



**EXPLORING TURNOVER, BULLYING AT WORK AND  
ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT IN THE  
COMMUNICATION FIELD**

ALINA-ROXANA DUMITRU, VLAD BURTAVERDE, TEODOR  
MIHAILA\*<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup> University of Bucharest, Department of Psychology

**Abstract**

*The purpose of this research is to test the moderating effect of organizational commitment on the relationship between bullying at work and intention to leave the organization in the context of the consolidation of two important companies in Romania.*

*The objectives of the study is to identify, explore and analyze the relationship between intention to leave the organization, organizational commitment and bullying at work in a multinational company from the communications field. The research results have confirmed a negative relationship between organizational commitment and intention to leave the organization. The same thing happened with the relationship between affective organizational commitment and intention to leave the organization and between the normative organizational commitment and intention to leave the organization.*

*It was also demonstrated that there is a positive relationship between continuance organizational commitment and bullying at work and between bullying at work and intention to leave the organization.*

*Research results regarding the moderating role of organizational commitment and its forms did not support the existence of any moderating effect of the concepts mentioned above on the relationship between workplace bullying and intention to leave the organization.*

**Cuvinte cheie:** *agresiune la locul de munca, angajament organizational, intentia de a parasi organizatia*

**Keywords:** *bullying at work, organizational commitment, turnover intentions*

---

\*Corresponding author. Email: teo.mihaila@gmail.com

## 1. INTRODUCTION

### 1.1. REPEATED AGGRESSION AT WORK

Various terms and concepts have been used to study situations where colleagues, superiors, subordinates or even customers are engaged in harassing actions at work, also known as "psychological terror" (Leymann, 1990) or "victimization" (Olweus, 1991). However, "bullying" is the term most often used in Scandinavia. In Canada and the United States the used terms are "harassment" (Brodsky, 1976), "small tyranny" (Ashforth, 1994) "workplace trauma" and "abuse towards employees" (Wilson, 1991). Table 1 provides an overview of the concepts and definitions used in the study of "bullying" in the workplace.

Even if only one serious episode (eg a physical attack) can be viewed as bullying or harassment, most definitions emphasizes the phrase "repeated negative actions" (Olweus, 1991). A closer examination of the negative acts involved has both an empirical and a conceptual aspect. Brodsky (1976) identified five forms of harassment, namely, scapegoating, name-calling, physical abuse, pressure at work and sexual harassment.

In research regarding students, "direct aggression" along with open verbal or physical abuse to the victim was distinguished from "indirect aggression", which takes the form of more subtle acts, such as exclusion or isolation of the victim from the group . (Björkqvist, Lagerspetz and Kaukiainen, 1994).

In another research, Cowie, Naylor, Rivers (2002) grouped behaviors of bullying at work into the following types: (1) threat to professional status (eg, public professional humiliation and accusations of a lack of effort of the employee), (2) threat to human (eg, nicknames, insults, intimidation, and the devaluation with respect to age the employee), (3) containment (preventing access to different opportunities, physical isolation and social and retention of information), (4 ) strain at work (undue pressure, impossible deadlines, unnecessary disturbances) (5) instability (inability to provide reliable when needed, unnecessary burdens, removing accountability and continuous remembrance of employee mistakes).

Leymann (1990) divided the actions involved in aggression and psychological terror at work in five different types, which include manipulation: (1) the

reputation of the victim, (2) its ability to fulfill the duties, (3) the opportunity of the victim to communicate with colleagues and (4) social circumstances of the victim.

## 1.2. ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT

Organizational commitment is a major focus of research since the beginning of the 1990s and was also granted considerable attention as we shall see below. It is now known, for example, that organizational commitment is a multidimensional construct and that historically, commissioning correlation and its consequences vary by size. Commitment is a force that binds an individual to an action relevant to one or more targets (Meyer and Herscovitch, 2001). This action may refer to focal and discretionary behaviors and thus the behavior of not leaving a company is defined as focal if talking about organizational commitment (Meyer and Allen, 1991; Mowday, Porter and Steers, 1974), and its main feature is that there are implications for the decision to continue or not to be a part of the company.

Brown (1996) defines commitment as a pledge or promise, an obligation of some sort and concludes that the commitment of a person in an organization or towards any object, person concerned, etc. is a complex change of internal (psychological) and external (circumstantial) influences that affects the way a person sees both a commitment and a fulfilment of conditions.

The concept of organizational commitment has a long history and has been the subject of much research analysis. This concept provides a basis for understanding the development of links between individuals and organization (Cuskelly and Boag, 2001). The more an individual is attached to the organization, the rate of retention of employees in the company decreases, which reduces operating costs (Liou, 2008 ) and behaviors such as creativity and innovation (Salleh et al., 2012).

Studies have consistently shown that organizational commitment was positively associated with individual actions, such as the low intention of individuals to seek new jobs or low rate regarding leaving the company (Cho, Johanson and Guchait, 2009). Meyer and Herscovitch (2001) suggest in their study a definition as a starting point for their model and define organizational commitment as a force that unites the individual to a course of action relevant to one or more targets and therefore commitment is different from other forms of motivation and attitudes relevant, and can influence behavior even in the absence of extrinsic motivation and positive attitudes. Organizational commitment is very

important for the organization to be successful, and employee engagement is seen as a key factor in achieving performance (Ali & Baloch, 2009). When employees believe that personnel can develop and learn within the organization to which they belong, their commitment to remain in that organization is higher (Gbadamosi, 2011).

### 1.3. TURNOVER INTENTIONS

Organizational commitment can have both positive effects and negative effects across the organization. A low level of organizational commitment is considered to bring negative effects to the company, while increased levels benefit the organization. Employees who manifest low commitment on the long term are unproductive and show professional negligence at work (Meyer, Allen, 1997), and thus organizational commitment can be seen as an organizational malfunction if characterized by sub-commitment or over-commitment (Lowman , 1993). The table below shows the characteristics of the two malfunctions. Several authors (Petriglieri, 2011; Bakker & Demero, 2006; Jacobs, 2005; Mobley, 1982) have developed and tested models in an attempt to explain intention to leave the organization. The most prominent of these is the model of workplace-resources requirements (JD-R) (Bakker and Demero, 2006) that provides a plausible explanation as to why individuals may choose to leave the organization. In most studies that used the JD-R model, intention to leave the organization is the result of the work requirements and thus professional overwork (burnout). An indirect relationship between workplace requirements and the intention to leave the organization is therefore proposed.

Bester (2012) also suggested that this idea is based on studies that have found that the requirements of the workplace, especially when there are fewer resources, stimulates depletion (opposite engagement) and leads to intention to leave organization (Bakker and Demero, 2006)

Another researcher, Jacobs (2005) proposed a different model of the intention to leave, where positive or negative perceptions of organizational culture (predictors) were related to intention to leave the organization (criterion). A number of variables mediate this relationship, such as work satisfaction, organizational citizenship behavior, organizational commitment and sharing of knowledge (Wasti, 2003). Individual perceptions about organizational culture can

trigger key mediating variables, which may again lead to decisions to leave or stay in the organization.

## **2. OBJECTIVE AND HYPOTHESES**

### **2.1. OBJECTIVE**

The objectives of the study it is to find, explore and analysis the relationship between turnover, organizational commitment and repeated bullying at work in a multinational organization.

### **2.2. HYPOTHESES**

H1. As much organizational commitment it is lower, with that much turnover is higher.

H1a) As much affective organizational commitment it is lower, with that much turnover is higher.

H1b) As much continuity organizational commitment it is lower, with that much turnover is higher.

H1c) As much normative organizational commitment it is lower, with that much turnover is higher.

H2. As much organizational commitment it is lower, with that much bullying is higher.

H2a) As much affective organizational commitment it is lower, with that much bullying is higher.

H2b) As much continuity organizational commitment it is lower, with that much bullying is higher.

H2c) As much normative organizational commitment it is lower, with that much bullying is higher.

H3. As much turnover it is higher, with that much bullying is higher.

H4. Bullying and turnover is moderated by organizational commitment

H4a) Bullying and turnover is moderated by affective organizational commitment

H4b) Bullying and turnover is moderated by normative organizational commitment

H4c) Bullying and turnover is moderated by continuity organizational commitment

### 3. METHOD

#### 3.1. PARTICIPANTS/SUBJECTS

This study include 74 participants: 54 male (73%) and 20 female (27%), age between 21 and 59 ( $M = 37.84$ ,  $AS = 10.35$ ), seniority in the company between 1 and 45 ages ( $M = 10.27$ ,  $AS = .680$ ). All participants are Romanian.

#### 3.2. INSTRUMENTS/APPARATUS/STIMULI/MATERIALS

Negative Act Questionnaire Revised (NAQ-Revised) conceput de Einarsen Hoel și Notelaers (2009). NAQ-R se bazează pe precedentă NAQ ((Einarsen și Raknes, 1997; Mikkelsen și Einarsen, 2001).

Negative Act Questionnaire Revised (NAQ-Revised) made by Einarsen Hoel și Notelaers (2009). The NAQ-R version it has 22 items and measures exposure to repeated bullying in the last 6 months with a 5-point Likert scale: Never, Sometimes, Monthly, Weekly and Daily. The Cronbach Alpha coefficient is .90 in this study. One item measured victimization after repeated aggression in the last 6 months, having 6-point Likert scale: yes; yes, but rarely; yes, sometimes; yes, several times per month; yes, many times per week; yes, many times per day (Giorgi, 2010; Einarsen, Hoel și Notelaers, 2009.).

Organizational commitment (Meyer, Allen & Smith, 1993), it consists of 18 items (4 items with reverse score) and contains three subscales: Affective organizational commitment (AOA), Continuity organizational commitment (AOC) and Normative organizational commitment (NOC). Previous research has reported a Cronbach Alpha coefficient between .74 and .83, and this instrument has a 7-point Likert scale: 1-Total disagree; 7-Total agree.

Turnover is measured with 3 items of subscale of the questionnaire Turnover Intention of Michigan Organizational Assessment and has 5-point Likert response scale: 1-Total disagree; 5-Total agree (Cammann, Fichman, Jenkins și Klesh, 1979; Seashore et al., 1982).

#### 3.3. PROCEDURE

It was obtained the approval of the General Director of a communications companies in Romania. Before filling in the questionnaires, employees were informed about the objective of the study and they signed the informal consent. Completing average duration was 15 minutes, questionnaires were administered paper and pencil.

### 3.4. EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN

This study has a cross-sectional design, the dependent variables is turnover, independent variables is bullying, and the moderating variable is organizational commitment.

## 4. RESULTS

Table 1. Pearson correlation between study variables

		organizational _commitment	Affective_ commitment	continuance_ commitment	normative_ commitment	Turnover
organizational_com mitment	Pearson Correlation	1	.804**	-.012	.870**	-.571**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.920	.000	.000
	N	74	74	74	74	74
Affective_commit ment	Pearson Correlation	.804**	1	-.067	.580**	-.383**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.571	.000	.001
	N	74	74	74	74	74
continuance_comm itment	Pearson Correlation	-.012	-.067	1	-.056	.172
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.920	.571		.637	.143
	N	74	74	74	74	74
normative_commit ment	Pearson Correlation	.870**	.580**	-.056	1	-.535**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.637		.000
	N	74	74	74	74	74
Turnover	Pearson Correlation	-.571**	-.383**	.172	-.535**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.001	.143	.000	
	N	74	74	74	74	74

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

In table 1, there can be seen the correlations between affective commitment, organizational commitment, continuance commitment, normative commitment and turnover. Thus, there was a significant correlation between organizational

commitment and turnover ( $r = -.57, p < 0.05$ ), affective commitment and turnover ( $r = -.38, p < 0.05$ ), normative commitment and turnover ( $r = -.53, p < 0.05$ ).

Tabel 1.2. Pearson correlation between study variables

		organizational_ commitment	Affective_ commitment	continuance_ commitment	normative_ commitment	Total_ work_bull
organizational_ commitment	Pearson Correlation	1	.804**	-.012	.870**	-.182
	Sig. (2- tailed)		.000	.920	.000	.124
	N	74	74	74	74	74
Affective_ commitment	Pearson Correlation	.804**	1	-.067	.580**	-.219
	Sig. (2- tailed)	.000		.571	.000	.062
	N	74	74	74	74	74
continuance_ commitment	Pearson Correlation	-.012	-.067	1	-.056	-.896**
	Sig. (2- tailed)	.920	.571		.637	.000
	N	74	74	74	74	74
normative_ commitment	Pearson Correlation	.870**	.580**	-.056	1	-.211
	Sig. (2- tailed)	.000	.000	.637		.071
	N	74	74	74	74	74
Total_ work_bull	Pearson Correlation	-.182	-.219	.896**	-.211	1
	Sig. (2- tailed)	.124	.062	.000	.071	
	N	74	74	74	74	74

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2tailed).

Tabel 1.2. Pearson correlation between study variables

		Total_work_bull	Turnover
Total_work_bull	Pearson Correlation	1	.291*
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.012
	N	74	74
Turnover	Pearson Correlation	.291*	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.012	
	N	74	74

In table 1, there can be seen the correlations between continuance commitment and bullying ( $r = .89, p < .05$ ), and bullying and turnover ( $r = .29, p < .05$ ). For the others variables does not exist significant correlations.

Table 2. Regression model analysis

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.617a	.381	.354	2.10607

Predictors: (Constant), Moderatoare\_OCQ\_work\_bullying, Total\_organisational\_commitment, Total\_work\_bull

ANOVA<sup>b</sup>

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	188.578	3	62.859	14.172	.000 <sup>a</sup>
	Residual	306.052	70	4.436		
	Total	494.630	73			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Moderatoare\_OCQ\_work\_bullying, Total\_organisational\_commitment, Total\_work\_bull

b. Dependent Variable: turnover

Table 3. Regression model analysis

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	Change Statistics			
						F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.435 <sup>a</sup>	.189	.154	2.41073	.189	5.370	3	70	.002

a. Predictors: (Constant), moderatoarex1, Total\_work\_bull, Affective\_commitment

ANOVA<sup>b</sup>

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	93.629	3	31.210	5.370	.002a
	Residual	401.001	70	5.812		
	Total	494.630	73			

a. Predictors: (Constant), moderatoarex1, Total\_work\_bull, Affective\_commitment

Dependent Variable: turnover

Table 4. Regression model analysis

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	Change Statistics			
						F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.357 <sup>a</sup>	.127	.090	2.50376	.127	3.398	3	70	.022

a. Predictors: (Constant), moderatoarex2, continuance\_commitment, Total\_work\_bull

ANOVA<sup>b</sup>

	Model	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	63.899	3	21.300	3.398	.022 <sup>a</sup>
	Residual	438.817	70	6.269		
	Total	502.716	73			

Predictors: (Constant), moderatoarex2, continuance\_commitment, Total\_work\_bull  
 Dependent Variable: turnover

Table 5. Regression model analysis

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	Change Statistics			
						F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.577 <sup>a</sup>	.333	.305	2.18802	.333	11.669	3	70	.000

a. Predictors: (Constant), moderatoarex3, normative\_commitment, Total\_work\_bull

ANOVA<sup>b</sup>

	Model	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	167.596	3	55.865	11.669	.000 <sup>a</sup>
	Residual	335.120	70	4.787		
	Total	502.716	73			

a. Predictors: (Constant), moderatoarex3, normative\_commitment, Total\_work\_bull

In table 2 where it conducted an moderating analysis between organizational commitment, bullying and turnover is not statistically significant ( $\Delta R^2 = .381$ ,  $F(3, 70) = 14.172$ ,  $p > .05$ ).

In table 3 where it conducted the same analysis between affective commitment, bullying and turnover is not statistically significant ( $\Delta R^2 = .189$ ,  $F(3, 70) = 5.37$ ,  $p > .05$ ).

In table 4 where it conducted an moderating analysis between continuance commitment, bullying and turnover is not statistically significant ( $\Delta R^2 = .333$ ,  $F(3, 70) = 11.67$ ,  $p > .05$ ).

In table 5 where it conducted an moderating analysis between normative commitment, bullying and turnover is not statistically significant ( $\Delta R^2 = .333$ ,  $F(3, 70) = 11.67$ ,  $p > .05$ ).

## 5. CONCLUSIONS

The main objectives of this study were to examine the relationship between organizational commitment and turnover, organizational commitment and bullying, but also the moderating effect of organizational commitment on relationship between turnover and bullying. Thus, the results of the study confirmed the

negative relationship between organizational commitment, turnover and bullying. The same thing it did not happened with the relationship between continuity commitment and turnover. Regarding on the relationship between continuity commitment and bullying is a strong correlation between them.

## REFERENCES

- Ali, N., Baloch, Q. B. (2009). Predictors of Organizational Commitment and Turnover Intention of Medical Representatives (An Empirical Evidence of Pakistani Companies). *Journal of Managerial Sciences*, 3(2), 263-273.
- Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1990). Organizational socialization tactics: a longitudinal analysis of links to newcomers' commitment and role orientation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33(4), 847-858.
- Allen, N. J., Meyer, J. P. (1996). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: An examination of the construct validity. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 49, 252–276.
- Ashforth, B. (1994). Petty tyranny in organizations. *Human Relations*, 47, 755–778.
- Bester, F. (2012). A model of work identity in multicultural work settings. Unpublished DPhil thesis, University of Johannesburg, Johannesburg.
- Bjorkqvist, K., Lagerspetz, K. M. J., Kaukiainen, K. (1992). Do girls manipulate and boys fight? Developmental trends regarding direct and indirect aggression. *Aggressive Behavior*, 18, 117–127.
- Brown, R. B. (1996). Organizational Commitment: Clarifying the Concept and Simplifying the Existing Construct Typology. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 49(3), 230–251.
- Cammann, C., Fichman, M., Jenkins, D., & Klesh, J. (1979). The Michigan organizational assessment questionnaire. *Unpublished manuscript, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor*.
- Cammann, C., Fichman, M., Jenkins, D., Klesh, J. (1979). The Michigan Organisational Assessment Questionnaire. Unpublished manuscript, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- Cho, S., Johanson, M. M., Guchait, P. (2009). Employees intent to leave: A comparison of determinants of intent to leave versus intent to stay. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 28(3), 374-381.
- Cowie, H., Naylor, P., Rivers, I., Smith, P. K., Pereira, B. (2002). Measuring workplace bullying. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 7(1), 33–51.
- Einarsen, S., & Raknes, B. I. (1997). Harassment in the workplace and the victimization of men. *Violence and victims*, 12(3), 247-263.

Einarsen, S., Hoel, H., & Notelaers, G. (2009). Measuring exposure to bullying and harassment at work: Validity, factor structure and psychometric properties of the Negative Acts Questionnaire-Revised. *Work & Stress*, 23(1), 24-44.

Giorgi, G. (2010). Workplace bullying partially mediates the climate-health relationship. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 25(7), 727-740.

Jacobs, E. J. (2005). *The development of a predictive model of turnover intentions of professional nurses*. University of Johannesburg: (Doctoral dissertation).

Leymann, H. (1990). Mobbing and psychological terror at workplaces. *Violence and Victims*, 5(2), 119–126.

Leymann, H. (1996). The content and development of mobbing at work. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 5(2), 165–184.

Liou, S. (2008). Nurses' intention to leave: critically analyse the theory of reasoned action and organizational commitment model. *Journal of nursing management*, 17(1), 92-99.

Meyer, J. P., Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human resource management review*, 1(1), 61-89.

Meyer, J. P., Allen, N. J., & Smith, C. A. (1993). Commitment to organizations and occupations: Extension and test of a three-component conceptualization. *Journal of applied psychology*, 78(4), 538.

Meyer, J. P., Herscovitch, L. (2001). Commitment in the workplace: Toward a general model. *Human resource management review*, 11(3), 299-326.

Meyer, J. P., Maltin, E. R. (2010). Employee commitment and well-being: A critical review, theoretical framework and research agenda. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 77(2) 323–337.

Meyer, J. P., Stanley, I. J., Parfyonova, N. M (2012). Employee commitment in context: The nature and implication of commitment profiles. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 80(1) 1–16.

Mikkelsen, E. G., & Einarsen, S. (2001). Bullying in Danish work-life: Prevalence and health correlates. *European journal of work and organizational psychology*, 10(4), 393-413.

Mowday, R.T., Steers, R.M. & Porter, L.W. (1974). The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 14, 224-247.

Olweus, D. (1991). Bully/victim problems among schoolchildren: Basic facts and effects of a school based intervention program. *The development and treatment of children aggression*, 411–448.

Porter, L. W., Steers, R. M., Mowday, R. T., Boulian, P. V. (1974). Organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover among psychiatric technicians. *Journal of applied psychology*, 59(5), 603.

Seashore, S. E., Lawler, E. E., Mirvis, P., & Cammann, C. (1982). Observing and measuring organizational change: A guide to field practice.

Wasti, A.S. (2003). Organisational commitment, turnover intentions and the influence of cultural values. *Journal of Occupational and Organisational Psychology*, 76(3), 303–321.

Wilson, C. B. (1991). U.S. businesses suffer from workplace trauma. *Personnel Journal*, 47–50.

### **REZUMAT**

*Scopul acestei cercetări este acela de a testa rolul moderator al angajamentului organizațional asupra relației dintre intenția de a părăsi organizația și agresiunea repetată la locul de muncă în contextul fuziunii a două mari companii din România.*

*Astfel, obiectivele studiului este acela de a identifica, explora și analiza relațiile existente între variabilele intenția de a părăsi organizația, angajamentul organizațional și agresiunea repetată la locul de muncă în cadrul unei companii multinaționale din domeniul comunicațiilor.*

*Astfel, rezultatele cercetării au confirmat o relație negativă între angajamentul organizațional și intenția de a părăsi organizația și același lucru s-a întâmplat și în cazul relațiilor dintre angajamentul organizațional afectiv și intenția de a părăsi organizația și dintre angajamentul organizațional normativ și intenția de a părăsi organizația.*

*De asemenea, s-a demonstrat că există o relație pozitivă între angajamentul organizațional de continuitate și agresiunea repetată la locul de muncă și între agresiunea repetată la locul de muncă și intenția de a părăsi organizația.*

*Rezultatele cercetării în ceea ce privește rolul moderator al angajamentului organizațional și al formelor acestuia nu au susținut existența vreunui efect moderator al conceptelor menționate mai sus asupra relației dintre agresiunea repetată la locul de muncă și intenția de a părăsi organizația.*