

Shaken Bases: Impact of Changing Paradigms on Organizational Commitment and Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Kerem Toker¹ , Erdal Tekarslan² 

¹Assoc.Prof. Bezmialem Vakif University, Faculty of Health Sciences, Department of Health Management, Istanbul, Türkiye

²Prof. Dr., Bezmialem Vakif University, Faculty of Health Sciences, Department of Health Management, Istanbul, Türkiye

ABSTRACT

The 21st-century business ecosystem is rapidly transitioning from the modern to the postmodern paradigm. This study examines the concepts of organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior within the context of the postmodern paradigm. At the same time, the study questions the efficacy and legitimacy of these concepts in addressing contemporary managerial and organizational challenges. This study is based on an exhaustive literature review and a meticulous examination and analysis of previous research on organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior within the framework of shifting paradigms. Adjustments in goals, restructuring of organizational structures, modifications in leadership understanding, and alterations in time perception cause conventional organizational behavior concepts such as organizational commitment and organizational citizenship to be problematized and questioned. The management and organizational approach of the previous century, which claimed rationality, objectivity, and universality, has been superseded by management and organizational approaches prioritizing concepts such as irony, parody, subjectivity, and locality. The concept of organizational commitment, which is a precursor to organizational citizenship behavior, is being replaced by career or professional commitment. Therefore, organizational citizenship behavior is fading away within the postmodern paradigm. Due to delays in grasping this transformation and transition process, administrators persist in defining and applying management policies based on modern paradigms, including their concepts, tools, and techniques.

Keywords: Organizational commitment, Organizational citizenship behavior, Modernism, Postmodernism

JEL Code: M10, M12, and Z13

INTRODUCTION

In the twenty-first century, workplaces have become a more complex environment. The integration of various economies has led to an increase in competitive working conditions (Ocampo et al., 2018). Consequently, the advent of the new economy has resulted in a transformation of organizational structures and management practices. At the same time, employee-organization relationships have also changed, raising questions regarding the optimal integration of career development activities within these evolving dynamics (Weng et al., 2010). As employees become increasingly responsible for managing their careers, businesses are compelled to re-examine the strategies employed to foster organizational commitment among their employees (Ng & Feldman, 2010). In this context, the needs of businesses for employees who go beyond the scope of their defined career duties, develop collaboration, and support colleagues, employers, and customers are increasing daily (Shahin et al., 2014). Therefore, it is necessary to constantly assess employee engagement to overcome managerial problems that may arise and ensure that employees develop a positive work attitude that is essential for optimal organizational performance (Hanaysha, 2016). In this context, it is crucial to interrogate and debate the empirical evidence on organizational commitment and citizenship behavior.

Organizational commitment is one of the most frequently studied forms of psychological bonding between employees and organizations (Ng, 2015). Academics and professionals have been researching the concept of commitment for more than half a century (Singh & Gupta, 2015). This concept stands out in the literature because commitment is accepted as an essential factor that determines employee work behavior (Yahaya & Ebrahim, 2016). Although 21st-century managers continued to focus on employee attitudes and organizational commitment, scholars have identified a need for greater explicitness, cohesion, and accessibility in the organizational commitment literature (Mercurio, 2015). Therefore, there should be more consistency in the definition of organizational commitment (Yahaya & Ebrahim, 2016). However, organizational commitment is often referred to as an antecedent

Corresponding Author: Kerem Toker E-mail: ktoker@bezmialem.edu.tr

Submitted: 25.04.2024 • Accepted: 06.12.2024



This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0)

of organizational citizenship behavior. It has been claimed that engaged employees are more likely to engage in actions that enhance their value and support the organization (Zeinabadi, 2010). Therefore, the concepts of organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior, which are critical for managers, constitute two sides of the same coin.

Existing literature proves that organizational citizenship behavior has emerged as a key concern in the service sector (i.e. banks, hotels, hospitals, and academic institutions) and industrial sectors in the 21st century (Ocampo et al., 2018). Because of this focus, when organizational citizenship behavior is expected in the workplace, the organization becomes more attractive to the employee (Bolino et al., 2015). Organizational citizenship behavior refers to employee behaviors that are not part of an individual job description and are not included in the employee contract but benefit organizational performance (Grego-Planer, 2019). Recently, there has been an increasing interest in organizational citizenship in marketing and strategy. However, most studies on organizational citizenship behavior have focused on identifying the factors that affect this behavior, with a particular emphasis on organizational justice and leaders' characteristics (Lee et al., 2013). Nevertheless, there is also body literature that addresses the phenomenon of organizational citizenship fatigue. According to Bolino et al. (2015), the origin of organizational citizenship fatigue can be traced back to research that seeks to elucidate the impact of work becoming an integral part of the person and the subsequent challenges that arise when such work demands are perceived as exceeding one's capacity.

In this context, attempts to resolve 21st-century management and organizational issues through 20th-century concepts have resulted in theoretical gaps and practical failures. Unless the basic prejudices of management and behavioral scientists regarding employee motivation change and, at the same time, the institutional structure does not coincide with the changing judgments, the pervasive inertia behind failure will continue in the eyes of those occupying target positions (Levinson, 2008). Therefore, leaders should take on board the decreasing trend in employees' levels of organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior (Shahin et al., 2014) and develop new insights concerning the reasons for this decrease. Considering this, this study aims to provide a novel and original perspective on organizational commitment and citizenship behavior by analyzing the concepts of organizational commitment and citizenship within the framework of scientific literature and by presenting a synthesis within the framework of recent understandings of the concepts. First, we will shed light on the concepts in question.

Organizational Commitment

Although organizational commitment has been conceptualized in various ways, it is widely viewed in the organizational behavior literature as an emotional commitment to an organization characterized by sharing values and the desire to maintain membership (Meyer & Allen, 1984). In this context, commitment can be defined as attachment, identification, or loyalty to an entity (Singh & Gupta, 2015). Historically, devotion was a solemn vow of service to God, romantic partners, or other objects important to the self. Since its introduction into management fields in the second half of the 20th century, the term commitment began to focus on the "organization" that is the object of one's service (Solinger et al., 2015). In this regard, organizational commitment is defined as the effect of an employee's identification and participation in a particular organization (Nazir et al., 2016). According to Hanaysha (2016), employees who are committed to an organization tend to exhibit positive attitudes toward corporate goals and values. Furthermore, they are more likely to develop positive work behaviors. Therefore, employee engagement is associated with employee retention, availability, performance, quality of work, and various desirable behavioral outcomes for the organization to succeed. As employees become more committed to their organizations, their retention increases, which reduces operating costs (Liou, 2008). As Dhar (2015) posits, this correlation indicates that employees who are firmly dedicated to an organization can be encouraged to achieve organizational goals without prioritizing personal gain. These explanations demonstrate that organizational commitment encompasses more than mere passive commitment; it also encompasses an employee's aspiration and active engagement in contributing in a more meaningful manner (Rita et al., 2018). For this reason, managers must understand organizational commitment and the relationship between the organization and employees from a holistic perspective.

Various definitions of organizational commitment have been discussed in literature since the concept emerged. The most used approach is the three-dimensional organizational commitment model developed by Meyer et al. (1993). This model includes emotional, normative, and continuance commitment (Ng, 2015; Zeinabadi, 2010). An alternative conceptualization of the concept is the one-dimensional structure in which commitment is conceived as a psychological bond expressed by commitment and responsibility to a goal (Solinger, 2015). Although unidimensional structures exist, it is necessary to explain the dimensions developed by Meyer et al. (1993) to gain comprehensive insight into organizational commitment. The first dimension to be explained here is emotional commitment.

Emotional Commitment

Emotional commitment is defined as an employee's attachment to the organization through emotions, identification with the organization, and participation in the organization (Noordin et al., 2010; Liou, 2008). Therefore, emotional commitment is

conceptualized as a psychological state that characterizes an employee's relationship with the organization (English et al., 2010). In other words, employees with emotional commitment work beyond what is necessary to obtain a specified reward (Vanhalala et al., 2016). Employees with strong emotional commitment identify strongly with their organizations, participate in it, and enjoy membership. Therefore, a positive relationship with the organization is established due to the desired work behavior (Filstad, 2011; Noordin et al., 2010). Weng et al. (2010) stated that employees voluntarily stay in an organization because the organization meets employees' career needs. Another dimension of organizational commitment is normative commitment.

Normative Commitment

Normative commitment refers to psychological commitment based on socialization experiences that emphasize the appropriateness of an employee's commitment to the organization or a moral obligation to repay the benefits obtained from the organization (Weng et al., 2010). When employees share goals or values, they are more likely to see fit to obey the authority and norms of the group (Liou, 2008). Therefore, normative commitment requires an employee's commitment to the organization. Employees with high normative commitment remain within an organization due to a sense of obligation (Yousef, 2017; Nazir et al., 2016). According to Grego-Planer (2019), an employee's level of normative commitment may be affected by the rules he accepts and the mutual relationship between the organization and employees. The third dimension of organizational commitment is continuance commitment.

Continuance Commitment

Continuance commitment refers to employees' evaluations of whether the costs of leaving the organization are more significant than the costs of staying (Wang et al., 2020; Bahrami et al., 2016). Unlike affective and normative commitment, continuous commitment is based on value maximization and is therefore instrumental. Continuance commitment occurs when employees feel they should stay with an organization because of the benefits that employers provide them (e.g., seniority, schedule flexibility, autonomy, and compensation) or because there are no comparable employment alternatives (Wang et al., 2020). Employees with continuance commitment only perform the minimum required to retain their positions (Liou, 2008). Grego-Planer (2019) asserted that an employee with continuance commitment is less productive and has more complex relationships with colleagues. Herein, a rational approach, rather than a psychological or moral one, forms the foundation for loyalty. The greater the congruence between individual and organizational values and goals, the higher the employee's commitment to the organization (Rita et al., 2018). Another concept discussed in organizational commitment within the framework of the changing business ecosystem is organizational citizenship behavior.

Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Organizational citizenship behavior refers to an extra individual behavior that is informal, not directly or explicitly recognized in the work system, yet can enhance the effectiveness of organizational functions (Organ, 1988). Employees who feel like they are "citizens" of the organization they work for, like citizens of a state, engage in voluntary actions that benefit their colleagues and the organization (Grego-Planer, 2019; Pham et al., 2019). Organizational citizenship behavior is a voluntary act that supports employees' task performance and contributes to maintaining and developing the social and psychological context within the organization (Takeuchi et al., 2015; Rego et al., 2010). In other words, organizational citizenship behavior is informal behavior in which employees act beyond expectations and help promote the welfare of the organization and the security of the individual (Shahin et al., 2014). For this reason, organizational citizenship behavior entails the performance of positive actions that are not explicitly stated in the organization's norms and regulations but come from within the employees' work and functioning.

Organizations and employees benefit from this type of behavior. Such behaviors contribute to the development of social capital and facilitate the smooth functioning of the social mechanisms of an organization. Consistent with these conclusions, empirical studies have found that organizational citizenship behavior is associated with team and organizational effectiveness indicators, such as sales performance, productivity, product quality, and customer satisfaction (Bolino et al., 2015). This finding shows that when employees are satisfied by being treated attentively and given importance for their personal development and progress, they respond by exhibiting positive attitudes and behaviors for the general benefit of the organization (Indahyati & Sintaasih, 2019). According to Boiral and Paille (2012), the concept of organizational citizenship includes cooperation, collaboration, and self-sacrifice, including the maintenance of positive interpersonal relationships, assistance with the fulfillment of new employees' duties, the resolution of interpersonal conflicts, and the recognition of the achievements of others.

In this context, the five dimensions of organizational citizenship behavior are altruism, sportsmanship, civic virtue, conscientiousness, and courtesy (Kataria et al., 2013). *Altruism* refers to discretionary behaviors aimed at helping other individuals with an

organizational task or problem. *Sportsmanship* means tolerating the discomforts and troubles of organizational life without complaining or turning them into problems. *Civic virtue* is defined as responsible participation in an organization's political processes (e.g., contributing to discussions or participating in organizational activities to support and improve the organization) (Ocampo et al., 2018; Rego et al., 2010). While *conscientiousness* refers to behavior that goes beyond the requirements set by the organization in the work environment, *courtesy* relates to an employee's consideration of how his actions affect others (Shahin et al., 2014). As understood from the dimensions, organizational citizenship behavior emphasizes an intense and meaningful relationship between employees and organizations.

The goal of any organization should be to achieve organizational effectiveness, which can be defined as the maximization of employee work efficiency and commitment, the ability to perform well in difficult times, and maintaining intrinsic motivation (Kataria et al., 2013). Research has revealed that the contribution of organizational citizenship behavior to the smooth and efficient functioning of an organization may depend mainly on voluntary behaviors that are not defined by the organization. These include mutual aid among employees, participation in various non-rewarded organizational activities, personal development efforts, promotion of corporate image and values and constructive suggestions (Boiral and Paille', 2012). Considering that work generally entails collective rather than individual effort, when solidarity and cooperation among teams and employees is required, organizational citizenship behavior comes to the fore. In a highly competitive business environment, employees provide a competitive advantage. Therefore, researchers have investigated the potential of human resource practices to predict organizational citizenship behavior (Ocampo et al., 2018). In this context, the effectiveness of management policies and HR strategies partly depends on how managers understand, comprehend, and evaluate organizational commitment and citizenship behavior. However, the changing paradigm renders the conventional concepts, tools, and techniques used to solve organizational issues inadequate. Therefore, the changing paradigm must be discussed and clarified.

The Transformation from Modernism to Postmodernism

In the last century, businesses have been designed and managed with a logical and mechanical paradigm primarily based on reason and scientific principles (Biberman & Whitty, 1997). This paradigm is defined by modernism, human beings are rational beings, and businesses must be rational organizations. On this rational basis, it is always possible to identify and implement the most effective and efficient methods. Organizations can overcome various managerial difficulties to achieve their goals in this context. In contrast to modernism, which is characterized by the assumption that rational humans can prevail in the struggle with nature and life, postmodernism emphasizes liberation from the natural world and the division of culture into distinct areas rather than struggling with it (Hassard, 1999). In this context, the most effective method for an organization to achieve its goals has been superseded by a series of fragmented, intuitive, relative, local, and subjective approaches. In epistemological terms, postmodernism involves critical questioning of the assumptions and consequences of modernism. Modernism is used to express the ideals of Enlightenment, in which scientific reasoning replaced the baseless theories, speculations, superstitions, and witchcraft of the Middle Ages (the premodern age) (Franklin, 1998). In the postmodern paradigm, the idea of a superior, objective perspective is completely rejected, and the inherent instability of an organization is emphasized (Hassard, 1999). According to Franklin (1998), postmodernism in social sciences first questions and then rejects the objectification of positivism borrowed from physics and other disciplines. For example, modern (i.e. modernist) organizational analysis treats the idea of organization as an abstraction, as if it were "out there, distant from the community that constitutes the entity itself." In contrast, postmodernism adopts a different ontology and forces individuals to explain the world from their perspectives and experiences, not as passive and distant observers but as stakeholders and activists.

Individuals who adopt the modern management paradigm are expected to adhere to a set of rigid attitudes and beliefs regarding their own nature, superiors, and subordinates, as well as a set of behavioral patterns that align with these beliefs. (Biberman & Whitty, 1997). For example, they may do this to strengthen the bonds of goodwill between themselves and their employees, motivate them to work harder, or sometimes because of social norms. The \$5 per day minimum wage policy implemented by Henry Ford is well known. Ford's objectives were to reduce absenteeism, avoid losing employees to other businesses, and reduce the risk of strike casualties. Many employers have resorted to similar measures, especially when recruiting and retaining employees is challenging or when employee motivation is critical to business success (Acemoğlu & Johnson, 2023). However, unlike modern industrial societies, where production is the cornerstone, postmodern societies simulate and control social relations (Hassard, 1999). Flexibility, change, and creativity are inherent in this type of social relationship. Uymaz (2012) emphasized that the most important motivation for the postmodern individual in a life characterized by change is the drive to achieve, which includes diverse work experiences shaped by survival instincts rather than leaving permanent traces in an organization through self-actualization.

However, postmodernism focuses on another issue considered essential for the social scientific analysis of management and organization -culture. Although once seen as the periphery of organizational sociology, studies on culture have recently come to the fore recently (Hassard, 1999). In the context of culture, postmodernism emphasizes a transition from universal, uniform, and "correct" normative business approaches to a situation in which each employee builds his or her own culture. This transition

corresponds to a world in which the idea of “organization” is replaced by the idea of “organization.” In cases where the process of establishing relationships with people is a priority, there is an understanding in which the modern idea of “organization” is ignored to draw attention to organizational processes that cause constant emergence, growth, disruption, and change in time and space, and probably nothing remains constant other than the name of the organization (Franklin, 1998). In this context, differences are accepted as cultural wealth. An organizational approach has emerged, and an understanding of diversity, pluralism, and inclusion has developed.

A critical component of the modern paradigm is the belief in resource scarcity. This belief has led to a range of personal and organizational practices, such as competition, political manipulation, “padding” budget requests, empire-building, and a lack of trust and cooperation between individuals and units. Additionally, this understanding has led to the belief that the person or organization is separate from other individuals or organizations, and that preserving the self is crucial to survival, even at the cost of the other (Biberman & Whitty, 1997). Postmodernism, on the other hand, moves the origin of the problem of resource scarcity beyond an economic context. It harshly criticizes attempts to confront rational organization in production for continuous and balanced economic growth with creating rationally organized consumption models through consumer culture. This criticism causes individuals to question overworking, consume more, earn too much, and achieve promotion goals. Loyalty to the organization also receives a share of this questioning.

In this context, Ocampo et al. (2018) highlighted the challenges posed by a highly globalized and diversified environment in promoting organizational citizenship behavior among employees. Furthermore, they identify significant concerns for businesses arising from recent changes in workplace order. According to Liou (2008), individuals can devote themselves to their careers despite frequent changes in work and organization. People with this commitment style are intensely and emotionally committed to their careers. They are willing to invest considerable effort in their work, provided it serves to advance their career goals rather than those of the organization. To comprehend the reasons behind employees’ “egocentric” attitudes, it is necessary to consider the concepts of organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior.

Dynamics of Shaking Bases: A Brief Discussion

The literature indicates that engagement is a dynamic interaction process between individuals and their environment. As employees become more involved in their organization, the nature of their commitment also changes (Liou, 2008). However, with the increasing prevalence of the postmodern paradigm, the concept of organizational commitment evolves toward career commitment. This process has a hindering effect on the realization of organizational citizenship behavior. In this context, a formal consensus has yet to be reached on which organizational citizenship behavior and human resources practices lead to (Ocampo et al., 2018). The reason for these differences of opinion is that the value that the postmodern paradigm attributes to fragmentation, diversity and subjectivity has given a volatile, temporary and superficial nature to the universal work norms advocated by modernism. In the process of transformation in terms of speech, the effects of goals, organizational structure (tools), leadership understanding, and changing perception of time play a critical role.

Impact of Changing Goals

There are two schools of thought regarding the meaning of social capital. One such study is Robert Putnam, who defined social capital as people’s voluntary participation in social and civic organizations. The second, developed by Alejandro Portes and Harrison White, focuses on family, education, and labor networks. While Putnam emphasizes willingness to engage, Portes and White discuss the depth and breadth of people’s engagement in networks, whether voluntary or involuntary (Sennett, 2015). In this context, there is a trade-off between individual capacity and degree of involvement in the organization and freedom. While the demand for freedom removes individuals from organizational life, it forces them to produce a new system of values and goals under the pressure of insecurity and an uncertain future. Glasser (1998) posited that the capacity to experience pleasure, positive emotions, and freedom are defining features of humanity, enabling the expression of creativity. Creativity without freedom can cause pain to individuals, whereas creativity is meaningful to individuals when it enables them to express themselves and utilize it for constructive purposes. The postmodern individual requires the freedom to fulfill their needs and express themselves.

In this context, the government is aware of the individuality of each individual and manages the organization and its members by establishing ideal contracts that are tailored to the specific needs of each member. These contracts do not apply to other employees and may have different contents and validity periods depending on the status, age, competence and skills of each member. For example, in the United Kingdom, some organizations attempt to retain their most talented employees by offering them exceptional learning and development opportunities, promotions, and promises of higher wages. These practices result in greater employee differentiation and individualism. French sociologist François Dupuy defined this structure as an “unspoken hierarchy” (Uymaz, 2012). The legitimacy of discrimination and unequal policies is a challenge to eliminating organizations’ entropy tendencies. Hence, loyalty in organizational life cannot transcend the romantic discourse that carries the residue of modernism.

Effect of Change in Structure (Tools)

One critical element that regulates social relations in businesses is the organizational structure (Toker et al., 2017). Modern organizations require tools to gain local power, survive, and maintain a dynamic tension between empowerment and disempowerment. Therefore, departments gain power as subunits, simultaneously contributing to their downfall. As a department or function becomes increasingly powerful within itself, the organization becomes lifeless (Hassard, 1999). For this reason, in the postmodern approach, managers began to conceptualize the organization as a network rather than a pyramid. As sociologist Walter Powell notes, “network-type arrangements are more agile than pyramid-shaped hierarchies.” Although hierarchy is not subject to fixed rules in these structures, no clear definition of job duties exists because the network constantly changes its structure (Sennett, 2017). The same is true for the employee self. The self is no longer perceived as a subject to be hidden within layers of secrecy and depth; it is a decentralized network, rather than a mysterious and elusive spirit (Eagleton, 2019). In contrast to traditional pyramid-type organizational structures, modern businesses place little value on seniority, length of service, or loyalty. This shift in value systems has led to a rupture in the relationship between employees and employers (Sennett, 2015). This rupture erodes social and legal rights, such as severance pay, job security, and health insurance. However, this loss is attempted to be compensated by the individual by acquiring more free time, more productive use of abilities, and greater autonomy.

The emergence of short-term, contract, and seasonal work accompanies changes in modern institutional structures. Businesses are trying to reduce layers of bureaucracy and become flatter and more flexible organizations (Sennett, 2017). Suppose a manager expects his employees to do their duties spontaneously, devote themselves to their jobs, be emotionally committed, and keep up with innovations. Corporate bureaucratic structures become self-destructive weapons (Levinson, 2008). This is why the slogan of flexibility dominates today’s business world. The underlying approach of this slogan differs from the long-term mentality of the modern era and the interconnection of labor and capital. In the postmodern period, a short-term mentality prevailed, and capital attempted to avoid being tied to labor. The basis of this situation lies in the constant change in the information used by organizations and the market conditions in which they operate (Uymaz, 2012). Hence, the postmodern organization has structural features that reflect the socio-economic philosophies of “flexible specialization” and “post-Fordism” (Hassard, 1999). In this regard, the postmodern approach criticizes rigid hierarchical organizational structures and advocates organizing within networks. This structure, which operates as a flexible and loosely connected network rather than a rigid top-down chain of commands, can weaken social ties. In his analysis of contemporary corporate networks, sociologist Mark Granovetter says that “power of weak ties” has become a dominant force. This assertion can be understood in two ways. First, it highlights that temporary forms of association are more beneficial to individuals than long-term connections. Second, this implies that the enforcement of solid social ties, such as loyalty, is no longer a reliable mechanism. These weak ties are embodied in teamwork, which constantly moves from one task to another and changes its members on the fly (Sennett, 2017). This fluidity and instability confer a high degree of adaptability to the individual and a necessary openness to innovation. According to Biberman and Whitty (1997), the philosophy of participation adopted in the team model can be expanded to encompass human unity, higher consciousness, and continuous improvement in the 21st century. Thus, in organizational life, the rational “*homo economicus*” of the modern narrative is replaced by “*homo narrans*”¹, which is in search of meaning it can explain.

Scholars who challenged the status quo contributed to the dissemination of the postmodern paradigm within organizational contexts. For example, John Kotter advised young people to work outside organizations because of the weak ties in today’s institutions. He recommends consulting instead of getting stuck in long-term jobs. According to the author, remaining loyal to a particular organization means being trapped in an economic structure where “business styles, product designs, competitor data, capital and all kinds of information are shorter-lived.” “Employees market themselves better when they know they cannot trust the business,” said a consultant who ran a layoff operation at IBM. To cope with today’s challenges, non-commitment and superficial collaborations are preferred rather than attitudes based on commitment and merit (Sennett, 2017). In this context, disconnection and superficiality are seen as the most effective ways to survive in an ever-changing organizational structure.

Effect of Change on Leadership Ideas

In a technologically advanced communication environment, the interactions of leaders and followers are qualitatively different, more complex, and extend beyond the modernist definitions of space and time (Brocato et al., 2011). Therefore, the results of the interaction between leaders and their followers can also be identified as changing paradigm factors. The understanding of leadership in all classical, neoclassical, or modern approaches was male, patient, predictable, based on facts, planned, long-term, leveraging technology, deflationary, structured, based on left-brain rationality, top-down, and contained a culture within an axis with military symmetry. An axis shift has emerged within the postmodern approach. Leadership is inverted, unreal, immoral, impatient, inflationary, selfish, spiritual, irrational, asymmetrical, multipolar in strategy, omnidirectional, multipolar,

¹ Within the framework of this term, storytelling is believed to be a fundamental feature that distinguishes humans from animals.

omnidirectional, bottom-up, information-laden, fluid, and stubborn. The conclusion that can be drawn from this is that the leadership axis has shifted to a fast-moving, asymmetrical axis. Thus, subordinates began to emulate leader behaviors in a manner analogous to the phenomenon of mirror neurons, which has been demonstrated in neurobiology (Uymaz, 2012). Thus, organizations take on the appearance of a community of leaders. Hence, leaders are subjected to showers of criticism, now and then explicitly and implicitly (Lewis & Malmgren, 2021). Technological advancements and cultural changes have played a role in power transfer from leaders to followers. However, this process is accompanied by disillusionment and global awareness that have profoundly affected individual and collective worldviews through epistemology. In this context, individuals may perceive themselves as critical beings (French, 2016). This new form of relationship, which can be conceptualized as a community of leaders, can also be expressed as a “community of followers” in some structures. In both cases, this process in which power is shared from the leader to followers is a critical development that prevents organizational commitment from being formed.

Within the framework of these developments, developing leadership models that can reliably measure the intercultural, inter-gender, and intergenerational communication biases of an organization/stakeholders seems complicated (Brocato et al., 2011). The fact that the leader’s presence and authority are constantly questioned, and critical pressure causes different coping methods. Leaders challenge cold rationalism and claim the universality of the modern paradigm through attitude and behavioral tools such as sarcasm, entertainment, and humor (Lewis & Malmgren, 2021).

Effect of Change in Time Perception

The decline in commitment to the organization can be attributed to the shift from a “long-term” approach, which has been a dominant feature of classical management thought, to a business model based on the slogan “there is no long term” due to the accelerated pace of change in the contemporary global market. The increasing uncertainty and complexity within the framework of the global market order have led to the perception of long-term investments as a source of risk. For this reason, the public sector must consider the potential risks of long-term investments. Different employee perceptions and understandings have developed in the business environment and market order dominated by the postmodern paradigm (Sennett, 2017). The underlying belief in the futility of long-term planning is that it can lead to significant risks today (Beck, 1992). In this context, the postmodern individual tends to reject the idealized beliefs of traditions and defend realities that change dynamically and are limited by time, space, and perspective (Javanmardi, 2020). Therefore, traditional careers that progress step by step in the corridors of only one or two institutions are disappearing, and it does not seem possible for individuals to progress throughout their working life without changing their skills. Today, a young American with at least two years of college education must be prepared to change jobs and renew basic skills at least 11 times during his or her working life. A manager of ATT states that the slogan “no long term” has begun to change the meaning of work itself (Sennett, 2017):

“At ATT, we must promote the fact that the workforce is temporary, even though most temporary workers are inside the building. Projects and workspaces are replacing jobs.”

Management guru James Champy says, “People are hungry for change, because the market is now more consumer-focused than ever in history”. According to this view, the market is too dynamic to allow a job to be completed in the same way or even to do the same job from one year to the next. Economist Bennet Harrison states that this desire for change is “capital’s impatience”, that is, the desire to obtain quick returns (Sennett, 2017). This impatience leads to oppressive working conditions and inequality. The no-long-term approach, which causes individuals to move away from organizational life, forces the organization-employee relationship to seek a new balance on uncertainty. In addition, employees are increasingly moving away from the patience and discipline required for long-term career plans. As Glasser (1998) stated, this distance coincides with the satisfaction of freedom and entertainment, which are the individual’s basic needs. The postmodern individual should slow down and enjoy the moment; freedom and entertainment motivate his choices and behaviors.

The “no long-term” principle appears to have the effect of eroding trust, loyalty, and interdependence. A feeling of trust may exist in a formal framework, such as in business agreements or compliance with rules. However, more intense trust experiences often occur informally, such as knowing who to trust when taking on a challenging task. Such social ties need time to develop, and trust can only take root in the cracks and gaps in institutions eventually (Sennett, 2017). However, in contemporary postmodern society, these labor processes are further isolated from individual relationships because of the computer-controlled production structure and distribution networks that cross many national borders (Mirchandani, 2005). This informal relationship network creates a field of possibilities and opportunities in which employees maintain connections with the organization’s staff even after leaving the organization.

Conclusion

There is a need to re-empirically test whether organizational commitment and citizenship behavior are antecedents of organizational performance. However, theoretical and methodological difficulties arise in determining and explaining causal relationships between concepts. These difficulties are caused by the fact that the postmodern context still needs to be adequately understood, and sufficient insight has yet to be provided. Changes in goals, organizational structure (tools), leadership understanding, time perception, and the impact of these changes cause employees to show a tendency to decrease their commitment to organizations. The weakening of organizational commitment negatively affects organizational citizenship behavior and transforms this behavior into a utopian form of organizational life. Therefore, managers must deeply understand the evolution of the modern paradigm from which these concepts are derived toward postmodernism. Such an understanding will help them recognize the dysfunction and ineffectiveness of policymaking in building employee commitment and citizenship.

Peer Review: Externally peer-reviewed.

Author Contributions Conception/Design of Study- K.T., E.T.; Data Acquisition- K.T., E.T.; Data Analysis/Interpretation- K.T., E.T.; Drafting Manuscript- K.T., E.T. ; Critical Revision of Manuscript- K.T., E.T.; Final Approval and Accountability- K.T., E.T.

Conflict of Interest: Authors declared no conflict of interest.

Financial Disclosure: Authors declared no financial support.

ORCID:

Kerem Toker 0000-0002-1904-1406
Erdal Tekarslan 0000-0002-4423-9596

REFERENCES

- Acemoğlu, D. & Johnson, D. (2023). İktidar ve Teknoloji -Bin Yıllık Mücadele-. Çev. Duran, C., 1. Basım, İstanbul: Doğan Kitap
- Bahrami, M. A., Barati, O., Ghoroghchian, M. S., Montazer-Alfaraj, R., & Ezzatabadi, M. R. (2016). Role of organizational climate in organizational commitment: The case of teaching hospitals. *Osong Public Health and Research Perspectives*, 7(2), 96-100. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.phrp.2015.11.009>
- Beck, U. (1992). *Risk Society, Towards a New Modernity*. Sage: London.
- Biberman, J., & Whitty, M. (1997). A postmodern spiritual future for work. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 10(2), 130-138. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09534819710160790>
- Bolino, M. C., Hsiung, H. H., Harvey, J., & LePine, J. A. (2015). “Well, I’m tired of tryin’!” Organizational citizenship behavior and citizenship fatigue. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 100(1), 56-74. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0037583>
- Boiral, O., & Paillé, P. (2012). Organizational citizenship behaviour for the environment: Measurement and validation. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 109(4), 431-445. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-011-1138-9>
- Brocato, B., Jelen, J., Schmidt, T., & Gold, S. (2011). Leadership conceptual ambiguities: A post-positivistic critique. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 5(1), 35-50. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jls.20203>
- Dhar, R. L. (2015). Service quality and the training of employees: The mediating role of organizational commitment. *Tourism Management*, 46, 419-430. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2014.08.001>
- Eagleton, T. (2019). *Hayatın Anlamı*. Çev. Tunca, K. (6. Basım). Ayrıntı Yayınları: İstanbul
- English, B., Morrison, D. & Chalon, C. (2010). Moderator effects of organizational tenure on the relationship between psychological climate and affective commitment. *Journal of Management Development*, 29(4), 394-408. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02621711011039187>
- Filstad, C. (2011). Organizational commitment through organizational socialization tactics. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 23(6), 376-390. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13665621111154395>
- Franklin, P. (1998). Thinking of strategy in a postmodern way. Part 2. *Strategic Change*, 7(8), 437-448. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1099-1697\(199812\)7:8<437::AID-JSC390>3.0.CO;2-V](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-1697(199812)7:8<437::AID-JSC390>3.0.CO;2-V)
- French, R. P. (2016). Deconstructing the end of leadership: postmodernity, epistemology, and worldviews. *Sage Open*, 6(1), 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244016628588>
- Glasser, W. (1998). *Choice Theory A New Psychology of Personal Freedom*. HarperCollins Publishers: New York
- Grego-Planer, D. (2019). The relationship between organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behaviors in the public and private sectors. *Sustainability*, 11(22), 6395. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su11226395>
- Hanaysha, J. (2016). Testing the effects of employee engagement, work environment, and organizational learning on organizational commitment. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 229, 289-297. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2016.07.139>
- Hassard, J. (1999). Postmodernism, philosophy and management: concepts and controversies. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 1(2), 171-195. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2370.00011>

- Indahyati, N., & Sintaasih, D. K. (2019). The relationship between organizational justice with job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior. *International Research Journal of Management, IT and Social Sciences*, 6(2), 63-71. <https://doi.org/10.21744/irjmis.v6n2.611>
- Javanmardi, E., Liu, S., & Xie, N. (2020). Exploring the philosophical paradigm of grey systems theory as a postmodern theory. *Foundations of science*, 25(4), 905-925. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10699-019-09640-5>
- Kataria, A., Garg, P., & Rastogi, R. (2013). Employee engagement and organizational effectiveness: The role of organizational citizenship behavior. *International Journal of Business Insights & Transformation*, 6(1), 102-113.
- Lee, U. H., Kim, H. K., & Kim, Y. H. (2013). Determinants of Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Its Outcomes. *Global Business & Management Research*, 5(1), 54-65.
- Levinson, H. (2008). *Liderlik Psikolojisi*. Çev: Tayanç, D. İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları
- Lewis, C. & Malmgren, P. (2021). *Liderlik Laboratuvarı*. Çev: Şensoy, Ü., Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları: İstanbul
- Liou, S. R. (2008). An analysis of the concept of organizational commitment. *Nursing Forum*, 43(3), 116-125. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6198.2008.00103.x>
- Mercurio, Z. A. (2015). Affective commitment as a core essence of organizational commitment: An integrative literature review. *Human Resource Development Review*, 14(4), 389-414. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1534484315603612>
- Meyer, J.P., Allen, N.J., & Smith, C.A. (1993). Commitment to organizations and occupations: extension and test of a three-component conceptualization. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78(4), 538-551. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.78.4.538>
- Meyer, J. P. & Allen, N. J. (1984). Testing the "side-bet theory" of organizational commitment: Some methodological considerations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 69, 372-378. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.69.3.372>
- Mirchandani, R. (2005). Postmodernism and sociology: From the epistemological to the empirical. *Sociological Theory*, 23(1), 86-115. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0735-2751.2005.00244.x>
- Nazir, S., Shafi, A., Qun, W., Nazir, N., & Tran, Q. D. (2016). Influence of organizational rewards on organizational commitment and turnover intentions. *Employee Relations*, 38(4), 596-519. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ER-12-2014-0150>
- Ng, T. W. (2015). The incremental validity of organizational commitment, organizational trust, and organizational identification. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 88, 154-163. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2015.03.003>
- Ng, T. W., & Feldman, D. C. (2010). Idiosyncratic deals and organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 76(3), 419-427. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2009.10.006>
- Noordin, F., Omar, S., Sehan, S., & Idrus, S. (2010). Organizational climate and its influence on organizational commitment. *International Business & Economics Research Journal*, 9(2), 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.19030/iber.v9i2.516>
- Ocampo, L., Acedillo, V., Bacunador, A. M., Balo, C. C., Lagdameo, Y. J., & Tupa, N. S. (2018). A historical review of the development of organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) and its implications for the twenty-first century. *Personnel Review*, 47(4), 821-862. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-04-2017-0136>
- Organ, W.D. (1988). *Organizational Behavior Citizenships: The Good Soldier Syndrome*, LexingtonBooks, Lexington, MA
- Pham, N. T., Tučková, Z., & Jabbour, C. J. C. (2019). Greening the hospitality industry: How do green human resource management practices influence organizational citizenship behavior in hotels? A mixed-methods study. *Tourism Management*, 72, 386-399. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2018.12.008>
- Rego, A., Ribeiro, N., & Cunha, M. P. (2010). Perceptions of organizational virtuousness and happiness as predictors of organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 93(2), 215-235. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-009-0197-7>
- Rita, M., Payangan, O. R., Rante, Y., Tuhumena, R., & Erari, A. (2018). Moderating effect of organizational citizenship behavior on the effect of organizational commitment, transformational leadership and work motivation on employee performance. *International Journal of Law and Management*, 60(4), 953-964. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJLMA-03-2017-0026>
- Sennett, R. (2017). *Karakter Aşınması*. Çev: Yıldırım, B. Ayrıntı Yayınları: İstanbul.
- Sennett, R. (2015). *Yeni Kapitalizm Kültürü*. Çev: Onocak, A. Ayrıntı Yayınları: İstanbul.
- Shahin, A., Naftçali, J. S., & Pool, J. K. (2014). Developing a model for the influence of perceived organizational climate on organizational citizenship behaviour and organizational performance based on balanced score card. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 63(3), 290-307. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPPM-03-2013-0044>
- Singh, A., & Gupta, B. (2015). Job involvement, organizational commitment, professional commitment, and team commitment. *Benchmarking: An International Journal*, 22(6), 1192-1211. <https://doi.org/10.1108/BIJ-01-2014-0007>
- Solinger, O. N., Hofmans, J., & Van Olffen, W. (2015). The dynamic microstructure of organizational commitment. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 88(4), 773-796. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joop.12097>
- Takeuchi, R., Bolino, M. C., & Lin, C. C. (2015). Too many motives? The interactive effects of multiple motives on organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 100(4), 1239-1248. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000001>
- Toker, K., Çetin, C., Güven, B., & Aksu, B. (2017). Örgüt yapısının örgütsel sinizm üzerindeki etkisi üzerine lojistik sektöründe bir araştırma. *Journal of Current Researches on Social Sciences*, 7(4), 247-264. <https://doi.org/10.26579/jocress-7.4.19>
- Uymaz, A.O. (2012). *Örgütsel davranışa post-modern yaklaşım*. (Yayınlanmamış doktora tezi). İstanbul Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- Wang, W., Albert, L., & Sun, Q. (2020). Employee isolation and telecommuter organizational commitment. *Employee Relations: The International Journal*, 42(3), 609-625. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ER-06-2019-0246>
- Weng, Q., McElroy, J. C., Morrow, P. C., & Liu, R. (2010). The relationship between career growth and organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 77(3), 391-400. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2010.05.003>

- Vanhala, M., Heilmann, P., & Salminen, H. (2016). Organizational trust dimensions as antecedents of organizational commitment. *Knowledge and Process Management*, 23(1), 46-61. <https://doi.org/10.1002/kpm.1497>
- Yahaya, R., & Ebrahim, F. (2016). Leadership styles and organizational commitment: literature review. *Journal of Management Development*, 35(2), 190-216. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JMD-01-2015-0004>
- Yousef, D. A. (2017). Organizational commitment, job satisfaction and attitudes toward organizational change: A study in the local government. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 40(1), 77-88. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01900692.2015.1072217>
- Zeinabadi, H. (2010). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as antecedents of organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) of teachers. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 5, 998-1003. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.07.225>

How to cite this article

Toker, K., Tekarslan, E. (2024). Shaken bases: impact of changing paradigms on organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior. *Istanbul Management Journal*, 97, 30-39. <http://doi.org/10.26650/imj.2024.97.1473776>