overseer, 2% (n=2) tellers and 1% (n=1) IT specialists.

3.4.1.9. Period of employment

Figure 3.11: Distribution of the respondents by their respective organisation

Figure 3.11 shows the number of years spent by the respondents in their respective organisations. It can be seen that the modal number of the respondents (n = 39 or 39%) falls in the 1-5 years’ service group and 29 respondents (29%) fall in the less than a year service group. Seventeen respondents (17%) fall in the 6-10 years’ service group while 4 respondents (4%) fall in the 16-20 years’ service group. The smallest number of respondents (n = 3 or 3%) falls in the 21-25 years’ service group another 3% (n=3) in the 11-15 years and yet another 3% (n=3) in the 26-30 year group. One respondent
(1%) falls in the 31-35 years service group and the last one respondent (1%) (n=1) falls in the 36-40 years service group.

![Years on the Present Position](image)

**Figure 3.12: Distribution of respondents by their number of years on the present position**

Figure 3.12 shows the number of years that the respondents have served at their current position. The modal number of the employees (46% or n=46) have been in their positions for 1-5 years, 31% (n=31) have been working for less than a year in their present positions while 17% (n=17) have worked for 6-10 years at present posts. Four respondents (4%) have worked for 11-15 years and 2% (n=20) have worked for 16-20 years in their present positions.
3.5. Data collection

3.5.1 Research Instrument

The data collection instrument used to collect data from the respondents is a questionnaire. As defined by Hair, BlackBabin, Anderson, and Tatham, (2006), a questionnaire is a document consisting of a set of questions and scales to gather primary data. Leung (2001) defines a questionnaire as a booklet of standardized procedure, pre-coded and containing both closed-ended and open-ended questions; or it can be regarded as a data collection instrument that sets out questions to be asked in a formal way in order to extract desired information.

The questionnaire used to collect data was divided into two parts. The first part of the questionnaire elicited the biographical and occupational details of the respondents. This part of the questionnaire was developed by the researcher in order to gain biographical information including age and gender differences between the respondents and their managers (i.e. their immediate supervisors). To measure organisational commitment, the second part of the questionnaire was used. It consists of the Meyer and Allen's (1997) Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ).

Meyer and Allen (1984) initially proposed making distinctions between two types of commitment: affective commitment and continuance commitment. Affective commitment denoted a sense of belonging and emotional attachment to the organization, whereas, continuance commitment emphasized the perceived costs of leaving the organization. Allen and Meyer (1990) subsequently introduced a third component of commitment, normative commitment, which reflected the perceived obligation to remain with the
organization. Later, Meyer, Allen, and Smith (1993) revised the normative commitment scale to clarify the distinction between affective commitment and normative commitment.

While the earlier versions (Meyer and Allen, 1984, 1991; Allen & Meyer, 1990) of the OCQ contained 24 items (eight items for each scale), the later version by Meyer and Allen (1997) only contained 18 items (six items for each scale) and was the one used in the present study. Responses to each of the 18 items are rated using a 5-point Likert scale with anchors labelled: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neither agree nor disagree, 4 = agree, 5 = strongly agree. According to Meyer and Allen (1997) the Cronbach alpha coefficients of the OCQ are .85 for affective commitment, .79 for continuance commitment, and .73 for normative commitment.

The questionnaires were accompanied by a covering letter explaining the purpose of the study and giving assurance of anonymity and confidentiality. The identity of all the respondents was thus protected to ensure reliable responses.

3.5.2 Questionnaire Administration and Response Rate

After receiving approval from the Research Committee at the University of Fort Hare for the commencement of the study, the researcher approached the Human Resource Departments of various factories in the Buffalo City Metropolitan area, Eastern Cape South Africa to request permission to conduct the study at those companies. Permission was obtained from different factories where the study was to be conducted. The recommended minimum sample size to be considered was 100 lower-level employees; however one hundred and twenty-five (125) questionnaires were distributed by the
researcher to selected factories’ Human Resource departments. The researcher asked the each of the factories Human Resource department personnel to distribute the questionnaires to every 10th lower-level employee in their employment list.

The researcher went back to the different organisations after two weeks to collect the questionnaires. In the 125 questionnaires sent out, 100 were returned, fully completed; thus there were no illegible and unusable questionnaires, giving a response rate of 80%.

3.6. Data analysis

The collating, coding and processing of data forms an integral part of data analysis. In quantitative research, data analysis is the conversion of meaningless data into valuable information that can be easily understood, it involves the reduction of accumulated data to a manageable size, developing summaries, looking for patterns and applying statistical techniques. It also includes the interpretation of research findings in the light of the research questions and determines if the results are consistent with the research hypotheses and theory (Cooper & Schindler, 2003).

As the research at hand is quantitative in nature, the data was analyzed initially using descriptive statistical analysis. Descriptive analysis provides a very useful initial examination of data and a means of presenting data in a transparent manner with tables and graphs, using the most fundamental techniques and the construction of frequency distributions or measures of variability. The data was coded in a spreadsheet (Microsoft Excel) to make it possible to collate and analyze the data using the computer software programme, SPSS version 10.0. The relationship between the variables was analysed
using mainly analysis of variance (ANOVA) and the t-test. The researcher also used Cronbach’s Coefficient Alpha to assess the reliability of the measuring instruments. After analysis of the gathered data, the results were then interpreted in order to provide an answer to the research question by indicating whether or not the hypotheses of the study are true.

3.6.1 The Data Analysis Process

The data analysis process began with editing and coding of the data. The process entailed checking of questionnaires for omissions, legibility and consistency in classification as well as discarding of questionnaires with missing data, identifying potential errors in data collection and discussing its implications. The coding of data involved assigning numbers to similar sets of data for data capturing purposes.

Thereafter, the data was recorded into Ms Excel spread sheets. The researcher together with a statistics expert from the University of Fort Hare Statistics Department ran the statistical processes for this study. The SPSS package was used to compile descriptive and inferential statistics. The latter took the form of analysis of variance (ANOVA) and t-tests when hypotheses were tested.

In this study, a data analysis process outlined by Cooper and Schindler (2008) was adopted. The process is diagrammatically illustrated in Figure 3.13:
3.7. Ethical considerations

In the spirit of humanity, research and the pursuit of knowledge should never take precedence over participants' personal, social and cultural values. Research should avoid posing a threat to people’s physical, mental and emotional health (Barbie & Mouton; 2006). Thus, in conducting the proposed research, due care was taken by the researcher regarding ethics. This involved following a number of ethical practices such as: informing all participants regarding the study (i.e. its purpose, duration, sites, etc.) and obtaining the consent of participants that is fully informed and voluntary (Gregory, 2003). However, voluntary participation can sometimes conflict with the need to have a high response rate. Low return rates can introduce response bias (Patten, 2004). In order to ensure a high response rate, the researcher engaged in multiple contacts with the respondents.
The researcher also avoided possible harm to participants’ physical, mental and emotional health. This could include embarrassment or feeling uncomfortable about questions. A further ethical guide was to protect a respondents’ identity. This was accomplished by exercising anonymity and confidentiality. A survey is anonymous when a respondent cannot be identified on the basis of a response. A survey is confidential when a response can be identified with a subject, but the researcher promises not to disclose the individual’s identity (Patten, 2004). Fourthly, the researcher accepted accountability for her research actions and consequences and made sure that there was transparency of research methods to allow for reliability.

3.8. Conclusion

This chapter has examined research methodology touching on the research design; research instrument; the sampling method used; the sampling technique, data collection, data analysis, and ethical considerations. The following chapter reports the findings of the study in terms of the reliability of some of the measuring instruments and in relation to the hypotheses of the study.
Chapter 4: Results

4.1. Introduction

The previous chapter described the research method used in this study. This chapter serves to present the results of the study. The chapter first presents the results relating to the internal consistency of some of the measuring scales before it then presents the results relating to the hypotheses of the study.

4.2. Internal consistency

The Cronbach Alpha Coefficient was used to determine the reliability of each component of organisational commitment (affective commitment, continuance commitment and normative commitment), and overall organizational commitment. The Cronbach Alpha Coefficient determines the inter-item correlation among the items measuring the construct. As illustrated in Table 4.1, the Cronbach Alpha Coefficient for affective commitment was 0.78; for continuance commitment it was 0.76; for normative commitment it was 0.73, and for overall organizational commitment it was 0.78. As the Cronbach Alpha Coefficient in this study is within the acceptable range, the measuring instruments are therefore deemed to have adequate reliability and construct validity for use in the study.
Table 4.1: Cronbach Alpha Coefficient for affective commitment, continuance commitment, normative commitment and overall organisational commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Cronbach Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affective Commitment</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuance Commitment</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative Commitment</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Organisation Commitment</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3. Results in relation to the hypotheses

The project sought to test the hypotheses of the study which for ease of reference, are repeated below together with the pertinent results.

4.3.1. Similarity hypotheses

Hypothesis 1

H₀: Male employees supervised by a male manager do not have a significant difference in the level of organisational commitment than male employees supervised by a female manager.

H₁: Male employees supervised by a male manager have a significant difference in the level of organisational commitment than male employees supervised by a female manager.
Table 4.2: Mean and Standard Deviation results for male employees supervised by male managers and male employees supervised by female managers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Supervisor gender</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affective Commitment</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>17.91</td>
<td>1.147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18.55</td>
<td>2.259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuance Commitment</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12.63</td>
<td>2.414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25.15</td>
<td>2.434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative Commitment</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>23.09</td>
<td>2.894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.30</td>
<td>.470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Organisational Commitment</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>53.63</td>
<td>6.455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>5.163</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A. Affective Commitment

Table 4.3: Affective commitment t-test for male employees supervised by male managers and male employees supervised by female managers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average score</th>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>78.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>-2.032</td>
<td>19.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results in Tables 4.2 and 4.3 show that there were 34 male employees supervised by male supervisors with an affective commitment mean score of 17.91 and a standard deviation of 1.15. There were also 20 male employees supervised by female supervisors and they had an affective commitment mean score of 18.55 and a standard deviation of 18.55. The results show that there was a significant difference on the level of affective commitment between male employees supervised by male managers and those male employees supervised by female managers \((t= -2.668; \text{df}=52; \ p<0.01)\). Therefore from the result, we fail to reject the null hypothesis and the alternative hypothesis rejected. Male employees supervised by a male manager do not have a higher level of affective commitment than male employees supervised by a female manager. Instead, the exact reverse applies.
B. Continuance Commitment

Table 4.4: Continuance commitment t-test for male employees supervised by male managers and male employees supervised by female managers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average score</th>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>7.680</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>-39.000</td>
<td>19.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results in Table 4.2 and 4.4 show that there were 34 male employees supervised by male supervisors with a continuance commitment mean score of 12.63 and a standard deviation of 2.26. There were also 20 male employees supervised by female supervisors and they had a continuance commitment mean score of 25.15 and a standard deviation of 2.43. The results show that there is a significant difference in the level of continuance commitment. Male employees supervised by male managers have a significantly lower level of continuance commitment than those supervised by female managers (t= -39.000; df=19; p<=0.00). Therefore from the result we fail to reject the null hypothesis. Male employees supervised by a male manager do not have a higher level of continuance commitment than male employees supervised by a female manager. Instead, the exact reverse is true.
C. Normative Commitment

Table 4.5: Normative commitment t-test for male employees supervised by male managers and male employees supervised by female managers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average score</th>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>5.478</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>47.393</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results in Tables 4.2 and 4.5 show that there were 34 male employees supervised by male supervisors with a normative commitment mean score of 23.09 and a standard deviation of 2.89. There were also 20 male employees supervised by female supervisors and they had a normative commitment mean score of 10.3 and a standard deviation of 0.47. The results show that there is a significant difference in the level of normative commitment between male employees supervised by a male manager and male employees supervised by a female manager (t= 47.393; df=33; p<=0.000). Therefore from the result, the alternative hypothesis is accepted and the null hypothesis rejected. Male employees supervised by a male manager have a higher level of normative commitment than male employees supervised by a female manager.
D. Overall Organisational Commitment

Table 4.6: Overall organisational commitment t-test for male employees supervised by male managers and male employees supervised by female managers

Independent Samples Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average score</th>
<th>Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>7.680</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>19.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results in Tables 4.2 and 4.6 show that there were 34 male employees supervised by male supervisors with an overall organisational commitment mean score of 53.63 and a standard deviation of 6.46. There were also 20 male employees supervised by female supervisors and they had an overall organisational commitment mean score of 54.00 and a standard deviation of 5.16. The results show that there is no significant difference in the level of overall organisational commitment between male employees supervised by a male manager and male employees supervised by a female manager (t= 1.313; df=52; p<=0.330). Therefore from the results, we fail to reject the null hypothesis. Male employees supervised by a male manager do not have a higher level of overall organisational commitment than male employees supervised by a female manager.
Hypothesis 2

H₀: Female employees supervised by a female manager do not have a significantly higher level of organisational commitment than female employees supervised by a male manager.

H₁: Female employees supervised by a female manager have a significantly higher level of organisational commitment than female employees supervised by a male manager.

Table 4.7: Mean and Standard Deviation results for female employees supervised by female managers and female employees supervised by male supervisors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Supervisor gender</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affective Commitment</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17.82</td>
<td>1.362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuance Commitment</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>.745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25.67</td>
<td>.485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative Commitment</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23.25</td>
<td>2.533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10.33</td>
<td>.485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Organisational Commitment</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>53.57</td>
<td>4.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2.425</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A. Affective Commitment

Table 4.8: Affective commitment t-test for female employees supervised by female managers and female employees supervised by male managers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Levene’s Test for Variance</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>53.295</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>3.081</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results in Tables 4.7 and 4.8 show that there were 28 female employees supervised by female supervisors with an affective commitment mean score of 19 and a standard deviation of 1.46. There were also 18 female employees supervised by male supervisors and they had an affective commitment mean score of 17.82 and a standard deviation of 1.36. The results show that there is a significant difference in the level of affective commitment. Female employees supervised by a female manager have a significantly higher level of affective commitment than female employees supervised by a male manager (t=3.081; df=20.36; p<=0.006). The null hypothesis is therefore rejected and the alternative hypothesis accepted.
B. Continuance Commitment

Table 4.9: Continuance commitment t-test for female employees supervised by female managers and female employees supervised by male managers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average score</th>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>2.751</td>
<td>.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>4.021</td>
<td>27.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results in 4.7 and 4.9 show that there were 28 female employees supervised by female supervisors with a continuance commitment mean score of 25.67 and a standard deviation of 0.49. There were also 18 female employees supervised by male supervisors and they had a continuance commitment mean score of 12.5 and a standard deviation of 0.75. The results show that there is a significant difference in the level of continuance commitment. Female employees supervised by a female manager have a significantly higher level of continuance commitment than female employees supervised by a male manager (t=4.021; df=27; p<=0.004). The null hypothesis is therefore rejected and the alternative hypothesis accepted.
C. Normative Commitment

Table 4.10: Normative commitment t-test for female employees supervised by female managers and female employees supervised by male managers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average score</th>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>2.751</td>
<td>.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>-27.000</td>
<td>27.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results in Tables 4.7 and 4.10 show that there were 28 female employees supervised by female supervisors with a normative commitment mean score of 10.33 and a standard deviation of 0.49. There were also 18 female employees supervised by male managers and they had a normative commitment mean score of 23.25 and a standard deviation of 2.53. The results show that there is a significant difference in the level of normative commitment. Female employees supervised by female managers have a significantly lower level of normative commitment than female employees supervised by a male manager (t= -21.56; df=44; p<=0.000). Therefore we fail to reject the null hypothesis and reject the alternative hypothesis. The significant difference is in the opposite direction to that hypothesized.
D. Overall Organisational Commitment

Table 4.11: Overall organisational commitment t-test for female employees supervised by female managers and female employees supervised by male managers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Samples Test</th>
<th>Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>2.751</td>
<td>.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results in Tables 4.7 and 4.11 show that there were 28 female employees supervised by female managers with an overall organisational commitment mean score of 55 and a standard deviation of 2.43. There were also 18 female employees supervised by male managers and they had an overall organisational commitment mean score of 53.57 and a standard deviation of 4.64. The results show that there is no significant difference in the level of overall organisational commitment. Female employees supervised by female managers do not have a significantly higher level of overall organisational commitment than female employees supervised by male managers (t= 1.000; df=27; p<=0.326). Therefore we fail to reject the null hypothesis and the alternative hypothesis rejected. Female employees supervised by female managers do not have a higher level of organisational commitment than female employees supervised by male managers.
Hypothesis 3

H$_0$: Employees who have a manager who is the same age as them do not have a significantly higher level of organisational commitment than employees with a manager who is older or younger than them.

H$_1$: Employees who have a manager who is the same age as them have a significantly higher level of organisational commitment than employees with a manager who is older or younger than them.

Table 4.12: Mean and Standard Deviation results for employees supervised by managers who are the same age as them and employees supervised by managers who are younger or older than them

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Supervisor gender</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affective Commitment</strong></td>
<td>Same age</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18.12</td>
<td>1.101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Different age</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>18.07</td>
<td>1.489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Continuance Commitment</strong></td>
<td>Same age</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Different age</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>15.48</td>
<td>5.717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Normative Commitment</strong></td>
<td>Same age</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>6.569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Different age</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>20.19</td>
<td>5.921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Organisational</strong></td>
<td>Same age</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>14.630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>Different age</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>53.75</td>
<td>13.127</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A. Affective Commitment

Table 4.13: Affective commitment t-test for employees supervised by managers who are the same age as them and employees supervised by managers who are younger or older than them

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average score</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results in Tables 4.12 and 4.13 show the number of employees who have a manager who is the same age as them (n=32), and those with older or younger managers (n=68). Employees supervised by managers of the same age as them had an affective commitment mean score of 18.1 and a standard deviation of 1.10, and employees supervised by older or younger managers had an affective commitment mean score of 18.07 and a standard deviation of 1.49. From the results it can be seen that there was no significant difference in affective commitment between employees supervised by same-age managers and those supervised by older or younger managers (t= -0.113; df= 55.47; p<=0.91). Hence, we fail to reject the null hypothesis and reject the alternative hypothesis.
B. Continuance Commitment

Table 4.14: Continuance commitment t-test for employees supervised by managers who are the same age as them and employees supervised by managers who are younger or older than them

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average score</th>
<th>Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances</td>
<td>t-test for Equality of Means</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>7.694</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results in Tables 4.12 and 4.14 show that there are 32 employees who have a manager who is the same age as them and 68 with older or younger managers. Employees supervised by managers of the same age as them had a continuance commitment mean score of 16 with a standard deviation of 6.96 and employees supervised by older or younger managers had a continuance commitment mean score of 15.48 with a standard deviation of 5.72. From the results, it can be seen that there was no significant difference in continuance commitment between employees supervised by same-age managers and those supervised by older or younger managers (t= -1.143; df=65.76; p<=0.26). Hence, we fail to reject the null hypothesis and reject the alternative hypothesis.
C. Normative Commitment

Table 4.15: Normative commitment t-test for employees supervised by managers who are the same age as them and employees supervised by managers who are younger or older than them

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average score</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>3.480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>1.256</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results in Tables 4.12 and 4.15 show that there were 32 employees with a manager who is the same age as them, and 68 with older or younger managers. Employees supervised by managers of the same age as them had a normative commitment mean score of 19.4 and a standard deviation of 6.57, and employees supervised by older or younger managers had a normative commitment mean score of 20.19 and a standard deviation of 5.92. From the results, it can be seen that there was no significant difference in normative commitment between employees supervised by same-age managers and those supervised by older or younger managers (t= 1.235; df=98; p<=0.220). Hence we fail to reject the null hypothesis and reject the alternative hypothesis. Employees who have a manager who is the same age as them do not have a higher level of organisational commitment than employees with a manager who is older or younger than them.
D. Overall Organisational Commitment

Table 4.16: Overall organisational commitment t-test for employees supervised by managers who are the same age as them and employees supervised by managers who are younger or older than them

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>1.194</td>
<td>.277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>-.479</td>
<td>45.224</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results in Tables 4.12 and 4.16 show that there were 32 employees with a manager who is the same age as them, and 68 with older or younger managers. Employees supervised by managers of the same age as them had a mean score of 53.5 and a standard deviation of 14.63 on overall organisational commitment, and employees supervised by older or younger managers had a mean overall organisational commitment score of 53.75 and a standard deviation of 13.13. From the results, it can be seen that there was no significant difference in overall organisational commitment between employees supervised by same-age managers and those supervised by older or younger managers (t= -0.547; df=98; p<=0.586). Hence, we fail to reject the null hypothesis and reject the alternative hypothesis. Employees who have a manager who is the same age as them do not have a higher level of organisational commitment than employees with a manager who is older or younger than them.
4.3.2. Social role or cultural hypotheses

Hypothesis 4

\( H_0 \): Employees managed by a male manager do not have a significantly higher level of organisational commitment than employees managed by a female manager.

\( H_1 \): Employees managed by a male manager have a significantly higher level of organisational commitment than employees managed by a female manager.

Table 4.17: Mean and Standard Deviation results for employees supervised by male managers and employees supervised by female managers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Supervisor gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affective Commitment</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>18.28</td>
<td>1.349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>18.13</td>
<td>1.806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuance Commitment</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>17.06</td>
<td>6.538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>17.77</td>
<td>6.514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative Commitment</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>18.76</td>
<td>6.537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>17.85</td>
<td>6.782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Organisational Commitment</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>14.434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>15.102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A. Affective Commitment

Table 4.18: Affective commitment t-test results for employees supervised by male managers and employees supervised by female managers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average score</th>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>.185</td>
<td>.668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>.436</td>
<td>89.919</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results in Tables 4.17 and 4.18 show that the number of employees managed by male manager is 52, and those managed by female managers are 48 in number. Employees supervised by male managers had an affective commitment mean score of 18.28 and a standard deviation of 1.35 while employees supervised by female managers had an affective commitment mean score of 18.13 and a standard deviation of 1.81. From the results, it can be seen that there was no significant difference in affective commitment between employees supervised by male managers and those supervised by female managers (t=0.440; df=98; p<=0.661). Hence, we fail to reject the null hypothesis and reject the alternative hypothesis. Employees managed by a male manager do not have a higher level of affective commitment than employees managed by a female manager.
B. Continuance Commitment

Table 4.19: Continuance commitment t-test results for employees supervised by male managers and employees supervised by female managers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average score</th>
<th>Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>.668</td>
<td>.416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results in Tables 4.17 and 4.19 show that there were 52 employees supervised by male managers and 48 supervised by female managers. Employees supervised by male managers had a continuance commitment mean score of 17.06 and a standard deviation of 6.54 while employees supervised by female managers had a continuance commitment mean score 17.77 and a standard deviation of 6.51. From these results, it can be seen that there is no significant difference in continuance commitment between employees supervised by male managers and those supervised by female managers (t= -0.618; df=98; p<0.538). Hence, we fail to reject the null hypothesis and reject the alternative hypothesis.
C. Normative Commitment

Table 4.20: Normative commitment t-test results for employees supervised by male managers and employees supervised by female managers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average score</th>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>3.601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>.736</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results in Tables 4.17 and 4.20 show that there were 52 employees supervised by male managers and 48 supervised by female managers. Employees supervised by male managers had a normative commitment mean score of 18.76 and a standard deviation of 6.54 while employees supervised by female managers had a normative commitment mean score of 17.85 and a standard deviation of 6.78. From these results, it can be seen that there was no significant difference in normative commitment between employees supervised by male managers and those supervised by female managers (t=0.738; df=98; p<0.46). Hence, we fail to reject the null hypothesis and reject the alternative hypothesis.
D. Overall Organisational Commitment

**Table 4.21: Overall organisational commitment t-test results for employees supervised by male managers and employees supervised by female managers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average score</th>
<th>Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>9.687</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>1.430</td>
<td>47.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results in Tables 4.17 and 4.21 show that there were 52 employees supervised by male managers and 48 supervised by female managers. Employees supervised by male managers had an overall organisational commitment mean score of 54.1 and a standard deviation of 14.43 while employees supervised by female managers had an overall organisation commitment mean score of 53.75 and a standard deviation of 15.10. From these results, it can be seen that there is no significant difference in overall organisational commitment between employees supervised by male managers and those supervised by female managers (t=1.489; df=98; p<0.140). Hence, we fail to reject the null hypothesis and reject the alternative hypothesis.
Hypothesis 5

H₀: Employees managed by an older manager do not have a significantly higher level of organisational commitment than employees managed by a younger or same-age manager.

H₁: Employees managed by an older manager have a significantly higher level of organisational commitment than employees managed by a younger or same-age manager.

Table 4.22: Mean and Standard Deviation results for employees supervised by an older manager and employees supervised by younger or same-age managers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affective Commitment</td>
<td>Same age</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Younger</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18.13</td>
<td>1.727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Older</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>18.43</td>
<td>1.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuance Commitment</td>
<td>Same age</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Younger</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>17.54</td>
<td>6.513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Older</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>16.71</td>
<td>6.592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative Commitment</td>
<td>Same age</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>6.569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Younger</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>6.537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Older</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>18.71</td>
<td>6.294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Commitment</td>
<td>Same age</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>14.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Younger</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>53.972</td>
<td>14.777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Older</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>53.86</td>
<td>13.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.23: Affective commitment ANOVA results for employees supervised by older managers compared to employees supervised by younger or same age managers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>.531</td>
<td>.589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>12.859</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>.133</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis 5 was tested by means of Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). The results in Tables 4.22 and 4.23 show that 57 employees were supervised by older managers with an affective commitment mean score of 18.43 and a standard deviation of 1.08. Eleven employees were supervised by same-age managers with an affective commitment mean score of 18.1 and a standard deviation of 1.10; and 32 employees were supervised by younger managers with an affective commitment mean score of 18.13 and a standard deviation of 1.73. From the results, it can be seen that there is no significant difference in affective commitment among employees supervised by same-age, younger or older managers (F=0.531; df=2/97; p<0.60). We fail to reject the null hypothesis and reject the alternative hypothesis.
B. Continuance Commitment

Table 4.24: Continuance commitment ANOVA results for employees supervised by an older manager compared to employees supervised by younger or same age managers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1.245</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.622</td>
<td>.660</td>
<td>.519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>91.505</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>.943</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results in Tables 4.22 and 4.24 show that 57 employees were supervised by older managers with a continuance commitment mean score of 16.71 and a standard deviation of 6.59. Eleven employees were supervised by same-age managers with a continuance commitment mean score of 16 and a standard deviation of 6.96, and 32 employees were supervised by younger managers with a continuance commitment mean score of 17.54 and a standard deviation of 6.51. From the results, it can be seen that there was no significant difference in continuance commitment among employees supervised by same-age, younger or older managers (F=0.660; df=2/97; p<0.52). We therefore cannot reject the null hypothesis and reject the alternative hypothesis.
C. Normative Commitment

Table 4.25: Normative commitment ANOVA results for employees supervised by an older manager compared to employees supervised by younger or same age managers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2.012</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.006</td>
<td>1.061</td>
<td>.350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>91.988</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>.948</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results in Tables 4.22 and 4.25 show that there were 57 employees supervised by older managers with a normative commitment mean score of 18.71 and a standard deviation of 6.29 while 11 employees were supervised by same-age managers and had a normative commitment mean score of 19.4 and a standard deviation of 6.57, and 32 employees were supervised by younger managers and had a normative commitment mean score of 18.3 and a standard deviation of 6.54. From the results, it can be seen that there was no significant difference in normative commitment among employees supervised by same-age, younger or older managers (F=1.061; df2/97; p<0.35). We therefore fail to reject the null hypothesis and reject the alternative hypothesis.
Table 4.26: Overall Organisational commitment ANOVA results for employees supervised by an older manager compared to employees supervised by younger or same age managers

ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>2.122</td>
<td>.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>1.878</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results in Tables 4.22 and 4.26 show that there were 57 employees supervised by older managers with an overall organisational commitment mean score of 53.857 and a standard deviation of 13.97 while 11 employees were supervised by same-age managers and had an overall organisational commitment mean score of 53.5 and a standard deviation of 14.63, and 32 employees were supervised by younger managers and had a normative commitment mean score of 53.97 and a standard deviation of 14.78. From the results, it can be seen that there was no significant difference in overall organisational commitment among employees supervised by same-age, younger or older managers (F=2.122; df2/97; p<0.13). We therefore fail to reject the null hypothesis and reject the alternative hypothesis.
4.4. Conclusion

This chapter has provided the results of the study in terms of the reliability and construct validity of the instrument measuring organisational commitment and in relation to the hypotheses of the study. Chapter 5 presents a discussion of the results.
Chapter 5: Discussion of results, Recommendations and Conclusions

5.1 Introduction

This chapter provides a discussion of the research findings of the study in relation to the reliability and validity of some of the measuring instruments and in relation to the hypotheses. In order to contextualize the research, comparisons are drawn with available literature on the relationship between age and gender differences and organisational commitment. The chapter provides conclusions that can be drawn from the research and offers suggestions for future research into the impact of age and gender differences between managers and employees on organisational commitment. It also makes recommendations for future managerial/professional practice based on the results of the study.

5.2. Reliability and construct validity

In the present study, an Organisational Commitment Questionnaire was used and it consisted of 18 structured statements or items, measuring affective, continuance and normative dimensions of organisational commitment (Meyer & Allen, 1997). The affective commitment dimension measures organisational members’ emotional attachment to, identifying with and involvement in the organisation, meaning members stay with the organisation because they want to. The continuance commitment dimension measures members’ commitment to the organisation based on the costs that are associated with leaving the organisation. In other words, members stay with the organisation because they need to do so. Lastly, the normative commitment dimension measures members’ obligation to remain with the organisation, which implies that members stay with the organisation because they ought to. The Cronbach Alpha Coefficient for affective commitment was 0.78; for continuance commitment it was 0.76;
for normative commitment it was 0.73, and for overall organizational commitment it was 0.78. As the Cronbach Alpha Coefficient in this study is within the acceptable range, the constructs are therefore deemed to have adequate reliability and construct validity.

5.3. Discussion of the results in relation to the hypotheses and previous research findings.

5.3.1. The results relating to Hypotheses 1 to 3 (the similarity/attraction hypotheses)

**Hypothesis 1** is as follows:

**H₀**: Male employees supervised by a male manager do not have a higher level of organisational commitment than male employees supervised by a female manager.

**H₁**: Male employees supervised by a male manager have a higher level of organisational commitment than male employees supervised by a female manager.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>H₀</th>
<th>H₁</th>
<th>Significant</th>
<th>Expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affective commitment</td>
<td>Fail to reject</td>
<td>Reject</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuance commitment</td>
<td>Fail to reject</td>
<td>Reject</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative commitment</td>
<td>Reject</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall organisational commitment</td>
<td>Fail to reject</td>
<td>Reject</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As far as overall organisational commitment is concerned, no significant difference was found in organisational commitment between male employees reporting to male
managers and male employees reporting to female managers (t=1.313; df=52; p=<0.33). This was in support of the null hypothesis and not the alternative hypothesis.

As far as affective and continuance commitment are concerned, a significant difference was found but not in the expected direction (t=-2.668; df=52; p=<0.01 and t=-39.000; df=19; p=<0.00 respectively). In other words, male employees reporting to male managers showed significantly less affective and continuance commitment than male employees reporting to female managers. Thus, though there was a significant difference between the two groups the null hypothesis still has to be accepted and the alternative hypothesis rejected.

It is only in relation to normative commitment that there is a significant difference between the two groups that is in support of the alternative commitment as expected, and not in support of the null hypothesis (t=47.393; df=33; p=<0.00).

In other words therefore, there are mixed results with respect to Hypothesis 1 where the results for overall organisational commitment, affective commitment, and continuance commitment have failed to support the research hypothesis of the study but the results relating to normative commitment are in support of the research hypothesis. Table 5.1 is an attempt to present these results in summary form.

**Hypothesis 2**

Hypothesis 2 is as follows:

\[ H_0: \text{Female employees supervised by a female manager do not have a higher level of organisational commitment than female employees supervised by a male manager.} \]
H1: Female employees supervised by a female manager have a higher level of organisational commitment than female employees supervised by a male manager.

Table 5.2: Summary of the results related to Hypothesis 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>H0</th>
<th>H1</th>
<th>Significant</th>
<th>Expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affective commitment</td>
<td>Reject</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuance commitment</td>
<td>Reject</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative commitment</td>
<td>Fail to reject</td>
<td>Reject</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall organisational commitment</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>Reject</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As far as overall organisational commitment is concerned, no significant difference was found in organisational commitment between female employees reporting to female managers and female employees reporting to male managers (t=1.000; df=27; p=<0.33). This was in support of the null hypothesis and not the alternative hypothesis.

As far as affective and continuance commitment are concerned, a significant difference was found and in the expected direction (t=3.081; df=20; p=<0.006 and t=4.021; df=27; p=<0.004). In other words, female employees reporting to female managers showed significantly higher affective and continuance commitment than female employees reporting to male managers. Thus, the alternative hypothesis is accepted and the null hypothesis rejected.

In normative commitment there was a significant difference between female employees reporting to female managers and those female employees reporting to male managers but it was in an unexpected direction (t=-21.56; df=44; p=<0.000). In other words, female employees reporting to female managers showed significantly less normative commitment than female employees reporting to male managers. Thus, though there
was a significant difference between the two groups the null hypothesis still has to be accepted and the alternative hypothesis rejected.

In other words therefore, these are mixed results with respect to Hypothesis 2 where the results for overall organisational commitment and normative commitment have failed to support the research hypothesis of the study but the results relating to affective and continuance commitment are in support of the research hypothesis. Table 5.2 presents these results in summary form.

**Hypothesis 3**

Hypothesis 3 is as follows:

\[ H_0: \text{Employees who have a manager who is the same age as them do not have a higher level of organisational commitment than employees with a manager who is older or younger than them.} \]

\[ H_1: \text{Employees who have a manager who is the same age as them have a higher level of organisational commitment than employees with a manager who is older or younger than them.} \]

**Table 5.3: Summary of the results related to Hypothesis 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commitment</th>
<th>( H_0 )</th>
<th>( H_1 )</th>
<th>Significant</th>
<th>Expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affective commitment</td>
<td>Fail to reject</td>
<td>Reject</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuance commitment</td>
<td>Fail to reject</td>
<td>Reject</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative commitment</td>
<td>Fail to reject</td>
<td>Reject</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall organisational commitment</td>
<td>Fail to reject</td>
<td>Reject</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As far as overall, affective, continuance and normative commitment are concerned, no significant difference was found between employees reporting to same-age managers and those employees reporting to younger or older managers (\( t=-0.547; \) df=98;
p=0.59, t=-0.113; df=55.47; p=0.91, t=-1.143; df=65.76; p=0.26 and t=1.235; df=98; p=0.220 respectively) and these results were all not in the expected direction. They are in support of the null hypothesis and not the alternative hypothesis.

In other words therefore, Hypothesis 3 results for overall organisational commitment, affective commitment, continuance commitment and normative commitment have failed to support the research hypothesis of the study. These results are presented in summary form in Table 5.3.

5.3.1.1. Theoretical implications of the results relating to Hypotheses 1 to 3 (the similarity/attraction hypotheses).

It will be recalled that Hypotheses 1 to 3 are based on the Similarity/ Attraction Paradigm of Byrne (1971). According to this theory, similarity in personal attributes, such as age and gender, is a source of interpersonal attraction. In terms of this theory, it can thus be expected that age and / or gender similarity between managers and their subordinates will result in a high level of organisational commitment on the part of the subordinates.

The results relating to Hypothesis 1 (the hypothesis relating to male employees) support the theory with respect to normative commitment but not with respect to affective, continuance and overall organisational commitment. In other words, male employees reporting to male managers are higher in organisational commitment than male employees reporting female managers in relation to normative commitment only, but not in relation to affective, continuance and overall organisational commitment.

As far as Hypothesis 2 is concerned, there are mixed result as well. This hypothesis relates to female employees and hypothesizes that female employees reporting to
female managers will show a higher level of organisational commitment than female employees reporting to male managers.

The results show that this is the case only in relation to affective commitment and continuance commitment, but not in relation to normative and overall organisational commitment.

Hypothesis 3 relates to age and postulates that employees who report to same-age managers will be higher in organisational commitment than employees who report to managers who are younger or older than them.

The results of the study show completely no support for this hypothesis and therefore no support for the similarity/attraction paradigm as far as age differences are concerned. This applies to affective, continuance, normative, and overall organisational commitment. There are no significant differences in organisational commitment with respect to any of these aspects of organisational commitment.

In summary, then, the result of the study partly support for the Similarity/Attraction Paradigm in terms of gender differences. They, however, show absolutely no support for the theory in terms of age differences.

As far as previous literature is concerned, the similarity-attraction paradigm suggests that the more individuals are surrounded by others of the same age and gender at work, the higher their levels of organisational commitment is expected to be. That is, levels of organisational commitment will be higher for those employees working in same-age and same-gender dominated positions.
Social scientific research has provided considerable support for tenets of the theory since the mid-1900s. Researchers from a variety of fields such as marketing, political science, social psychology, and sociology have contributed to and these positive findings in relation to the similarity/attraction theory. The theory provides a parsimonious explanatory and predictive framework for examining how and why people are attracted to and influenced by others in their social worlds.

According to studies by Berscheid and Walster (1978) and Byrne (1971) in general people are most attracted to others who share similar attitudes and there are several reasons why people prefer the company of others who espouse attitudes, especially important attitudes, which are similar to their own (Berscheid and Walster 1969; Byrne 1971). Most importantly perhaps, sharing similar attitudes provides corroboration that a person is not alone in his or her belief; they might even be correct to hold the attitude in question. Other possible reasons suggested for why people prefer others who are similar to themselves are that (1) knowledge of similar attitudes may help people to predict others’ future behaviours, providing a predictive “window” into the other’s behavioural predilections, and (2) people may be more likely to assume that others who hold similar attitudes to themselves have a greater chance of being attracted to them, a "likeness begets liking" explanation.

In addition to people’s inclinations to be attracted to those who share similar attitudes, people are also attracted to others who manifest personality characteristics (e.g., optimism, self-esteem, shyness, conscientiousness) that are similar to their own. In fact, people may choose to associate with certain others because they are of same age or even gender.
Additionally, when it comes to the workplace setting, the study by Khalili and Asmawi (2012), showed men having higher levels of affective commitment, continuance commitment and overall organizational commitment in comparison with women. On the contrary, female employees demonstrated that they have more normative commitment to the organisation than males. Tsui, Egan and O'Reilly (1992), Wharton and Baron (1987), Kaldenberg, Becker and Zvonkovic, (1995), and Dodd-McCue and Wright (1996) though, in their studies found that there is no clear or significant difference between age and gender similarity and overall employee commitment at work. In other words, age and gender differences have between managers and employees no significant impact on organisational commitment.

5.3.2. The results relating to Hypotheses 4 and 5 (the social role or cultural hypotheses)

Hypothesis 4

Hypothesis 4 is as follows:

\( H_0 \): Employees managed by a male manager do not have a higher level of organisational commitment than employees managed by a female manager.

\( H_1 \): Employees managed by a male manager have a higher level of organisational commitment than employees managed by a female manager.

Table 5.4: Summary of the results related to Hypothesis 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>( H_0 )</th>
<th>( H_1 )</th>
<th>Significant</th>
<th>Expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affective commitment</td>
<td>Fail to reject</td>
<td>Reject</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuance commitment</td>
<td>Fail to reject</td>
<td>Reject</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative commitment</td>
<td>Fail to reject</td>
<td>Reject</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall organisational commitment</td>
<td>Fail to reject</td>
<td>Reject</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As far as overall organisational commitment, affective, continuance and normative commitment are concerned, no significant difference was found in organisational commitment between employees reporting to male managers and those employees reporting to female managers (t=1.49; df=98; p=<0.14.; t=0.44; df=98; p=<0.66.; t=-0.618; df=98; p=<0.54 and t=0.74; df=98; p=<0.46 respectively) and they are all not in the expected direction. They are in support of the null hypothesis and not the alternative hypothesis.

In other words therefore, Hypothesis 4 results for overall organisational commitment, affective commitment, continuance and normative commitment have failed to support the research hypothesis of the study. These results are summarized in Table 5.4.

**Hypothesis 5**

Hypothesis 5 is as follows:

- **H₀**: Employees managed by an older manager do not have a higher level of organisational commitment than employees managed by younger or same age managers.

- **H₁**: Employees managed by an older manager have a higher level of organisational commitment than employees managed by younger or same age managers.

**Table 5.5: Summary of the results related to Hypothesis 5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>H₀</th>
<th>H₁</th>
<th>Significant</th>
<th>Expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affective commitment</td>
<td>Fail to reject</td>
<td>Reject</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuance commitment</td>
<td>Fail to reject</td>
<td>Reject</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative commitment</td>
<td>Fail to reject</td>
<td>Reject</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall organisational commitment</td>
<td>Fail to reject</td>
<td>Reject</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As far as overall organisational commitment, affective, continuance and normative commitment are concerned, no significant difference was found in organisational commitment between employees reporting to male managers and those employees reporting to female managers (F=2.122; df=2/97; p=<0.13; F=0.53; df=2/97; p=<0.60; F=0.66; df=2/97; p=<0.52 and F=1.06; df=2/97; p=<0.35 respectively) and these results are not in the expected direction. They are in support of the null hypothesis and not the alternative hypothesis. The results relating to Hypothesis 5 are summarized in Table 5.5.

In other words therefore, Hypothesis 5 results for overall organisational commitment, affective commitment, continuance and normative commitment, have failed to support the research hypothesis of the study.

5.3.2.1. Theoretical implications of the results relating to Hypotheses 4 and 5 (the social role or cultural hypotheses)

It will be recalled that Hypotheses 4 and 5 are based on the social roles or cultural hypothesis of Eagly (1987) and Tajfel and Turner (1986).

These theories argue that society or culture prescribes certain roles to certain groups and that members of society generally accept these social prescriptions and become comfortable if they are adhered to and uncomfortable if they are not adhered to. Males are therefore commonly assigned the role of manager and females are assigned the role of subordinates. Similarly older members of society are assigned the role of manager and younger members are assigned the role of subordinates.

These theories lead to the argument that employees reporting to a male manager would be happier and therefore more committed to their organisation than employees
reporting to a female manager. Similarly employees reporting to a manager who is older than them would be happier with their manager and therefore more committed to their organisation than employees reporting to a younger or same-age manager.

The results of the study show no support at all for the social roles or cultural hypotheses whether in relation to gender or age differences between managers and their subordinates. This is surprising as 100% of the respondents in the present study were Africans. The results were unexpected from members of the African culture where society prescribes different roles to members of different groups and such roles generally coincide with power and status norms. African society ascribes the managerial role to men and older persons while women and younger persons are supposed to be subordinates. These results may mean that the sample is westernised and this can be attributed to their relatively high levels of education since education is known to have a westernizing influence. These results may also be due to the westernizing influence of the urban area of East London (or Buffalo City) where virtually all the respondents resided and may have resided there for a long time or even for life.

In summary, then, the results of this study are partially in support of the similarity / attraction paradigm and do not support the social roles theory at all.

As far as previous literature relating to the latter theory is concerned, social role theory recognizes the historical division in labour between females, who often assumed responsibilities of supporting roles, and males, who often assumed responsibilities of being leaders, and also between older persons who often assumed the leadership role and younger persons who often assumed the subordinate or supporting role (Eagly, 1987). As a consequence of the concomitant age and gender differences in social
behaviour, the expectancies of men and women began to diverge (Eagly, 1987). These expectancies are transmitted to future generations and, in turn, impinge on the social behaviour of each gender (Eagly, 1987, 1997; Eagly, Wood, & Diekman, 2000) and represent gender and age stereotypes (Williams & Best, 1982).

Accordingly, the behaviour of males and females, older, younger or same-age individuals is governed by the stereotypes of their social roles. For example, to conform to these expectations, males and older persons developed traits that manifest agency. Agency relates to traits such as the inclination to be independent, assertive, and competent (Eagly & Karau, 1991). In contrast, females and younger persons develop traits that manifest communal or expressive behaviour, which inhibits their aggression. Communal traits entail the tendency to be friendly, unselfish, and expressive (Eagly & Karau, 1991).

Two processes underpin the connection between expectancies and behaviour. First, through socialization processes, each gender and age group learn different skills or acquire disparate qualities through socialization processes. That is, authority figures, such as teachers and parents, encourage individuals to develop the skills and qualities that will facilitate their social roles. Second, gender roles and age group differences might more directly affect the courses of action that individuals choose in a specific setting.

This theory does imply, however, that age and gender differences are flexible, because they are dependent on the immediate social role of individuals. For example, individuals occupy many roles simultaneously, all of which impinge on their behaviour. Work roles,
such as leadership positions for instance, might override their age and gender roles and reduce the effects of age and gender differences (Eagly & Johnson, 1990).

Social role theory implies that individuals might question the capacity of female and younger individuals in particular positions, such as leadership roles. That is, older and male individuals often occupy leadership roles. As a consequence, individuals often assume that leadership demands the manifestations of an assertive personality. Hence, the leadership role is assumed to align the male and older individuals (Eagly, Karau, & Makhijani, 1995; Peters, Kinsey, & Malloy, 2004).

According to Diekman, Goodfriend and Goodwin, (2004), however, gender and age differences in power are perceived to be eroding. As females and younger individuals are gaining more access to positions typically associated with power, their social role seems to be changing. This means that the working environment is now more diverse and the people both males and females, older and younger are more amenable to the changes that are taking place, and thus have no problem being led by a female or younger person.

5.4. Limitations of the study

Though this study was carefully planned and carried out, it nevertheless entails certain limitations which future studies should avoid. Some of the limitations of a study are briefly discussed below.

- The sample for the present study is relatively small because of financial problems and time limitation hence only 100 respondents were used out of a population of 1000. Therefore, generalization of the findings of the study will be limited. In
terms of the generally accepted Raosoft Sample Size Calculator, the appropriate sample size for a population of 1000 is 278 (Raosoft Inc., 2004).

- The study only used employees’ responses to estimate the ages of their managers instead of using more objective means. This may have resulted in inaccuracies as far as this is concerned.

- Another limitation of the present research is the possibility of common method variance, which may result in spurious relationships among variables based on the fact that self-report questionnaires were used to gather data relating to all the variables. The use of close-ended questionnaires also limits the amount of information that can be obtained from respondents since it does not allow respondents to express their own views to the maximum.

- The study also used factories in East London, which is a small area, thus limiting the generalizability of findings to other parts of the province or the country.

5.5. Recommendation for future research

The limitations of this research have important implications for similar future research. Future studies should be done using larger samples calculated with the Raosoft Sample Size Calculator (Raosoft Inc, 2004). They should also use more objective measures of the differences in age between managers and subordinates. It is also suggested that this research be replicated by collecting data from numerous factories throughout the Eastern Cape to facilitate more accurate generalization of findings to a wider population.

Future researchers must also use both quantitative and qualitative methodologies and thus provide a more in-depth understanding of the possible impact of age and gender differences on organisational commitment as opposed to the use of only a questionnaire
as in the present study. This would not only obviate the possibility of common-method variance but such triangulation would also be a further check on the validity and reliability of the measuring instruments.

5.6. Recommendations for future managerial/professional practice

This study was designed to investigate the applicability of two theories with important though divergent implications for workplace diversity management in the Eastern Cape. One of these theories is the similarity/attraction theory of Byrne (1971) and the other is the social roles or cultural theory of Eagly (1987).

The similarity/attraction theory espouses beliefs that negate the practice of workplace diversity and instead encourage workplace homogeneity whereby managers and subordinates would have to be similar in all important personal characteristics.

The social roles or cultural theory also negates the practice of workplace diversity because it implies that managers or employees should be selected so that they fit into certain culturally accepted categories. Managers should be males, for example, and should also be older than those they manage.

The results of the present study show that the applicability of these theories is either waning or non-existent in the Eastern Cape of today. The results show partial support of the similarity/attraction paradigm and absolutely no support of the social roles or cultural paradigm.

The practical implication of this is that managers in the Eastern Cape should be encouraged to apply the principles of workforce diversity in personnel selection. They should, however, also continue to provide diversity training in the workplace so as to
dispel any vestiges of resistance to diversity which may have accounted for the partial support for the similarity/attraction paradigm that was demonstrated by the results of this study.

5.7. Chapter conclusion
This chapter discussed the results of the study, highlighted the limitations of the study and made recommendations for future research as well as for future managerial practice.

5.8. Conclusions relating to the entire study
The main purpose of this study was to investigate the possible effects of gender and age differences between managers and employees on organisational commitment among lower-level employees in selected factories in the Buffalo City Metropolitan area. The main objective of the study was to determine whether the level of organisational commitment of an employee will differ depending on the manager's and employee's age and gender; to test the validity of the similarity-atraction paradigm of Byrne (1971), the social identity theory of Tajfel and Turner (1986), and the social roles theories of Eagly (1987) in the Eastern Cape, and to provide guidelines that could aid in both the management of organisational commitment and the assignment of employees to work teams. The study found significant differences in the unexpected directions in affective commitment and continuance commitment between male employees supervised by male managers and male employees supervised by female managers and also between female employees supervised by female managers and female employees supervised by male managers; male employees were found to have higher levels of affective and
continuance commitment when supervised by female managers and female employees were found to have a higher level of normative commitment when supervised by male managers than when supervised by female managers. This is different from what the present study hypothesed. In addition, the study showed surprising results in terms of the social or cultural hypothesis where employees supervised by male managers and older managers were not significantly different in organisational commitment to those managed by female and by younger or same-age managers. This study illustrates that people in the Buffalo City Metropolitan area have embraced diversity. Fair play and credibility in the workplace will earn managers respect regardless of their age or gender. This respect is likely to be translated into tangible organisational rewards, but this is a subject for another investigation.
Dear Prospective Respondent

My name is Nombali Qwabe. I am a master's degree student in the Department of Industrial Psychology at the University of Fort Hare conducting research as a prerequisite for the completion of my degree. The research is solely for academic purposes and all information obtained will be kept confidential. You are kindly requested to respond to the statements in the following questionnaire. The statements are related to work and life in the organization that you work for. Your name is not required.

Your responses are of great importance, I therefore value your co-operation very highly. There are no right or wrong answers to any questions. I am only interested in your personal opinions. The “right” answer to any question is your frank and truthful response. Please ensure that you respond to every question.

Thank you.
Section A: Demographic Information

(Please mark with an X in the appropriate box)

1. What is your age?

2. Give an estimate of the age of your immediate supervisor

3. How old is your immediate supervisor in relation to yourself?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Older</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. What is your gender?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. What gender is your immediate supervisor?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. What is your marital status?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. What is your highest educational qualification?

………………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………………

8. What is your home language?

………………………………………………………………………………………………………

9. What company do you work for?

………………………………………………………………………………………………………

10. In which department of your organization?

………………………………………………………………………………………………………

11. What is your present job title?

………………………………………………………………………………………………………

.........
12. How long have you been with the organization? .......................... years, .......................... months.

13. How long have you been in your present job?

............................. years, ............................. months.
Section B:

Please respond to the following questions, we would like to know how you feel about your company. “Use the scale provided to below each statement to reflect your view”.

1. This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Right now, staying with my organization is a matter of necessity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. I owe a great deal to my organization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. It would be very hard for me to leave my organization right now, even if I wanted to.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving this organization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. I do not feel “emotionally” attached to this organization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. I would feel guilty if I leave my organization now.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. I really feel as if this organization’s problems are my own.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. One of the few negative consequences of leaving scarcity of alternative.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. I do not feel like “part of the family” at my organization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. I would not leave my organization right now because I have a sense of obligation to its people.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. I do not feel a strong sense of “belonging” to my organization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Even if it were to my advantage, I do not feel it would be right to leave my organization now.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14. I do not feel any obligation to remain with my current employer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. This organization deserves my loyalty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Too much of my life would be disrupted if I decide I wanted to leave my organization now.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
18. If I had not already put so much of my life into this organization, I might consider working elsewhere.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Thank you for your time and co-operation!!!**
Appendix B: A Letter of Introduction

University of Fort Hare
Faculty of Management and Commerce
Alice (Main) Campus
Private Bag X1314, King William's Town Rd, Alice, 5700, RSA
Tel: +27 (0) 40 602 2533 Fax: +27 (0) 40 602 2514

16 August 2012

The Manager
HR Department

Dear sir/madam

Please allow me to introduce my student, Ms Nombali Qwabe.

Ms Nombali Qwabe is a master's degree student in Industrial Psychology and is one of the students whose research I supervise. She is doing research on the impact of age and gender diversity on organizational commitment. For her dissertation, she would like to collect data from several organizations in Buffalo City, including yours.

Could you please allow Ms Qwabe to gather the data in your organization. This data will be used for research purposes only, and the results will be shared with you if you are interested in them. She will make sure not to disturb work processes in your organization while collecting her data. She will discuss this with you beforehand.

Thanking you in advance for your assistance in this regard,

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

Professor QT Mjoli
Dean: Faculty of Management and Commerce

East London Campus:
P.O. Box 7426, 50 Church St, East London, 5201, RSA
Tel: +27 (0) 43 704 7000 Fax: +27 (0) 40 402 2615
VCD Dial Up: +27 (0) 43 704 7143/7144

Rhodes Campus:
P.O. Box 1153, KwT 5600, Independence Avenue, Rhodes Memorial, 5600, RSA
Tel: +27 (0) 40 606 - 5310 Fax: +27 (0) 40 602 2514

www.ufh.ac.za
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