Does Number of Years of Work Impact Employee behaviour in An Organization?

Mauli Mahajan
Senior Faculty,
Deptt.of Management,
American College of Dubai,
Dubai.

Abstract

The aim of the research was to study if there is any impact on the behaviour of employees in relation to the number of years they have worked in an organization. Nine different instruments were used to measure various employee dimensions such as Organizational Role Stress (ORS), Role-Efficacy (RE), Stress Tolerance level (STL), Organizational Commitment (OC), Motivational Orientation (MO) and Conflict Management Style (CMS). The study intended to answer the following questions: Ranging from less than a year, 1 to 2 years, 2 to 4 years, 4 to 6 years, 6 to 8 years, 8 to 10 years and 10 to 15 years of work, which range leads to high or low level of ORS, RE, STL, OC, MO & CMS? Null hypothesis was generated and was verified by an investigation which was based on interpretation and analysis of the instruments that was obtained through empirical research from 798 employees, in Mumbai city- India. Study revealed that, employees working since 1 to 2 years and 10 to 15 years scored significantly higher on ORS dimension and between 8 to 10 years scored significantly lower. Employees working since 2 to 4 years and 4 to 6 years scored significantly higher on RE and 10 to 15 years and 8 to10 years scored significantly lower. Depression was felt highest by employees who had served between 8 to 10 years and 10 to15 years and lowest between 4 to 6 and 6 to 8 years. Highest anxiety was felt by employees between 2 to 4 years and lowest was scored by employees between 1 to 2, 4 to 6, 6 to 8 and 10 to 15 years. Anger was scored highest by 10 to15 year's group and lowest by employees in the 1st year of their work. Highest score on Type-A-Behaviour was felt by 10 to 15 years group and lowest by 4 to 6 and 8 to10 years group. On the dimension of OC highest was scored by employees who had worked for 8 to 10 years and lowest by less than 1 year group. On MO dimension, highest was scored by employees who had worked for 1 to 2 years and lowest by 8 to 10 years group. As for the conflict management style, all the employees who had worked for less than one year to 15 years, they all go for collaborating and compromising approach. So we can conclude that different years of service in an enterprise bring out various highs and lows of different behavioural dimensions among employees.

Introduction

Today's fast growing and challenging business environment demands organizations to perform efficiently and systematically to consciously and competently face and deal with the emerging challenges and changes. This calls for leadership inputs at every level. It is well established that leadership has substantial influence on human performance and it is the quality and competency of human capital which determines success or failure of organizations. Leadership, therefore, is not to be perceived as position of power, but a skill that can enhance confidence in people by reorganizing each other's strengths and work together towards achieving goals and targets of an organization.

Second important factor to be considered is the number of years put in by the employee in the same organization. Before the scenario was such that an individual felt quiet secured and comfortable in the job he/she was doing and did not think of replacing it fast. The thought of change may have discomforted him/her so he/she may have continued the job in the same organization even though he/she may not have been 100% happy or satisfied. But in today's time with challenging competitive environment one

has started to think and act on replacement. It has made an individual jump from one job to another faster than before. This may be due to either better packages offered, better position/status, variety of work, intellectual stimulation, abuse from customers, high level of stress, high burn out, long hours at work, mergers and downsizing, difficult job at hand, not getting along with people or due to individual ambition to grow and achieve higher. Some jobs with high turnover rate are retail (67%), food service (62.2%), information technology (50%), nursing (43%), childcare (30%), hospitality (31 to 34%) and sales (66%).

Whatever may be the reason but it directly or indirectly affects positively or negatively to the organization or/and to the individual. Some negatives of high turn over rate on the organization are, it adds to the cost and time alongwith affecting the team dynamics, productivity and continuity of the organization. Compared to that there are some positive for staying with the organization for long such as, seniority, leadership opportunities, stability, increased benefits, self-improvement, perseverance, a say in company's future etc.

Thus it becomes interesting to know how number of years of working in the same organization influences the behavior of an employee, positively or negatively. The researcher identified nine behavioral dimensions such as role stress,role-efficacy, depression, anxiety, anger, motivation, commitment and conflict management styles that are found to be significant in influencing employee behavior and compared its effect on employees who have worked for less than 1 year to 15 years in the same organization.

Aim of the Study

The study was undertaken to find out if number of years of work in an organization impacts employee behavior.

Methodology

In order to determine the impact of number of years of work on employee behavior, qualitative research method was used. Enterprises were identified through reference mechanism with specific selection criteria such as:
1. Having employee strength of 90-100 in number,
2. Having investment of 1 - 1.5 crores, and
3. Having made some level of profit since last 5 years.

Out of 47 enterprises, 38 enterprises agreed to be part of the study with a condition that their identity will be kept strictly confidential. Three employees from each enterprise were randomly selected from each category of years of service making a sample size of 798. The representation of number of years in service was as follows:

Years of Service
Number of Sample

Years of Service	Number of Sample
Less than 1 year	114
1 to 2 years	114
2 to 4 years	114
4 to 6 years	114
6 to 8 years	114
8 to 10 years	114
10 to 15 years	114
Total	**798**

The study was taken up in and around Mumbai as it is the largest business center having large number of registered offices and corporate enterprises and fair representation of medium size organizations, which was confirmed from the review of secondary data.

Each employee was given a set of nine instruments to administer. They were: Organisational Role Stress Scale developed by Pareek (1981), Role Efficacy Scale developed by Pareek (1981), Depression Scale developed by Zung (1979), Self Rating Anxiety Scale developed by Zung and Cavenar (1990), State-Trait Anger Scale developed by Spielberger (1981), Type-A-Behaviour Scale developed by Gmelch (1982), Organisational Commitment Scale developed by Khokhle (1997), Motivational Orientation Questionnaire developed by Rao (1987), and Conflict Resolution Scale developed by Thomas Kilmann (1974).

Data Analysis

The data determined was statistically analysed by calculating mean and SD for each dimension under each number of years of work. In order to test the difference between mean scores of all categories, ANOVA and was calculated. To study the effect of one dimension on the other, correlation was calculated.

Results and Discussion

Table 1 shows the scores of employees who have worked for less than 1 year to the ones who have worked for 15 years. ORS was found highest in employees who had worked for 1 to 2 years and 10 to 15 years in comparison to others. This means that role stress is experienced highest during the initial years of joining work as well as after putting in more number of years in the same organization. Compared to that lowest ORS was found in employees who had worked for 8 to 10 years.

RE was found highest in employees who had worked for 2 to 4 years and 4 to 6 years, whereas it was lowest in employees who had worked for 8 to 10 years and 10 to 15 years. Depression was found highest in employees who had worked for 8 to 10 years and 10 to 15 years, whereas it was lowest in employees who had worked for 4 to 6 years and 6 to 8 years. Anxiety was found highest in employees who had worked for 2 to 4 years and lowest in employees who had worked for 1 to 2 years, 4 to 6 years, 6 to 8 years and 10 to 15 years in the same organization. Anger was found highest in employees who had worked for 10 to 15 years and lowest in employees who had worked for less than 1 year. Type A Behavior was found highest in employees who had worked for

Innovation The Research Concept

10 to 15 years and lowest for 4 to 6 and 8 to 10 years group.

Results reveal that high ORS leads to low RE, high depression, high anger and high type-a behavior, as found in the 10 to 15 years group. Role stress is seen highest during initial years of work and more than 10 years of work. It will be interesting to know various reasons that have led to the high level of stress, depression and anger.

OC was found highest in employees who had worked for 8 to 10 years and lowest amongst less than 1 year group. This stands true as when one joins the organization fresh, his attachment and commitment is not much but when one passes through various situations and experiences, where one sees how the organization reciprocates and gives back for the work done, commitment level increases after few years.

MO was found highest in employees who had worked for 1 to 2 years and lowest by 8 to 10 years group. Seems that when one joins a new organization the motivational level is very high to learn, to prove and to grow but as years pass by it comes down due to reasons such as leadership style, reward system, organizational climate, structure of work, relationship with co-worker, managing conflict at work and workshop education & learning. In the first couple of years one wants to show his potential and prove himself to the organization and so in the process gets highly motivated and charged up. But it is interesting to see that though commitment increases, motivational level goes own. That is the reason employees in 8 to 10 years group feel more depressed and their anger level goes up.

In managing conflict, avoiding style was found highest among employees who had worked for 4 to 6 years & 6 to 8 years, accommodating style was found highest amongst 1 to 2 years group, compromising & collaborating styles was found highest amongst 8 to 10 years group and competing style was found highest amongst 6 to 8 years group. In comparison to that, avoiding style was found lowest amongst 8 to 10 years group, accommodating, compromising & collaborating styles was found lowest amongst less than 1 year group and competing style was found lowest amongst 1 to 2 years group. Interestingly it was found that, all the employees who had worked for less than one year to 15 years, they all go for combination of collaborating and compromising approach to conflict management.

Table – 1
Employees Ranging From Less Than 1 Year to 15 Years of Work in the Same Organization

S. No.	Variable	1st year		1 to 2 years		2 to 4 years		4 to 6 years		6 to 8 years		8 to10 years		10 to 15 years	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
A	Organization Role Stress														
1	Inter Role Distance	5	3.536	5.09	3.986	5.64	4.43	4.23	3.632	5.6	4.402	7	3.969	5.64	5.002
2	Role Stagnation	3.77	3.059	4.82	5.363	5.57	3.4	2.92	2.253	6.7	3.713	4	3.122	6.57	4.256
3	RoleExpectation Conflict	2.62	2.987	4.09	3.961	3.18	2.68	3.31	3.011	3.3	4.855	2	2.291	4	3.573
4	Role Erosion	8.38	3.525	5.55	4.845	6.5	3.58	6.92	4.092	8.3	6.165	4.67	3.279	7	4.455
5	Role Overload	2.15	2.764	4.36	3.982	3.36	3.9	2.62	2.815	2.2	2.573	2.33	2.784	2.36	2.649
6	Role Isolation	4.23	3.14	5.82	4.191	4.39	4.13	4.54	3.045	4.1	4.358	3.33	3.041	6.29	5.165
7	Personal Inadequacy	3.92	3.616	4.82	4.355	3.82	3.28	2.23	2.386	5.5	4.95	2.33	2.179	3.14	3.278
8	Self-Role Distance	4.85	3.532	4.82	4.355	4.04	3.41	2.15	1.864	3.9	3.479	1.33	1	4.14	2.713
9	Role Ambiguity	3.69	3.816	4.27	5.179	4.11	4.93	3.92	4.03	2	3.399	2.33	2.784	3.71	3.292
10	Resource Inadequacy	3	3.24	4	3.406	4.68	3.63	4.15	3.693	3.4	5.661	3	2.598	4.14	3.549
11	Total	40.92	20.168	48.09	37.085	45.29	28.3	37	22.61	45	33.35	32.33	20.537	47	27.65
B	Role Efficacy														
1	RES	25.46	10.129	26.45	10.885	27.82	6.59	27.54	6.827	26	6.749	23.33	10.828	24.29	12.47
2	REI (%)	73.18	24.609	77.38	18.199	79.76	11.1	79.25	11.43	76.7	11.265	72.23	18.031	71.57	26.93
C	Stress Tolerance Limit														
1	Depression	27.85	9.2	30.36	7.749	28.25	8.12	26.54	7.434	27.4	5.854	33.33	11.303	33	6.563
2	Anxiety	26.92	5.188	24.55	4.503	27.79	6.39	24.23	4.246	25.6	3.777	26.67	4.272	24.57	8.262
3	Anger - S	21.38	10.276	16.73	1.794	21.64	8.02	19.15	5.352	17.9	9.171	21.67	8.544	18.93	3.562
4	Anger - T	24.92	6.211	26.91	7.409	25.68	10	23.38	7.252	27.7	7.631	26.33	1	29	6.972
5	Type of Behavior	9	3.082	10.36	3.585	9.64	3.93	7.62	2.219	10.8	4.264	7.67	2.179	11.79	2.992

Innovation The Research Concept

D	Organizational Commitment													
1	Affective Commitment	3.46	1.4485	3.512	0.9054	3.636	1.02	4.035	0.358	4.04	0.772	4.387	0.4413	3.988	0.54
2	Normative Commitment	3.32	1.39567	3.588	0.7313	3.38	0.95	3.295	0.52	3.59	0.9551	3.55	0.4634	3.609	0.723
3	Continuance Commitment	2.31	1.009	2.65	0.556	2.88	0.82	2.66	0.723	3.47	0.818	2.83	0.5	3.18	0.948
4	TOTAL	3.025	1.22262	3.236	0.4363	3.444	1.17	3.341	0.276	3.62	0.7068	3.737	0.14	3.592	0.512
E	Motivational Orientation													
1	Achievement	21.85	2.193	21.45	2.697	19.57	3.75	19.54	5.651	21.2	3.615	18.33	2.784	19.29	4.304
2	Affiliation	19.62	4.426	19.55	5.184	17.57	5.25	15.77	4.885	20.7	3.129	16.67	6.614	17.5	4.502
3	Aggression	10.92	6.184	14.55	4.18	11.21	3.28	8.77	2.522	11.3	2.946	9	0.866	10.57	3.715
4	Extension	17.08	4.173	20.36	3.501	17.25	3.98	18.62	3.927	19.6	2.797	18.67	3.041	18.86	4.912
5	Dependence	18.69	3.119	18.45	4.18	16.18	5.2	17.38	4.214	19.1	3.843	18	5.679	19.21	3.355
6	Control	14.92	3.475	18.73	4.149	16.43	5.53	17.38	4.369	18.4	4.195	11.33	2.179	19	3.658
7	Total	101.8	9.084	113	14.491	98.21	18.7	97.46	18.66	110	14.229	92	6.062	104.4	17.22
F	Conflict Management Style													
1	Avoiding	3.31	2.016	3.73	2.611	3.11	2.06	4	2.309	4.1	2.234	3	1.5	3.93	2.269
2	Accommodating	2.85	2.444	4.55	2.067	4.43	2.49	3.31	2.496	4.1	2.234	3.33	1.803	5.21	2.155
3	Compromising	5.77	3.745	7.55	3.267	7.14	2.95	8.46	2.602	8.3	2.263	10	0.866	7.79	3.142
4	Competing	4.62	3.305	3.45	2.876	5	2.49	4.92	2.326	5.7	1.703	4.33	2.646	4.07	2.586
5	Collaborating	6.54	3.95	7.64	3.171	7.57	3.1	8.46	2.817	7.7	1.767	9.33	0.5	7.14	3.255

* The mean difference is significant at the .05 level

Conclusions and Implications

The results imply that from the day an individual starts work till every additional year, it impacts his/her behavior positively or negatively. Positive dimension such as motivational level is higher in the initial years compared to the commitment level. As the years get added, commitment level increases but motivational level decreases. Organizational role stress also increases with more years and due to which role efficacy, depression, anxiety & anger increases. Surprisingly to manage conflict, number of years doesn't influence employee behavior as both newly employed as well as old veterans, they all go for compromising and collaborating approach.

Human Resource (HR) professionals need to work on individual employee needs and develop individual programs to enhance significant behavior dimensions. Identifying reasons that lead to role stress, depression, anxiety and anger, can guide them to increase motivational level, commitment level and role efficacy which play an important role in employee satisfaction, better performance and organizational growth. Keeping this in mind suitable organizational development modules can be developed to strengthen employee behaviour and sustainability of skilled and qualified employees.

References

1. Becker Sam (2017) . Bad Jobs? 7 Jobs with the Highest Turnover Rates. CheatSheet Website.
2. Bose K. & Pareek U. (1986). The Dynamics Conflict Management Styles of the Bankers. Indian Journal of Industrial Relations, 22(1), 59-78.
3. Davila Damian (2016). The 4 Jobs People Quit the Most. WiseBread Website.
4. Dhameja S.K (2002). Women Entrepreneurs: Opportunities, Performance & Problems. Deep & Deep Publications Pvt. Ltd, New Delhi.
5. Fleishman E. A. & F. E. Harns (1962). Patterns of Leadership Behaviour Related to Employee Grievances and Turnover. Personnel Psychology, 15, 43-55.
6. Goleman Daniel (1998). Working with Emotional Intelligence. Bantam Books, New York.
7. Habibullah AHM & Sinha JBP (1980). Motivational Climate & Leadership Styles. Vikalpa, 5(27), 85-93.
8. Invancevich J. M. & T. H. Donnelly (1970). Leader Influence on Performance. Personnel Psychology, 23(4), 539-549.
9. Luhn Rebecca (1992). Managing Anger. Crisp Publications, Inc., California.
10. Luthans Fred (2002). Organizational Behaviour (Ninth edition). Mc Graw-Hill Irwin, India.
11. McClelland, David (1961). The Achieving Society.Van Nostrand,Princeton,New Jersey.
12. Mohan & V. Chauhan (1997). Organizational Role Stress as Related to Efficacy amongst Managers of Government, Public and Private Sectors. Vision 1(2), 71-77.
13. Pareek Udai, T.V. Rao & D.M. Pestonjee (1981).Behavioural Processes in Organisations. Oxford and IBH Publishing Co., New Delhi.

Innovation The Research Concept

14. *Pareek Udai (1986). Motivational Analysis of Organizations: Behaviour (MAO-B) In J.W. Pfeiffer and L.D.*

15. *Goodstein (Eds). The 1986 Annual: Developing Human Resources University Associates San Diego, pp. 121-136.*

16. *Pareek Udai (1987). Monitoring Organizational Roles: Role Efficacy Approach. Rawat Publications, Jaipur.*

17. *Pareek Udai (1987). Organisational Behaviour Process. Rawat Publications, Jaipur.*

18. *Pareek Udai (1987). Motivating Organisational Roles. Rawat Publications, Jaipur.*

19. *Pareek Udai & T.V. Rao (1992). First Handbook of Psychological and Social Instruments. Concept Publishing Company, New Delhi.*

20. *Pareek Udai (1993). Making Organisational Role Effective. Tata McGraw-Hill, New Delhi.*

21. *Pareek Udai, Aahad M. Osman-Gani, S. Ramnatayan & T.V. Rao (editor) (2002). Human Resources Development in Asia: Trends and Challenges. Oxford & IBH, Publishing Co. Pvt. Ltd, New Delhi.*

22. *Pareek Udai (2002). Training Instruments in HRD & OD (2nd edition). Tata McGraw Hill Publishing Company Ltd, New Delhi.*

23. *Pestonjee D.M. & Pareek Udai (Eds) (1997). Studies in Organisational Role Stress and Coping. Rawat Publications, Jaipur.*

24. *Rao Gangadhar & Rao Surya (1995). Motivation and Leadership. Kanishka Publication, New Delhi.*

25. *Sanghi Seema (2001). A Study of Motivational Climate in Relation to Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment. Abhigyan 19(1), 19-25.*

26. *Sayeed O.B. (1953). Job-Stress and Role Making Behaviour. Managerial Psychology, 6 (1-2), 35-57.*

27. *Sharma Chandra Shekhar (1990). Organisational Commitment: A test of Predictor Models. Productivity,31(2)179-191.*

28. *Singh Amod Kumar and Others (2001). Role efficacy and role stress as Moderators of Organizational Effectiveness. Abhigyan 19(3), 15-23.*

29. *Thomas K.W. & Kilman R.H (1974). The Thomas-Kilman Conflict Mode Instrument. Tuxedo, N.Y: Xicom.*

30. *Verma D.P.S. & Jain Kamlesh (2001). Influence of Leadership Style on Organizational Effectiveness: A Study of Indian Managers. Abhigyan, 19(1), 27-33.*

31. *Williams David (2012). 10 Reasons To Stay At A Job For 10 Or More Years. Forbes Magazine.*

32. *http://www.mnestudies.com/human-resource/factors-affecting-motivation-work*

33. *https://www.bastiansolutions.com/blog/index.php/ 2011/08/02/22-factors-that-affect-employee-motivation-and-engagement/#.WWWVAYiGPb0*

Appendix – 1
Abbreviations

ORS	:	Organization Role Stress
IRD	:	Inter Role Distance
RS	:	Role Stagnation
REC	:	Role Expectation Conflict
RE	:	Role Erosion
RO	:	Role Overload
RI	:	Role Isolation
PI	:	Personal Inadequacy
SRD	:	Self-Role Distance
RA	:	Role Ambiguity
RIN	:	Resource Inadequacy
RES	:	Role Efficacy Score
REI (%)	:	Role-Efficacy Index
MO	:	Motivational Orientation
Org. Comm.	:	Organizational Commitment
AOC	:	Affective Commitment
NOC	:	Normative Commitment
COC	:	Continuance Commitment
STL	:	Stress Tolerance Limit
CMS	:	Conflict Management Style