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ABSTRACT

Core competitiveness is the capability of a company survives while facing strong competition, not only from inside the country but from international corporations. Even small or medium businesses facing strong rivals typically must be able to make changes quickly to maintain their competitiveness.

Employee attitude from management issue can affect the organization value and climate or culture. Therefore, motivation is the main force through which individuals allocate effort to generate and implement innovative ideas. However, employees are only motivated to go beyond their designated role and get involved in spontaneous and innovative activities if they have a strong identification with the organization.

This research main purpose is going to discovery the relation between organization climate, motivation and commitment as an offering of the manager level decision making support. There are 358 mails were sending out to north Taiwan high tech companies and 283 surveys were returned, however there are 250 surveys were useable. The return rate is 79.1%. In the result of the three components of commitment were significant in each other and twelve organization climates also significant in each other. The motivation variable only dependency was significant with age. In the result of this study that also find out there are only expert influence significant with the continuance commitment. In final, this research find out that the three components didn’t have any significant with the organization climate and only affective commitment correlation with supervision and decision making under overall climate factor.
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INTRODUCTION

Core competitiveness is the capability of a company survives while facing strong competition, not only from inside the country but from international corporations. Even small or medium businesses facing strong rivals typically must be able to make changes quickly to maintain their competitiveness.

Organizational culture forms the glue that holds the organization functions together and stimulates employees to commit to the organization and to perform well. Also organizational climate as shared perceptions of organizational work practices within organizational units that may differ from other organizational units. In every organization, there are values, symbols, rituals, myths and practices that have evolved and share over time. Employee attitude from management issue can affect the organization value and climate or culture. Therefore, motivation is the main force through which individuals allocate effort to generate and implement innovative ideas. However, employees are only motivated to go beyond their designated role and get involved in spontaneous and innovative activities if they have a strong identification with the organization. Wright & Bonnett (2002) point out that organization commitment can draw the attention from organization performance to employee contribution under organizational change. This attention is due to commitment's relationship to such important outcomes as job performance, organizational citizenship behaviors, willingness to share knowledge, absenteeism, tardiness, and turnover.
Therefore, organizational climate plays a critical role in motivating innovative behavior, as it can create commitment among members of an organization in terms of believing in innovation as an organizational value and accepting innovation-related norms prevalent within the organization.

This research main purpose is going to discovery the relation between organization climate, motivation and commitment as an offering of the manager level decision making support.

**LITERATURE REVIEW**

Organizational climate is an inherently multilevel construct involving distinct perceptions and beliefs about an organization’s physical and social environment. At the individual level, psychological climate refers to individuals’ perceptions of and the meanings they assign to their environment. As a higher level construct, organizational climate reflects beliefs about the organization’s environment that are shared among members and to which members attach psychological meaning to help them make sense of their environment (L. A. James & James, 1989; L. R. James & Jones, 1974).

Schneider and Reichers (1983) suggested that structural characteristics, the types of people within an organization, interaction patterns, and socialization practices all play a role in the emergence of organizational climates. These factors likely impact both perceptions of organizational climate and within-organization agreement concerning climate perceptions. Burns and Stalker’s (1961) mechanistic–organic model of organizational form provides a comprehensive perspective on organizational modes of operation that addresses structural characteristics, management practices, and employee interaction patterns. Moreover, aspects of organizational structure and form have also been linked to person–organization (P-O) fit (Cable & DeRue, 2002) and types of socialization practices used by organizations (Ashforth, Saks, & Lee, 1998), which influence the types of people who join and remain with an organization along with their perceptions of their organization’s environment. Together, these forces likely result in members of mechanistic and organic organizations developing different perceptions of how their organizations operate.

Research concerning the development of organizational commitment has been extensive but relatively unsystematic (Meyer & Allen, 1997; Reichers, 1985). Nevertheless, on the basis of theoretical considerations and accumulated evidence, Meyer and Herscovitch (2001) also identified several bases for the development of each of the three forms of commitment. They argued that the primary bases for the development of affective commitment are personal involvement, identification with the relevant target, and value congruence (Becker et al., 1996). In contrast, normative commitment develops as a function of cultural and organizational socialization and the receipt of benefits that activate a need to reciprocate (Scholl, 1981; Wiener, 1982). Finally, continuance commitment develops as the result of accumulated investments, or side bets (H. S. Becker, 1960), that would be lost if the individual discontinued a course of action, and as a result of lack of alternatives to the present course (Powell & Meyer, 2004).

Meyer and Allen (1991) initially developed their three-component model to address observed similarities and differences in existing one-dimensional conceptualizations of organizational commitment (Becker, 1960; Mowday et al., 1982; Wiener, 1982). Common to all, they argued, was the belief that commitment binds an individual to an organization and thereby reduces the likelihood of turnover. The main differences were in the mindsets presumed to characterize the commitment. These mindsets reflected three distinguishable themes: affective attachment to the organization, obligation to remain, and perceived cost of leaving. To distinguish among commitments characterized by these different mindsets, Meyer and Allen labeled them “affective commitment,” “normative commitment,” and “continuance
commitment,” respectively.

Meyer and Allen (1991) argued that one of the most important reasons for distinguishing among the different forms of organizational commitment was that they have very different implications for behavior. Although all three forms tend to bind employees to the organization, and therefore relate negatively to turnover, their relations with other types of work behavior can be quite different. Indeed, research shows that affective commitment has the strongest positive correlation with job performance, organizational citizenship behavior, and attendance, followed by normative commitment. Continuance commitment tends to be unrelated, or negatively related, to these behaviors.

Motivation has been a difficult concept to properly define, in part because there “are many philosophical orientations toward the nature of human beings and about what can be known about people” (Pinder, 1998, p. 11). Although some have argued that the term defies definition (Dewsbury, 1978), Kleinginna (1981) identified approximately 140 attempts. Pinder (1998) provided a definition that nicely accommodates the different theoretical perspectives that have been brought to bear in the explanation of work motivation:

*Work motivation is a set of energetic forces that originates both within as well as beyond an individual’s being, to initiate work-related behavior, and to determine its form, direction, intensity, and duration.* (p. 11)

There are two noteworthy features of this definition. First, motivation is identified as an energizing force—it is what induces action in employees. Second, this force has implications for the form, direction, intensity, and duration of behavior. That is, it explains what employees are motivated to accomplish, how they will attempt to accomplish it, how hard they will work to do so, and when they will stop. Many theories have been set forth to explain employee motivation (Kanfer, 1990; Pinder, 1998). None are complete, but most make meaningful contributions to our understanding of what is obviously a complex process. Locke (2004) noted that each of the different theoretical orientations offers a unique perspective and can be combined to form a general model.

**RESEARCH HYPOTHESES**

*Age and organizational motivation effect*

Hypotheses 1: there is no significant relation between age and organizational motivation effect

Stereotyping is judging, reacting to, or treating another person on the basis of one’s perception of the group to which that person belongs (old, young, manager, engineer) or in which they have been placed (Robbins, 2001). The terms old or older describe a group of people to which certain characteristics are assigned. These may include positive traits such as experience, good judgment, strong work ethic, and a commitment to quality. In a more negative vein, older workers have been characterized as lacking flexibility, resistant to new technology, unwilling or unable to learn new skills, and unable to change or adapt. Many people attribute high absenteeism and high job turnover to the older population due to the stereotype of a physically and mentally declining individual.

Smith and Hoy (1992) found that the turnover rate for older workers is less than that of younger workers. They also found that job satisfaction and organizational commitment are important determinants of turnover rate. Rhodes (1983) found that older workers were more satisfied and committed to their firms than were younger workers. Older workers demonstrated lower rates of avoidable absenteeism, but higher rates of unavoidable absenteeism. Older workers want to learn and are just as capable of learning as younger workers.
Organizational motivation effect and three component model of commitment to change

Hypotheses 2: there is significant relation between organizational motivation effect and three component model of commitment to change

According to Locke (1997), the performance that results from these efforts affects the level of satisfaction experienced, which, along with organizational commitment, can lead to other forms of action (e.g., job and work avoidance, deviance, adjustment). In addition to this causal chain from internal and external inducements, to goals, and, ultimately, to performance and satisfaction, Locke identified a set of moderating conditions that are necessary for goal accomplishment: feedback, goal commitment, ability, and task complexity.

Meyer and Allen (1991) initially developed their three-component model to address observed similarities and differences in existing one-dimensional conceptualizations of organizational commitment (Becker, 1960; Mowday et al., 1982; Wiener, 1982). Common to all, they argued, was the belief that commitment binds an individual to an organization and thereby reduces the likelihood of turnover. The main differences were in the mindsets presumed to characterize the commitment. These mindsets reflected three distinguishable themes: affective attachment to the organization, obligation to remain, and perceived cost of leaving. Meyer and Allen (1991) argued that one of the most important reasons for distinguishing among the different forms of organizational commitment was that they have very different implications for behavior. Although all three forms tend to bind employees to the organization, and therefore relate negatively to turnover, their relations with other types of work behavior can be quite different (Meyer et al., 2002).

Of course, even when commitment is involved, motivation can ebb and flow over time as commitment increases and decreases in salience. For example, a commitment to obtain a university degree should contribute to generally high levels of motivation to study, but day-to-day behavior will also be shaped by other sources of motivation (e.g., needs, values, incentives) that intrude and make the long-term commitment momentarily less salient. Nevertheless, we argue that commitment can serve as a particularly powerful source of motivation and can often lead to persistence in a course of action, even in the face of opposing forces (Brickman, 1987; Scholl, 1991).

three component model of commitment to change and organization climate

Hypotheses 3: three component model of commitment to change is not significant relation to organization climate

James & James (1989) point out that organizational climate is an inherently multilevel construct involving distinct perceptions and beliefs about an organization’s physical and social environment. At the individual level, psychological climate refers to individuals’ perceptions of and the meanings they assign to their environment. Even though members of an organization may have similar perceptions and beliefs, variance among their perceptions may still exist, and this variance provides meaningful information about the strength of the organization’s climate (Lindell & Brandt, 2000; Schneider, Salvaggio, & Subirats, 2002). Reichers (1985) state that commitment theory has been the recognition that commitment can be directed toward various targets, or foci, of relevance to workplace behavior, including the organization, occupation, supervisor, team, program, customer, and union. Meyer and Allen (1991) argued that one of the most important reasons for distinguishing among the different forms of organizational commitment was that they have very different implications for behavior. This point out that commitment has the potential conflict with organization climate.
METHODOLOGY

This research was carried out through a personal contact survey by students who work in the north Taiwan high tech company in the industrial parks and the companies’ employee number are lower than 1000 and registry category from the Registries list of industrial park index book. Survey was sent out and mail back by the postage-paid reply envelope and a cover letter and the authors’ name and voluntary consent form. There are 358 mails were sending out and 283 surveys were returned, however there are 250 surveys were useable. The return rate is 79.1%.

Motivational Analysis of Organizational Climate: the instrument for measurement of organizational climate (Pareek, 1989; 2002, pp. 757 -773) comprises six climate motives and the following twelve organizational dimensions:


Organizational Climate Motives There are three functional climate motives and three dysfunctional climate motives as explained below:

1. Achievement: Focusing on attainment of goals with quality and excellence.
3. Extension: Heightened concern for making oneself relevant to others in the team/group/ organization.
4. Control: Emphasis on consolidation of personal power in the organization.
5. Dependency: Emphasis on seeking approval from others, instead of taking one’s own decisions.
6. Affiliation: Heightened concern for maintaining friendly and affectionate personal relationships, even when they come in the way of attainment of goals.

Meyer and Allen (1991) conceptualized commitment to change as a psychological state, or mind-set, that increases the likelihood that an employee will maintain membership in an organization. The instrument for measurement of commitment is used the labels affective commitment (desire to remain), continuance commitment (perceived cost of leaving), and normative commitment (perceived obligation to remain) to differentiate among commitments to change characterized by different mind-sets.

FINDINGS

Three hypotheses were tested using the SPSS v14.0 software. The correlation and ANOVA procedures were utilized. The results of the tests of the hypotheses were the following:

Hypotheses 1: there is no significant relation between age and organizational motivation effect

As the table 1 shows that the one way ANOVA under age as the factors and six motivation factors as dependence variable correlation. As the table showed that the six motivation variables only dependency is significant with age. The significant number for achievement (0.951), extension(0.301), expert influence(0.59), control(0.859), affiliation(0.646), dependency(0.001).

Dependency variable have the significant with the age that show no matter the age is younger or older could need some others assistance. Other factors will not significant with age. Siegel (1993) found no significant difference between the performance evaluations of older managers and younger managers; however, older managers were less likely to be promoted. Sullivan and Duplaga (1997) found that in some occupations such as sales and paraprofessionals, productivity actually increased with age. Moreover there is no studies found that investigated the extent to which individual work factors contribute to age-related differences in job satisfaction or productivity. Therefore, hypotheses one: there is no
A significant relation between age and organizational motivation effect was accepted.

### ANOVA

#### Table 1

<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><strong>Achievement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>.419</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>.951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>295.825</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>1.203</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>296.244</td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Extension</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>8.255</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.752</td>
<td>1.226</td>
<td>.301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>551.941</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>2.244</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>560.196</td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expert influence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>16.195</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.398</td>
<td>2.511</td>
<td>.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>528.881</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>2.150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>545.076</td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1.596</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.532</td>
<td>.253</td>
<td>.859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>516.804</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>2.101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>518.400</td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affiliation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3.215</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.072</td>
<td>.553</td>
<td>.646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>476.341</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>1.936</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>479.556</td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>31.506</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.502</td>
<td>5.306</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>486.894</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>1.979</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>518.400</td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). * Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed). a Listwise N=250

Hypotheses 2: there is significant relation between organizational motivation effect and three component model of commitment to change.

As the table 2 shows that correlation with three components of commitment and the six motivation variables. However, it shows the correlation in six motivation variables have significant with each other under achievement, extension, expert influence, control, affiliation. But three component of commitment variables matrix shows that only continuance commitment is significant with expert influence (-.148**), and others is not significant with six motivation variables. Continuance commitment might effected by the technology or expert knowledge sharing. Company might have the on job training or knowledge platform that offer the great resource to keep employee moving upgrade. Work experience have high relation with the continuance commitment. Therefore, hypotheses two: there is significant relation between organizational motivation effect and three component model of commitment to change was rejected.
Hypotheses 3: three component model of commitment to change is not significant relation to organization climate

The table 3 shows that correlation of twelve organization climate with the affective, continuance and normative commitment. The three components of commitment in the twelve organization climates variable seems didn’t significant at all under the Person Correlation analysis but only affective commitment with supervision and decision making. The Pearson correlation of affective is Significant with supervision (-0.157) and decision making (-0.188) is significant. Other variables are not significant including the continuance commitment and normative commitment with the twelve organization climate variables. Therefore, the hypotheses three: three component model of commitment to change is not significant relation to organization climate was accepted.
CONCLUSIONS

The goal of this study was to find out the correlation organization climate and three components of commitment with the gender and organization motivation. Each of the three commitments was tested with the different variable. Motivation was tested with the age and twelve organization climates. However, in the result of the three components of commitment were significant in each other and twelve organization climates also significant in each other. The motivation variable only dependency was significant with age. Meyer & Allen (1991) point out that affective commitment is expect to be correlated with those work experiences and the organization that make the employee feel “psychologically comfortable” and enhance the employees’ sense of competence. In the result of this study that find out there are only supervision and decision making significant with affective commitment. Meyer & Allen (1991) stated that continuance commitment purportedly develops on the basis of the employee’s recognition of the investments employees’ made in the organization and lack of comparable employment alternative. In the result of this study that find out there are only expert influence significant with the continuance commitment.
Most of us have the stereotype image that the younger employees have more potential to learn and development in the future. However in the hypotheses one show that one way ANOVA age variable didn’t correlate with six motivations but the dependency variable. It is show that older workers want to learn and are just as capable of learning as younger workers and the older generation who participating in the survey trying to catch new things as their highest work priority. Siegel (1993) found no significant difference between the performance evaluations of older managers and younger managers; however, older managers were less likely to be promoted.

In final, this research find out that the three components didn’t have any significant with the organization climate and only affective commitment correlation with supervision and decision making under overall climate factor. Thus, it seems important to consider employee has the high emotion dependent mentality and expect the higher position leader management and decision as well. The overall climate factor and the commitment seems have individual separation relationship when investigating measures of organizational effectiveness.
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