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Abstract

This study has done to surveying relationship between organizational health with seven dimensions (institutional integrity, principal influence, consideration, initiating structure, resource support, morale and academic emphasis) and organizational commitment with three dimensions (affective, continuous, and normative commitment). We determined the amount of the sample size with the used of Cochran sampling method which the statistical sample is 130 of Mehr housing cooperative company managers which have been selected through the simple random sampling method. To gathering of data, we used a questionnaire in organizational health according to Hoy & Feldman (1987) and organizational commitment according to Allen & Meyer (1990). Questionnaire reliability was estimated by calculating Cronbach’s Alpha that was 0.92. In order to analyze the data resulted from collected questionnaires deductive and descriptive statistical methods are used. The results Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test shows the test distribution is not Normal. So we can use Spearman Correlation coefficients to test the hypothesis of the research. Findings confirm our hypothesis (H1) and we find a strong positive and meaningful relation between organizational health and organizational commitment at Mehr housing cooperative companies’ managers in Shoushtar City.
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INTRODUCTION

Today, competitive advantage doesn't go to the company with the best widget. It goes to the organization that can reinvent itself and defend itself from attackers -- wherever they may come from better than anyone else. This is so much more important now than in the past because returns for organizational health are far greater than they have been in the past. Focusing exclusively on performance is now just table stakes. Today, competitive advantage doesn't go to the company with the best widget. It goes to the organization that can reinvent itself and defend itself from attackers -- wherever they may come from -- better than anyone else (Price, 2010). It's impossible to get a defendable, sustainable advantage unless you can adapt rapidly. That is why having a healthy organization is more important now than it's ever been. Health is the capacity of
the organization to compete not only today, but tomorrow. Price (2010) believe that there Health having three elements:

- **Organization alignment.** Does the organization know where it's going? Are the people within that organization aligned about that direction? That may sound simplistic, but in many organizations it's not the case. There isn't a deep level of alignment around purpose and mandate from the leaders all the way to the frontline employees that make a difference to customers.

- **Capacity for execution.** This is the ability to turn ideas into action. How much interference is there? How much complexity slows a company's metabolic rate?

- **Capacity for renewal.** Is the organization changing at or just above the rate at which it's changed in the past? Or is the organization really focusing on changing at the rate required by the industry? (Price, 2010).

Organizational Health encompasses all the psychological, physiological and social components of the organizational system – all the distinctly human parts and culture elements that contribute to organizational function and capacity. Biology provides a good analogy: while Organizational Structure describes the skeleton, Organizational Health describes the muscle and soft tissues that animate that skeleton and allow it to function. Organizations face many complex challenges to their effectiveness, capacity and sustainability. One common factor contributes to an organization's capacity to meet these challenges – the human element – the focus of an Organizational Health approach (Fisher, 2007). Organizational health is an organization’s ability “to function effectively, to cope adequately, to change appropriately and to grow from within,” (Hill, (2003).

The theoretical framework of Coleman and Roney’s study is Hoy and Feldman’s (1987) concept of organizational health, which has both sociological and educational overtones. Their framework is an outgrowth of the Parson (1958) framework that identifies three areas of control which schools exert over their environment – technical, managerial and institutional. The concept of organizational health is defined by three levels of control—the technical, managerial, and institutional—which combine to create a healthy school. The technical level addresses issues related to a school’s academic emphasis and the affiliation of its teachers, inclusive of job satisfaction and a commitment to colleagues and students. At the managerial level issues of leadership, principal influence and resource support are at work. Lastly, the level of institutional integrity is described as “the degree to which the school can cope with environment in a way that maintains the educational integrity of its programs” (Hoy & Hannum, 1997, p. 294).

Behind the organizational health researchers and managers pay special attention to employees’ organizational commitment based on the belief that organizations with committed employees achieve superior long-term performance. Over the decades, studies involving organizational commitment have also been pervasive in sales research (Mulkiet al, 2006). This research focus is understandable, as a recent meta-analysis indicated that the positive relationship between organizational commitment and job performance is stronger for salespeople than for non-sales employees (Jaramillo et al, 2005). This notion echoes Pierce and Dunham’s (1987) observation that organizational commitment is more important in jobs that are complex, require adaptability, and demand initiatives, all of which are characteristics of personal selling (Sager and Johnston 1989).
The concept organizational commitment has grown in popularity in the literature on industrial and organizational psychology. Early studies on organizational commitment viewed the concept as a single dimension, based on an attitudinal perspective, embracing identification, involvement and loyalty. According to Porter et al (1974) an attitudinal perspective refers to the psychological attachment or affective commitment formed by an employee in relation to his identification and involvement with the respective organization (Rahimi and Vazifeh Damirchi, 2012).

Meyer and Allen (1984) initially viewed organizational commitment as two-dimensional namely, affective and continuance. Meyer and Allen (1984, p 375) defined the first dimension, namely affective commitment as “positive feelings of identification with, attachment to and involvement in the work organization”, and they defined the second dimension, namely continuance commitment as “the extent which employees feel committed to their organization by virtue of the costs that they feel are associated with leaving”. After further research, Allen and Meyer (1990) developed a three-component model, consisting of affective commitment, continuance commitment, and normative commitment. They define affective commitment as being based on one’s values, with normative commitment based on obligation, and continuance commitment based on calculation of costs and benefits. They argue that these components are differentially linked to variables as antecedents and consequents (Meyer, Allen, and Smith 1993). The three-component model has received considerable interest from organizational researchers and has been tested in a variety of empirical settings.

According to Mowday et al (1982) affective commitment is a strong belief in and acceptance of the organizational goals and values, a willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization and a strong desire to maintain membership in the organization (p. 27).

In contrast, Commeiras and Fournier (2001) said that continuance commitment is the outcome of an individual’s decision to remain with an organization because of the personal time and resources already devoted to the company and because of the financial costs of changing jobs (p. 239).

In addition, normative commitment is defined by Wiener (1982) as the totality of internalized normative pressures to act in a way which meets organizational goals and interests (p. 421).

The three-component model suggests that an employee can experience different levels of all three forms of commitment (Allen and Meyer 1990).

The conceptual model of this study in organizational health with seven dimensions (institutional integrity, principal influence, consideration, initiating structure, resource support, morale and academic emphasis) according to Hoy & Feldman (1987) and organizational commitment with three dimensions affective, continuous, and normative commitment) according to Allen & Meyer (1990).

Fig 1. Conceptual model
METHOD

The main purpose of this study was surveying the relationship between organizational health and organizational commitment. We determined the amount of the sample size with the used of Cochran sampling method which the statistical sample is 130 of Mehr housing cooperative company managers which have been selected through the simple random sampling method. To gathering of data, we used a questionnaire in organizational health according to Hoy & Feldman (1987) and organizational commitment according to Allen & Meyer (1990). Questionnaire reliability was estimated by calculating Cronbach’s Alpha that was 0.92.

In order to analyze the data resulted from collected questionnaires deductive and descriptive statistical methods are used. The results Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test shows the test distribution is not Normal. So we can use Spearman Correlation coefficients to test the hypothesis of the research. In order to determine the relationship between the variables of the study, the SPSS tool has been used

HYPOTHESES RESULTS

In this paper we have one main hypothesis and seven sub-hypothesis. The statistical way of analysis of hypotheses is two ways, H₁ is acceptance of hypothesis and H₀ is rejecting of hypothesis. In other words, it means that H₁ has positive meaning and H₀ has negative meaning.

Hypothesis 1: There is significant correlation between institutional integrity and Managers commitment at Mehr housing cooperative companies in Shoushtar city

Table 1: Results of Correlation coefficient between There is a significant relationship between institutional integrity and managers commitment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>institutional integrity</td>
<td>Managers commitment</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>0.671</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Confirm H₁</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to table (1), the evaluated p-value is 0.000. So, the correlation between institutional integrity and managers commitment in the p ≤ 0.05 had been significant, and we reject H₀ and accepted H₁ hypothesis with 95% confidence. And says that institutional integrity and managers commitment have significant correlation with managers commitment at Mehr housing cooperative companies’ managers in Shushtar City.

**Hypothesis 2:** There is significant correlation between principal influence and Managers commitment at Mehr housing cooperative companies in Shoushtar city

Table 2: Results of Correlation coefficient between principal influence and managers commitment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>principal influence</td>
<td>Managers commitment</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>0.467</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Confirm H₁</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to table (2), the evaluated p-value is 0.000. So, the correlation between principal influence and managers commitment in the p ≤ 0.05 had been significant, and we reject H₀ and accepted H₁ hypothesis with 95% confidence. And says that principal influence and managers commitment have significant correlation with managers commitment at Mehr housing cooperative companies’ managers in Shushtar City.

**Hypothesis 3:** There is significant correlation between consideration and Managers commitment at Mehr housing cooperative companies in Shoushtar city

Table 3: Results of Correlation coefficient between consideration and managers commitment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>consideration</td>
<td>Managers commitment</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>0.331</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Confirm H₁</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to table (3), the evaluated p-value is 0.000. So, the correlation between consideration and managers commitment in the p ≤ 0.05 had been significant, and we reject H₀ and accepted H₁ hypothesis with 95% confidence. And says that consideration and managers commitment have significant correlation with managers commitment at Mehr housing cooperative companies’ managers in Shushtar City.

**Hypothesis 4:** There is significant correlation between initiating structure and Managers commitment at Mehr housing cooperative companies in Shoushtar city

Table 4: Results of Correlation coefficient between initiating structure and managers commitment.
According to table (4), the evaluated p-value is 0.000. So, the correlation between initiating structure and managers commitment in the \( p \leq 0.05 \) had been significant, and we reject \( H_0 \) and accepted \( H_1 \) hypothesis with 95% confidence. And says that initiating structure and managers commitment have significant correlation with managers commitment at Mehr housing cooperative companies’ managers in Shushtar City.

**Hypothesis 5:** There is significant correlation between resource support and Managers commitment at Mehr housing cooperative companies in Shoushtar city

Table 5: Results of Correlation coefficient between resource support and managers commitment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>resource support</td>
<td>Managers commitment</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>0.231</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Confirm ( H_1 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to table (5), the evaluated p-value is 0.000. So, the correlation between resource support and managers commitment in the \( p \leq 0.05 \) had been significant, and we reject \( H_0 \) and accepted \( H_1 \) hypothesis with 95% confidence. And says that resource support and managers commitment have significant correlation with managers commitment at Mehr housing cooperative companies’ managers in Shushtar City.

**Hypothesis 6:** There is significant correlation between morale and Managers commitment at Mehr housing cooperative companies in Shoushtar city

Table 6: Results of Correlation coefficient between morale and managers commitment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>morale</td>
<td>Managers commitment</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>0.268</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Confirm ( H_1 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to table (6), the evaluated p-value is 0.000. So, the correlation between morale and managers commitment in the \( p \leq 0.05 \) had been significant, and we reject \( H_0 \) and accepted \( H_1 \) hypothesis with 95% confidence. And says that morale and managers commitment have significant correlation with managers commitment at Mehr housing cooperative companies’ managers in Shushtar City.

**Hypothesis 7:** There is significant correlation between academic emphasis and managers commitment at Mehr housing cooperative companies in Shoushtar city
Table 7: Results of Correlation coefficient between academic emphasis and managers commitment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>academic emphasis</td>
<td>Managers commitment</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>0.391</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Confirm H₁</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to table (7), the evaluated p-value is 0.000. So, the correlation between academic emphasis and managers commitment in the p ≤ 0.05 had been significant, and we reject H₀ and accepted H₁ hypothesis with 95% confidence. And says that academic emphasis and managers commitment have significant correlation with managers commitment at Mehr housing cooperative companies’ managers in Shushtar City.

Main Hypothesis: There is significant correlation between organizational health managers commitment at Mehr housing cooperative companies in Shoushtar city

Table 8: Results of Correlation coefficient between organizational health and managers commitment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>organizational health</td>
<td>Managers commitment</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>0.635</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Confirm H₁</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to table (8), the evaluated p-value is 0.000. So, the correlation between organizational health and managers commitment in the p ≤ 0.05 had been significant, and we reject H₀ and accepted H₁ hypothesis with 95% confidence. And says that organizational health and managers commitment have significant correlation with managers commitment at Mehr housing cooperative companies’ managers in Shushtar City.

CONCLUSION

This study has done to surveying relationship between organizational health with seven dimensions (institutional integrity, principal influence, consideration, initiating structure, resource support, morale and academic emphasis) according to Hoy & Feldman (1987) and organizational commitment with three dimensions affective, continuous, and normative commitment) according to Allen & Meyer (1990). The population was Mehr housing cooperative companies’ managers in Shushtar City. To examine the topic we developed one main hypothesis and seven sub-hypothesis. Findings confirm our hypothesis (H₁) and we find a strong positive and meaningful relation between organizational health and organizational commitment at Mehr housing cooperative companies’ managers in Shushtar City.

- There is significant correlation between institutional integrity and Managers commitment at Mehr housing cooperative companies in Shoushtar city (r=0.671).
- There is significant correlation between principal influence and Managers commitment at Mehr housing cooperative companies in Shoushtar city (r=0.467).
There is significant correlation between consideration and Managers commitment at Mehr housing cooperative companies in Shoushtar city (r=0.331).

There is significant correlation between initiating structure and Managers commitment at Mehr housing cooperative companies in Shoushtar city (r=0.388).

There is significant correlation between resource support and Managers commitment at Mehr housing cooperative companies in Shoushtar city (r=0.231).

There is significant correlation between morale and Managers commitment at Mehr housing cooperative companies in Shoushtar city (r=0.268).

There is significant correlation between academic emphasis and Managers commitment at Mehr housing cooperative companies in Shoushtar city (r=0.391).
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