



Team Performance Management: An International Journal

Organizational commitment in family SMEs and its influence on contextual performance

Mário Franco, Solange Franco,

Article information:

To cite this document:

Mário Franco, Solange Franco, (2017) "Organizational commitment in family SMEs and its influence on contextual performance", Team Performance Management: An International Journal, Vol. 23 Issue: 7/8, pp.364-384, <https://doi.org/10.1108/TPM-05-2016-0020>

Permanent link to this document:

<https://doi.org/10.1108/TPM-05-2016-0020>

Downloaded on: 09 October 2017, At: 12:09 (PT)

References: this document contains references to 79 other documents.

To copy this document: permissions@emeraldinsight.com

The fulltext of this document has been downloaded 7 times since 2017*



Access to this document was granted through an Emerald subscription provided by emerald-srm:233725 []

For Authors

If you would like to write for this, or any other Emerald publication, then please use our Emerald for Authors service information about how to choose which publication to write for and submission guidelines are available for all. Please visit www.emeraldinsight.com/authors for more information.

About Emerald www.emeraldinsight.com

Emerald is a global publisher linking research and practice to the benefit of society. The company manages a portfolio of more than 290 journals and over 2,350 books and book series volumes, as well as providing an extensive range of online products and additional customer resources and services.

Emerald is both COUNTER 4 and TRANSFER compliant. The organization is a partner of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) and also works with Portico and the LOCKSS initiative for digital archive preservation.

*Related content and download information correct at time of download.

Organizational commitment in family SMEs and its influence on contextual performance

364

Mário Franco

Department of Management and Economics, University of Beira Interior, Covilha, Portugal, and CEFAGE-UBI Research Center, University of Beira Interior, Covilha, Portugal, and

Solange Franco

Faculty of Human and Social Sciences, Universidade da Beira Interior, Covilha, Portugal

Received 9 May 2016
Revised 23 January 2017
24 March 2017
19 April 2017
Accepted 1 May 2017

Abstract

Purpose – This study aims to investigate whether organizational commitment in small and medium-sized family enterprises (FSMEs) is associated with their employees' contextual performance.

Design/methodology/approach – A quantitative and exploratory research approach was adopted focusing on FSMEs based in an inland region of Portugal. These were considered family firms, being owned exclusively by one or a small number of families. The data-collecting instrument was based on a questionnaire, with the final sample being composed of 101 employees.

Findings – The results obtained allow the conclusion that in FSMEs, affective commitment has a positive influence on contextual performance, as employees in this firm segment have an emotional connection in the context in which they are situated.

Practical implications – The authors can point out the fact that the strong association between affective commitment and employees' contextual performance has a relevant role in FSMEs. Therefore, these firms must be aware of this type of organizational commitment, as affective commitment increasingly influences their employees' and teams' performance.

Originality/value – The study contributes to advancing theory regarding the relationship between organizational commitment and contextual performance in small and medium-sized enterprises with a family structure. A new dimension of organizational commitment (Imperative) was considered in the family firm context.

Keywords Team management, Small and medium-sized enterprises, Family firms, Organizational commitment, Contextual performance

Paper type Research paper



1. Introduction

As part of the segment of small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs), family firms form a particular case, as they account for the great majority of firms worldwide and are widely recognized for their important performance in the global economy (Erdem and Erdem, 2011),

namely, concerning their great number, turnover, employment created and economic effects (Pérez-Cabañero *et al.*, 2012).

In the current climate, these firms find themselves in a context of transformations, where constant change has caused major impacts on the working environment and relationships between individuals and organizations (Franco and Haase, 2012). In seeking greater efficiency, small and medium-sized family enterprises (FSMEs) have implemented organizational processes and different modernizing strategies, but these efforts become limited if such firms do not have committed employees motivated toward objectives. Vergara (2000) highlights the importance of building a relationship of commitment and the firm should be in harmony with the changes in its surrounding environment, and with its employees' performance.

This study focuses on the specific context of FSMEs, where FSMEs can be viewed through the theoretical lens of teams (Pearson *et al.*, 2014). Schjoedt *et al.* (2013, p. 3) emphasized the fundamental importance of teams in family firms, where teams have identifiable features such as "interdependent skill sets, common goals, shared commitment and mutual accountability". The family, as a team, can exert influence on the firm, simply by their shared concerns, desires and values, communicated to decision-makers, often referred to as the non-economic goals of the family (Chrisman *et al.*, 2012). The family acts as a team in its normal day-to-day functioning, entirely removed from the workplace, yet the behaviors, norms and communication likely transfer over to the functioning of the firm, either implicitly or explicitly (Arregle *et al.*, 2007). These family team factors affect the social processes that can be transferred from the family to the firm.

Understanding team functioning may help resolve or better understand the dynamic of the family team that can impact the success of the FSMEs. Thus, in recent years, there has been a notable growth in research on organizational commitment, and especially the bases for its formation (Iles *et al.*, 1996; Vallejo and Langa, 2010; Hatak *et al.*, 2016). According to these authors, this increase is due to academics and managers' interest in understanding the links existing between individuals and the organization. For Sá (2000), individuals who are committed to the organization believe their behavior at work needs to be within what is right and morally correct, guiding themselves by internalized attitudes and standards. There is a psychological and affective behavioral link between the individual and the organization, which favors motivation for work, besides commitment itself (Cook and Wall, 1980; Abbott *et al.*, 2005).

Cunha *et al.* (2003) state that organizational commitment focuses on studying individuals and groups in the organizational context, as well as processes and internal practices in organizations that affect employees. For Marques and Cunha (1996), the need is, therefore, to analyze not only employees' association with organizations but also firms' impact, particularly on their employees' commitment, behavior and development. Memili *et al.* (2013) also mention that organizational commitment is important concerning the will to contribute to organizational objectives and is particularly relevant in FSMEs, as these firms often depend on family members' long-term involvement through succeeding generations.

For Meyer and Allen (1997), the concept of organizational commitment designates the psychological relationship individuals form with the organization in which they perform duties. Therefore, to analyze the level of organizational commitment present in family firms, this study is based on the multi-dimensional model by these two researchers. For them, the organizational commitment structure includes three components: affective, normative and instrumental. In the family firm sector, Sharma and Irving (2005) also indicated a new dimension: "imperative commitment".

There is a lack of understanding as to how organizational commitment influences employees' performance (De Massis *et al.*, 2013; Hatak *et al.*, 2016), more precisely, contextual performance. Contextual performance is understood here as behavior able to create the psychological, social and motivational climate which makes it easier for the employee to fulfill objectives related to the technical or task component (Pinto *et al.*, 2009).

While prior research has focused on these two constructs (organizational commitment and contextual performance) within the context of non-family firms, little research has been carried out on FSMEs (Sharma and Irving, 2005), with relatively few empirical studies about organizational commitment in family firms based on the dimensions defined by Meyer and Allen (1997) and Sharma and Irving (2005). However, family enterprises by definition are characterized by deep family involvement; it is often natural for family members to identify with the business (Dawson *et al.*, 2015). As noted by Sharma and Irving (2005), family firms are commitment-intensive organizations, as family members are emotionally attached and identify with the founder's business.

To fill this gap in the literature on family firms, the main aim of this study is to observe the association of organizational commitment (affective, normative, instrumental and imperative) with employees' contextual performance in FSMEs. This study contributes to the broader commitment literature by examining a four-component model of commitment in the FSME context. Our study also contributes to the underdeveloped research on organizational commitment by showing how family commitment as a distinctive characteristic of FSMEs influences employees' contextual performance.

The paper is organized as follows: Section 2 gives a theoretical overview of organizational commitment and contextual performance in FSMEs and develops hypotheses. Section 3 presents the methodology, i.e. sample, data collection, variables and measurement. Section 4 shows the findings. Finally, Section 5 discusses the results and concludes and puts forward the theoretical and practical implications of our study.

2. Theoretical foundations

2.1 Contextual performance

How employees' performance is accurately and comprehensively evaluated is one of the main focuses of human resource management research and practice. It is taken for granted that performance evaluations should reflect the real and overall contributions employees have made to organizations (Wang *et al.*, 2008).

Viswesvaran and Ones (2000) and Borman and Motowidlo (1997) define individual performance as including task performance and contextual performance. For these authors, definition of individual performance consists of a set of actions, behaviors and results that employees demonstrate and perform, contributing to the attainment of organizational goals.

In achieving firms' goals, employees are expected to perform many "contextual" activities that may not be directly related to their task functions but are important for their organizations (Borman and Motowidlo, 1997). These contextual activities are considered as critical catalysts for the accomplishment of task functions (Borman and Motowidlo 1993; Wang *et al.*, 2008). This type of performance does not aim so much to support the technical system, but rather the organization more broadly, the social and psychological climate in which the technical system should function. This dimension of individual performance affects the organizational culture and climate (Hatrup *et al.*, 1998), influencing its performance or effectiveness (Borman and Motowidlo, 1993; Borman *et al.*, 2001).

Contextual performance has been defined as behavior that affects the organizational, social and psychological context in which the work is performed (e.g. working cooperatively with others, persisting to reach difficult goals, following organizational rules

[Borman and Motowidlo, 1993; Gellatly and Irving, 2001]). Rego (2002) also mentions that contextual performance corresponds to activities that are not directly related to one's functions but which model the organizational, social and psychological environment.

The concept of contextual performance was introduced in response to the difficulty in expanding the job performance domain (Arvey and Murphy, 1998). In organizational settings, employees are required to interact and coordinate with others and to perform activities that go beyond their job descriptions to fulfill job-specific tasks. Such contextual behaviors serve to facilitate communication, improve social communication and reduce tension and/or disruptive emotional responses, all of which are essential for an organization's survival and success (Arvey and Murphy, 1998; Wang *et al.*, 2008).

Van Scotter and Motowidlo (1996, p. 525) divided contextual performance into two dimensions:

- (1) interpersonal facilitation, defined as "cooperative, considerate, and helpful acts that assist co-workers' (staff) performance"; and
- (2) job dedication, defined as "self-disciplined, motivated acts such as working hard, taking initiative and following rules to support organizational objectives".

Interpersonal facilitation refers to interpersonal behaviors that contribute to accomplishing organizational goals. This kind of behavior improves employee morale, encourages cooperation and supports the social context (Cichy *et al.*, 2009). Job dedication is the motivational foundation of job performance and refers to self-disciplined behavior such as following rules, working hard and taking the initiative to solve problems at work (Wang *et al.*, 2008). On the other hand, contextual performance behavior such as volunteering, persevering, helping and cooperating are related to motivational variables and personality characteristics (Borman and Motowidlo, 1997; Wang *et al.*, 2008).

In addition to defining the behavioral dimensions of contextual performance, considerable research attention has focused on predicting this aspect of performance (Borman and Motowidlo, 1997). The results generally show that individual differences in personality, rather than general cognitive ability or job-relevant knowledge and skills, are important predictors of contextual performance criteria (Hattrup *et al.*, 1998; Gellatly and Irving, 2001). Conscientiousness (e.g. achievement-oriented, organized and exacting) is particularly relevant as a dimension of contextual performance (Borman and Motowidlo, 1993; Gellatly and Irving, 2001).

Given that the dimension of conscientiousness has been linked to motivational processes and outcomes (Gellatly and Irving, 2001), it is reasonable to expect that managers and employees who score highly in this dimension are more likely than their low-conscientiousness counterparts to engage in goal-directed behavior and to perform tasks carefully and enthusiastically (Van Scotter and Motowidlo, 1996).

For Carlos and Rodrigues (2016), the concept of contextual performance can be measured through various dimensions: cooperation, organizational conscientiousness, interpersonal and relational skills and personal characteristics/persistent effort. From the existing literature, these authors built a framework of the dimensions of contextual performance (Table I).

2.2 Organizational commitment

Allen and Meyer (1996) define organizational commitment as a psychological connection between an employee and the organization which makes it less likely the employee will leave of their own accord. This concept emerged in the past decades as a crucial aspect in understanding employees' attitudes and behaviors with regard to a given organization

Table I.
Dimensions of
contextual
performance

Dimension	Definition
Persistent effort (merged with personal characteristics)	Persistence to reach goals
Cooperation	Effectiveness in working with others Performing extra tasks Helping colleagues
Organizational conscientiousness	Personal discipline (as people abstain from negative performance behaviors, such as excessive absenteeism and breaking rules and procedures at work) Observation
Personal characteristics (merged with persistent effort)	Initiative Motivation to perform, to learn (seeking information) and to work hard Creativity and innovation Adaptability Stress tolerance
Interpersonal and relational skills	Oral and written communication skills Conflict-solving Negotiation Influencing others Social networks

Source: Carlos and Rodrigues (2016)

(Allen and Meyer, 1990). Organizational commitment is a strong belief in the organization's goals and values, a willingness to work on behalf of the organization and a desire to maintain membership of the organization (Carmon *et al.*, 2010).

One of the primary motives for organizational commitment is identifying with the organization (Becker, 1992). Individuals who embrace their organizations' goals and missions through identification processes are more likely to remain committed to their organizations than individuals who do not (van Dick *et al.*, 2004).

Although research carried out in the field of organizational commitment attempts, above all, to find and develop models that quantify and explain individuals' different levels of commitment at work, it can be seen throughout these studies that the concept and its definitions have evolved (Allen and Meyer, 1990). Initially, commitment was analyzed from a one-dimensional perspective, through more specific approaches, as is the case of Mowday *et al.* (1979). Today this concept is accepted as being multi-dimensional, and various components of commitment are studied, namely through the approaches of Meyer and Allen (1991, 1997). These numerous studies carried out over time can be divided not only according to their dimensional but also conceptual approach.

Regarding the latter approach, three can be highlighted as being the most studied, namely, the instrumental/calculating, affective and normative approaches (Bastos, 1994). Meyer and Allen (1991) argue that in this way a better understanding of the individual's behaviour in the organization is achieved. Meyer and Allen (1991) believe that if the affective and normative aspects have more weight in organizations' relationships with their employees, this is a sign of greater organizational commitment among the latter.

For De Quijano *et al.* (2000), affective or attitudinal commitment entails aspects such as affection or fondness for the organization. In addition, according to Meyer and Allen's (1991) three-component model of organizational commitment, affective commitment refers to identification with and emotional attachment to the organization. Thus, affective

commitment can be defined as the extent to which the employee identifies with the firm (identification) (Vallejo and Langa, 2010).

Normative commitment consists of consequences of the obligation to remain in the organization. Employees experience these consequences because they believe this to be the right thing to do. This feeling of loyalty toward the organization may be triggered by family or cultural socialization pressures or processes (Morrow, 1993; Vallejo and Langa, 2010).

With regard to instrumental commitment, Meyer and Allen (1991) point out that this type of commitment represents aspects such as the costs – not only economic but also emotional – perceived by the employee as associated with leaving the organization. According to these authors, because continued employment is a matter of necessity for the employee with high instrumental commitment, the nature of the link between commitment and on-the-job behavior is likely to be dependent on the implications of that behavior for employment.

2.3 Organizational commitment and contextual performance in family firms

To clarify and operationalize the concept of a family firm, Chrisman *et al.* (2003) mention the following criteria: family ownership (the firm's capital is held mostly by the owner's family); family governance (the family has power over the firm's strategic decisions); family management (family members are in managerial posts); and/or various generations of the family are actively involved in the firm's daily operations. This study took as a condition that they should belong completely to a single family or small number of families, i.e., according to the criterion of family ownership defined by Chua *et al.* (1999).

The family firm can be seen as the result of the interactions of the three systems that define its structure: the family, ownership and the business (Churchill and Hatten, 1987; Tagiuri and Davis, 1996). This special nature means that family firms experience a phenomenon that these authors call “familiness”, which is a result of the interaction of the family system with the firm and leads to the firm possessing a unique bundle of resources (Habbersohn *et al.*, 2003; Carmon *et al.*, 2010). The business is like an extension of the family: everything that happens within the family can affect the business, and vice versa (Danes *et al.*, 2002; Vallejo and Langa, 2010).

One of the most frequently emphasized topics in studying family firms is the assumption that these are intensely influenced by family values (Collins and O'Regan, 2011). This situation forms one of the most important concepts underlying the special typology by which the family firm is recognized. In this type of firm, values such as organizational commitment are easily developed (Erdem and Baser, 2010).

Family businesses will be more likely to be able to create a strong sense of organizational identification and commitment where all family business employees perceive themselves as not only similar in values, beliefs and attitudes but also as treated fairly within the organization (Carmon *et al.*, 2010).

Once family business employees have “bought into” the ideals of the family business, the goals and ideas of all employees are likely to be aligned. This not only encourages participation in organizational decision-making but also encourages the development of a strong sense of identification with the family business (Zellweger *et al.*, 2010). If family businesses succeed in creating a sense of belonging and identification for non-family member employees, the perception that employees have been “let into the family” may be enough to create a sense of commitment (Carmon *et al.*, 2010).

Individuals' behavior in relation to the family business varies greatly, with implications for their effectiveness and for the firm's performance (Sharma and Irving, 2005). Therefore, it is not certain that everyone working for family firms dedicate themselves “body and soul”

to their business, that they choose these professional careers over time or that they even devote the same effort to the firm.

Zahra *et al.* (2008) found that family commitment as a socially based, family-specific resource (Eddleston *et al.*, 2008) can support enhanced organizational responsiveness (Miller and Le Breton-Miller, 2006) and improved firm performance (Hatak *et al.*, 2016).

In family firms, owners/managers tend to consider their organizations as extensions of themselves (Lastovicka and Fernandez, 2005), as in those companies, family members' names are identified with the organization (Dyer and Whetten, 2006). Therefore, owners can be one of the main contributors to reflection, highlighting the relationship with the family and distinguishing them from other employees (Belk, 1988; Thomson, 2006). A family highly committed to the firm can create trust and a strong familial bond in the family firm, resulting in a reduction of formal controls (Zahra *et al.*, 2008) and increased use of strategic behavioral controls (Hsu and Chang, 2011; Hatak *et al.*, 2016).

In this context, there is a positive association between organizational commitment and contextual performance (Samad, 2005). Locke *et al.* (1988) defend that the strength of this relationship will depend on the amount of variance in the commitment.

For Sharma and Irving (2005), the decisions of a family firm's descendants or heirs and which to some extent get mixed up with the firm's business because of some family member's action, can be studied according to, and/or influenced by four different dimensions (Affective, Normative, Instrumental and Imperative).

Affective commitment is based on a strong belief in, and acceptance of the firm's objectives, together with the desire to contribute toward those objectives, and with confidence in one's ability to do so (Sharma and Irving, 2005). When individuals' identity and career interests are aligned with their family enterprise, they experience affective commitment (Dawson *et al.*, 2015). A strong affective commitment to the firm on the part of the family makes it more likely that non-family employees will also develop commitment to the family firm (Barsade, 2002). As noted by Meyer *et al.* (2002), affective commitment has a positive association with contextual performance. Therefore, the following hypothesis is formulated:

H1a. Affective commitment in FSMEs has a positive association with contextual performance.

Normative commitment is based on feelings, on the obligation to follow a career in the family business. By trying to make a career in the family business, the successor tries to promote and maintain good relationships with the older generation. Briefly, employees with high levels of normative commitment feel they should follow a career (Sharma and Irving (2005). Consequently, if the normative aspect plays a determinant role in the relationships between employers and employees in family firms, and moreover, this aspect is one of the three components of the level of organizational commitment, then the level of commitment will conceivably be higher in family firms than in non-family firms (Vallejo and Langa, 2010). According to Meyer *et al.* (2002), organizational commitment has an association with contextual performance, this being positive in relation to normative commitment. Thus, the following hypothesis is presented:

H1b. Normative commitment in FSMEs has a positive association with contextual performance.

Instrumental commitment is based on perceptions of the substantial costs of opportunity, employees being informed about the loss of investment or value if they do not pursue a career in the family business. Employees with high levels of calculating commitment feel

they have to pursue a career (Sharma and Irving, 2005). The commitment of family members toward their business motivates them to be involved in it (Chirico *et al.*, 2011; Dawson *et al.*, 2015). Therefore, we propose the following hypothesis:

H1c. Instrumental commitment in FSMEs has a negative association with contextual performance.

Imperative commitment is based on a feeling of insecurity and uncertainty about the ability to have a successful career outside the family business. Individuals with high levels of imperative commitment perceive they have no alternative to a career in the family business. Underlying this mentality is the need to find a career (Sharma and Irving, 2005). These authors found out that this new type of commitment (imperative) has a negative association with (contextual) performance. Thus, the final hypothesis is formulated:

H1d. Imperative commitment in FSMEs has a negative association with contextual performance.

3. Research methodology

3.1 Sample

To carry out this study, an initial sample was chosen of employees in Portuguese FSMEs. These firms were classified as SMEs and simultaneously considered family firms (in this case, the criterion was ownership and all capital belonging to a single family). The concept of SME used was according to the European Commission Recommendation n° 203/361/CE, of 2003.

After initial contact and some refusals, the number of firms was set at eight FSMEs, which for reasons of confidentiality were given a letter of the alphabet (A to H) for identification purposes. Therefore, the initial sample was composed of 152 employees (Table II). These belonged to all corporate hierarchical levels, covering some management, technical and other positions in the firms selected.

Table III shows the sample characterization. The great majority of employees are male and the majority are in the age-groups of 31 to 40 and 41 to 50 years old. As for academic qualifications, the great majority of employees have completed secondary education, followed by technical courses, whereas only 12 employees have a degree or master. These results show a low level of academic qualifications among employees in family firms. Most employees (55) also have training related to the firm's area of activity, corresponding to a percentage of 54.5 per cent. Several employees have been in the firm (employee tenure) since its foundation (42.6 per cent).

3.2 Data collection and measurement

To achieve the proposed objective, a questionnaire was elaborated, with the scales being adapted from various authors. To measure the construct of organizational commitment, the scales of Meyer and Allen (1997) and Sharma and Irving (2005) were used. Considering organizational commitment as a multi-dimensional construct, each of the components, affective, normative, instrumental and imperative, was measured through these specific scales. These are formed by statements representing the specific dimension being measured. Responses were given on a seven-point Likert-type scale proposed by Meyer and Allen (1997) in which (1) corresponds to "Completely Disagree" and (7) "Completely Agree". Besides the seven-point Likert scale proposed by Meyer and Allen, the negative formulation of some items was also maintained. Table IV describes the items of each dimension, with (R) representing the items whose scale will have to be inverted.

Table II.
Generic characteristics of the selected firms

Firm	Year of foundation	Sector of activity	No. of family partners	% capital	No. of employees	Answers obtained
A	1995	Sales of Agricultural Machinery and Cars	3	100	30	30
B	1974	Construction	2	100	11	11
C	1993	Extraction of Granite	2	100	5	5
D	1975	Commerce	3	100	4	4
E	1994	Sales of Agricultural Machinery and Cars	2	100	25	9
F	1998	Goods and Passenger Transport	4	100	20	11
G	1998	Textiles	2	100	25	23
H	2001	Goods and Passenger Transport	2	100	32	8
Total					152	101

Characteristics	Frequency	(%)	Organizational commitment in family SMEs
<i>Gender</i>			
Female	36	35.6	
Male	65	64.4	
<i>Age</i>			
Between 21 and 30	13	12.9	
Between 31 and 40	35	34.7	
Between 41 and 50	36	35.6	
51 or over	17	16.8	
<i>Qualifications</i>			
Basic Education	19	18.8	
Secondary Education	42	41.6	
Technical Course	23	22.8	
Diploma	5	5.0	
Degree	11	10.9	
Master	1	1.0	
<i>Function in the Firm</i>			
Mechanic	12	11.9	
Salesperson	34	33.7	
Driver	9	8.9	
Clerk	10	9.9	
Joiner	3	3.0	
Metalworker	3	3.0	
Manager	5	5.0	
Stonemason	5	5.0	
Traffic Coordinator	4	4.0	
Other	16	15.8	
<i>Training</i>			
Yes	46	45.5	
No	55	54.5	
<i>Employee Tenure</i>			
Up to 1 year	9	8.9	
1 year to 3 years	10	9.9	
3 years to 5 years	12	11.9	
5 years to 7 years	18	17.8	
7 years to 10 years	9	8.9	
Over 10 years	43	42.6	

373

Table III.
Sample
characteristics

This scale includes 25 items, which captured four dimensions of organizational commitment. We conducted a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) on all the organizational commitment items to validate their factor structures. CFA intends to show whether the scale presents a good adjustment to the sample data (Hair *et al.*, 2010). The model fit indices were in the acceptable ranges (GFI = 0.8899; TLI = 0.931; TLI = 0.924; RMSEA = 0.084). To determine the internal consistency indices of the instrument used for data collection, the Cronbach alpha coefficient was calculated. The Cronbach alpha values obtained, for each sub-scale of organizational commitment, were above 0.70 (Nunnally, 1978), revealing good internal consistency. These results agree with those found by Nascimento *et al.* (2008) in the Portuguese context.

TPM
23,7/8

374

Dimensions/variables	Cronbach alpha
<i>Affective commitment</i>	
2. I do not feel 'emotionally attached to this firm'. (R)	0.812
6. This firm has great personal meaning for me	
7. I do not feel I am 'part of the family' in this firm. (R)	
9. I really feel this firm's problems as if they were my own	
11. I would be very happy to spend the rest of my working life in this firm	
15. I do not feel I am part of this firm. (R)	
<i>Normative Commitment</i>	
4. I would not leave this firm at the moment because I feel I have a personal obligation to the people who work here	0.753
5. I don't feel any moral duty to remain in the firm I am in now. (R)	
8. Even if it was to my advantage, I don't feel it would be right to leave this firm at the present time	
10. This firm deserves my loyalty	
12. I would feel guilty if I left this firm now	
18. I feel I have a great duty toward this firm	
<i>Instrumental Commitment</i>	
1. I believe there are very few alternatives, to be able to think of leaving this firm	0.719
3. I would lose a lot materially if I left this firm at this moment, even if I could do so	
13. One of the main reasons for continuing to work in this firm is that leaving it would require considerable personal sacrifice because another firm might not provide all the benefits I have here	
14. At this moment, remaining in this firm is as much a question of material needs as of personal will	
16. One of the negative consequences for me if I left this firm is the shortage of employment alternatives available	
17. Much of my life would be affected if I decided to leave the firm at this moment	
19. As I have given so much to this firm, at present I don't consider the possibility of working in another	
<i>Imperative Commitment</i>	
20. I feel I wouldn't be successful outside this type of business	0.819
24. I owe my career to this firm	
22. I feel I wouldn't be able to progress in my career if I left this firm	
25. All the success I have had in professional terms is due to this firm	
21. If I left this firm, I would feel a great sense of insecurity as regards finding another job	
23. This firm gives me a great feeling of security	

Table IV.
Dimensions of
organizational
commitment

To measure the construct of contextual performance, the scale developed by [Carlos and Rodrigues \(2016\)](#) applied to higher education institutions was used. Four dimensions are described in this scale:

- (1) Cooperation;
- (2) organizational conscientiousness;
- (3) interpersonal and relational skills; and
- (4) personal characteristics/persistent effort.

Each dimension has a specific scale, as shown in [Table V](#). Responses were also given on a seven-point Likert-type scale, in which (1) corresponds to "Completely Disagree" and (7) to "Completely Agree", with (R) representing items whose scale will have to be inverted.

Table V.
Dimensions of
contextual
performance

Dimensions/variables	Cronbach alpha
<i>Cooperation</i>	
1. I usually make less effort in performing a task when I work together with other people. (R)	0.610
2. I am always ready to help other workers in the organization, even when I don't have much time available	
3. I usually perform tasks that are not related to my specific duties	
<i>Organizational Conscientiousness</i>	
5. It's really difficult for me to stay off work, even when I feel ill	0.796
6. I would never take actions that could harm the wellbeing of other workers	
8. I take my work very seriously, so I comply with the rules and procedures imposed (by my supervisor or by the organization), even when nobody's around	
<i>Interpersonal and Relational Skills</i>	
14. My communication skills are so good that I can always get everyone's attention	0.672
16. When I write a message to other workers, I find it difficult to express what I'm thinking	
17. When someone has a different opinion from me, I usually persuade them that my opinion is better	
<i>Persistent Effort/Personal Characteristics</i>	
10. I usually take the initiative to give constructive feedback, so as to improve the performance of other workers (subordinates, colleagues, supervisor or work groups)	0.727
11. If the organization doesn't provide the training I consider necessary to perform my functions effectively, I look for information from other sources	
12. I am still able to perform my functions effectively when I work under pressure	
13. As soon as I arrive at work, I'm able to set aside all my personal problems, and so my performance does not suffer	

This scale includes 17 items, which captured four dimensions of contextual performance. We also conducted a CFA analysis on all the contextual performance items to validate their factor structures. The solution resulted in a moderate fit. The modification indices suggested that several items were cross loading on more than one latent construct. Thus, two items from organizational conscientiousness, one item from interpersonal and relational skills and another item from the persistent effort scale were removed to improve model fit for further analysis. Thus, the new scale to be tested was a four-factor, 13-item scale. The fit indexes showed improvement (GFI = 0.837; CFI = 0.901; RMSEA = 0.092; TLI = 0.912). [Table V](#) also presents the Cronbach alphas for each dimension of contextual performance used in this study. As can be observed, a Cronbach alpha above 0.60 ([DeVellis, 1991](#)) was obtained in the four dimensions presented, which reveals acceptable internal consistency for a study of an exploratory nature as this one.

In this study, we also controlled for two variables that may influence the relation between our dependent and independent variables. Therefore, we controlled for respondent age, as this variable has been found to be positively correlated to organizational commitment ([Finegold et al., 2002](#); [Khandelwal, 2009](#)). We controlled for age using four discrete categories (21-30, 31-40, 41-50 and over 51 years old). Although employee tenure has been found to be positively correlated to organizational commitment ([Al-Meer, 1989](#)), there is no definitive evidence of employee tenure differences with regard to organizational commitment ([Wright and Bonett, 2002](#)). Nevertheless, in this study, we controlled for employee tenure using six discreet categories (up to 1, 1-3, 3-5, 5-7, 7-10 and over 10 years).

To reinforce the reliability of the data-collecting instrument created for the study, a pre-test of the questionnaire was carried out also in four companies in the first week of April

2015. After that pre-test, all mistakes and/or suggestions indicated were taken into consideration and the questionnaire amended.

The final questionnaire was delivered personally to the FSMEs in the first week of May, and answers were obtained in the first week of August, amounting to 101 valid responses (see Table III).

4. Results

This study aimed to determine the organizational commitment (affective, normative, instrumental and imperative) existing in FSMEs and whether this influences employees' contextual performance, in terms of cooperation, organizational conscientiousness, interpersonal and relational skills and persistent effort/personal characteristics. To this end, we performed linear regression models, based on a questionnaire sent to employees in eight FSMEs in Portugal, to validate the hypotheses. According to Hair *et al.* (2010), linear regression is adopted when there are two or more independent variables to explain a dependent variable (contextual performance). In this case, the independent variable was organizational commitment.

Before proceeding to the results obtained from the regression models, we performed tests to assess potential multi-collinearity among the principal dimensions studied. To ensure that the data were appropriate for our analyses, we examined the variance inflation factors (VIFs), which showed that multi-collinearity was not a concern. All VIF coefficients were lower than 5 (e.g. Hamilton, 2006).

In a first analysis, descriptive statistics (average and standard deviation) were also used to describe the various dimensions studied. As for organizational commitment and considering more specifically Normative commitment, the results (Table VI) show that this type of commitment has a high average (4.95) and suggest that employees in FSMEs have an emotional attachment to the firm (Affective commitment) with an average = 4.80. Concerning contextual performance, the average is around 5; i.e. this dimension presents a moderate level of agreement.

A second analysis involved calculation of the Pearson correlation coefficients of all the dimensions present in the proposed research models including control variables, resulting in the matrix presented in Table VI. In general, the correlation coefficients obtained are high. Based on the results obtained, Affective commitment and Normative commitment are significantly and positively correlated with contextual performance. On the other hand, Instrumental and Imperative commitment appears to be of less importance for contextual performance in the employees studied here.

Table VI.
Descriptive statistics
and Pearson
correlation matrix

Dimensions	Average	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. OC Affective	4.80	0.84	1						
2. OC Normative	4.95	1.06	0.739**	1					
3. OC Instrumental	4.69	0.96	0.298**	0.425**	1				
4. OC Imperative	4.14	1.29	0.261**	0.401**	0.433**	1			
5. Contextual Performance	5.06	0.74	0.341**	0.281**	0.159	0.072	1		
6. Age	3.56	0.92	-0.027	0.140	-0.035	-0.020	-0.147	1	
7. Tenure	4.36	1.74	0.096	0.006	-0.049	-0.203*	-0.143	0.292**	1

Notes: $N = 101$; * $p \leq 0.05$; ** $p \leq 0.01$

Table VII shows the regression models followed, considering general contextual performance as the dependent variable. Model 1 considered all the control variables (age and employee tenure) and the predictors (organizational commitment). Model 2 excluded the effect of tenure, and in Model 3, age was excluded. All three models have a highly adjusted R^2 value as well as a highly significant F value. However, in Models 1 and 2, neither of the control variables had a significant effect on the dependent variable. However, when we consider tenure as the control variable (Model 3), this had a significant association with contextual performance. Wright and Bonett (2002) found that employee tenure had a very strong non-linear moderating effect on the commitment–performance correlation, with correlations tending to decrease exponentially with increasing tenure.

Considering the linear regression models created (Table VII) taking contextual performance (in general) as the dependent variable, it is plausible to infer that:

- Normative, Instrumental and Imperative commitment do not influence contextual performance, as they are not statistically significant. Therefore, *H1b*, *H1c* and *H1d* are rejected.
- Affective commitment ($\beta = 0.288$; $\rho = <0.05$) influences contextual performance, as the ρ -value is statistically significant. Therefore, *H1a* is accepted.

As already mentioned, contextual performance is composed of four dimensions: cooperation, conscientiousness, relational skills and personal characteristics. Therefore, and analyzing Table VIII, Affective commitment presents statistically significant values, and as such has a positive influence on Cooperation, Conscientiousness and Personal characteristics and a negative association with the Relational skills dimensions used to measure contextual performance. In addition, Imperative commitment also influences contextual performance except in the Personal characteristics dimension ($\beta = -0.016$; $p > 0.05$).

5. Discussion and contributions

The results obtained in this study allowed some conclusions to be drawn: a great effect of affective commitment was identified. The existence of a significant level of commitment was

Dimensions/variables	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Constant	7.219	7.029	7.639
<i>Organizational Commitment</i>			
Affective	1.977** (0.288)	1.696* (0.244)	2.311** (0.326)
Normative	0.623 (0.098)	0.801 (0.127)	0.337 (0.051)
Instrumental	0.595 (0.066)	0.522 (0.058)	0.699 (0.077)
Imperative	-0.947 (-0.105)	-0.644 (-0.071)	-0.952 (-0.106)
<i>Control variables</i>			
Age	-1.037 (-0.107)	-1.604 (-0.158)	
Tenure	-1.537 (-0.158)		-1.973* (-0.192)
F-value	3.142***	3.251***	3.552***
R^2	0.167	0.146	0.158
R^2 adjusted	0.114	0.101	0.113

Notes: $N = 101$; Dependent variable: contextual performance; *** $p < 0.01$; ** $p < 0.05$; * $p < 0.10$

Table VII.
Multiple linear
regression models –
general contextual
performance

to some extent expected, as in FSMEs, the owner's proximity to employees can create a bond between them. However, normative and instrumental commitments were not shown to be significant. These types of commitment have very weak or even negative relationships with discretionary behavior by employees in family firms.

It stands out that affective commitment is associated with all constructs forming contextual performance. For example, the results suggest that conscientiousness can be influenced by affective commitment, which agrees with the evidence of [Viswesvaran and Ones \(2000\)](#) and [Carlos and Rodrigues \(2016\)](#). As people abstain from negative performance behavior, such as excessive absenteeism, breaking rules and work procedures, they devote more effort to carrying out their tasks, even when working together with others. In these cases, employees are always ready to help colleagues and perform tasks that are not related to their specific duties.

As for contextual performance, the four dimensions are found to be influenced also by imperative commitment. This dimension can facilitate performance, and in turn, employees tend to present greater organizational commitment. In this study, imperative commitment is related to contextual performance because of some employees having been in the family firm since its foundation, so these employees have a great feeling of security with regard to the firm, which goes against the imperative commitment of [Sharma and Irving \(2005\)](#). On the other hand, the results of this association agree with [Meyer and Allen \(1997\)](#), as the results suggest a strong belief in and acceptance of the family firm's objectives, together with the wish to contribute to them.

This study also presents several implications/contributions for theory and practice. Although some studies relate organizational commitment with employees' performance, there is a gap regarding the relationship between organizational commitment and contextual performance in FSMEs. Therefore, this study represents a contribution in academic terms in this area; i.e. it is innovative in relating two areas that are little studied in the family business context. This study is the first attempt to examine empirically the multi-dimensional nature of commitment in the family SME context. This firm sector is an ideal setting in which to study organizational commitment because, although organizations can put effort into supporting their employees to increase their commitment ([Meyer et al., 2002](#)) family members have a natural propensity toward organizational commitment ([Neubaum et al., 2012](#)).

Table VIII.
Multiple linear
regression models –
dimensions of
contextual
performance

Independent variable	Dependent variable (β Value)			
	Organizational commitment	Cooperation	Conscientiousness	Relational skills
Affective	1.968** (0.286)	2.832*** (0.389)	-2.267** (-0.317)	2.362** (0.327)
Normative	-0.772 (-0.121)	-0.093 (-0.014)	1.076 (0.163)	0.844 (0.126)
Instrumental	0.509 (0.058)	1.461 (0.157)	-0.045 (-0.005)	-0.496 (-0.054)
Imperative	-2.018** (-0.227)	-1.943** (-0.207)	3.103*** (0.336)	-0.145 (-0.016)
F-value	2.117*	5.204***	4.262***	4.818***
R ²	0.081	0.178	0.151	0.167
R ² adjusted	0.043	0.144	0.115	0.132

Notes: N = 101; *** p < 0.01; ** p < 0.05; * p < 0.10

In practical terms, we can point out that the strong relationship between affective commitment and employees' contextual performance has a relevant role in FSMEs. Therefore, these firms must be aware of this type of organizational commitment, as affective commitment increasingly influences their employees' performance. If those in charge of FSMEs are sensitive to this matter, they will achieve positive results in their employees' performance, which, in turn, will contribute to the organization's success. So family SMEs should find strategies to increase affective commitment, so that this can contribute to employees' attitudes and behavior. The greater the amount of organizational conscientiousness, cooperation, relational skills and personal characteristics among employees, the greater the benefits for both employees and the organization itself.

In addition, FSMEs are formed by a group of two or more individuals who interact cooperatively and adaptively in pursuit of shared, valued objectives. The strength of a team's shared vision functions as a bonding mechanism that allows for shared communication and integration of ideas. These family SMEs are organizations based on teams, where affective commitment can influence the dynamic of the team performance. In FSMEs, teams have identifiable features such as interdependent skill sets, common goals, shared commitment and mutual accountability. In family firm teams, the characteristics of the team are unique because of the enduring nature of the family over time.

The results reported here must be viewed considering the study's limitations. One of them concerns the small sample of FSMEs situated in a specific region of Portugal. Therefore, more studies should be carried out with more representative samples and with family SMEs in other regions. In addition, although the rate of response to the data-collecting instrument was acceptable (63.52 per cent), ideally all employees approached would have collaborated and answered the questionnaire. In that case, we would have had a completely reliable representation of the eight FSMEs participating in the study. Despite performing CFA, another limitation concerns the fact that the scale used to measure contextual performance (Carlos and Rodrigues, 2016) had been validated in the university context, so this may not have been the best way to measure contextual performance in FSMEs.

In this study, the unit of analysis was the employee in general. Thus, further studies should compare the relation between organizational commitment and contextual performance across two groups: family members and regular employees. Nonetheless, we hope this procedure sparks off further interest in exploring this type of comparative analysis.

The cross-sectional research methodology does not allow us to make causal inferences with respect to the theoretical framework. However, unlike many other entrepreneurship studies, we could build our analysis on longitudinal data, avoiding issues of endogeneity related to reverse causality.

As our analysis addresses features of family firms closely related to the organizational culture, the ability to generalize the results is limited by the focus on a single country whose national cultural values, norms and codes of conduct inevitably influence organizational values and practices. Therefore, future research efforts should validate our findings by using larger and more heterogeneous samples.

Finally, despite these limitations, it is considered that the objectives drawn up for this study were achieved, and that they contribute to disseminating the construct of organizational commitment, providing an integrated view of the different perspectives and studies existing in this area, more specifically its influence on employees' contextual performance in FSMEs.

References

- Abbott, G., White, F. and Charles, M. (2005), "Linking values and organizational commitment: a correlational and experimental investigation in two organizations", *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, Vol. 78 No. 4, pp. 531-550.
- Allen, N.J. and Meyer, J.P. (1990), "The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization", *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, Vol. 63 No. 1, pp. 1-18.
- Allen, N.J. and Meyer, J.P. (1996), "Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: an examination of construct validity", *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol. 49 No. 3, pp. 252-276.
- Al-Meer, A. (1989), "Organizational commitment: a comparison of Westerns, Asians and Saudis", *International Studies of Management & Organizations*, Vol. 19 No. 2, pp. 74-84.
- Arregle, J., Hitt, M.A., Sirmon, D.G. and Very, P. (2007), "The development of organizational social capital: attributes of family firms", *Journal of Management Studies*, Vol. 44 No. 1, pp. 73-95.
- Arvey, R.D. and Murphy, K.R. (1998), "Performance evaluation in work setting", *Annual Review of Psychology*, Vol. 49, pp. 141-168.
- Barsade, S.G. (2002), "The ripple effects: emotional contagion and its influence on group behavior", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 47 No. 4, pp. 644-675.
- Bastos, A.V. (1994), *Comprometimento no trabalho: A estrutura dos vínculos do trabalhador com a organização, A carreira e o sindicato*, Tese de Doutorado, Universidade de Brasília, Brasília, DF.
- Becker, T.E. (1992), "Foci and bases of commitment: are they distinctions worth making?", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 35 No. 1, pp. 232-244.
- Belk, R.W. (1988), "Possessions and the extended self", *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 15 No. 2, pp. 139-169.
- Borman, W.C. and Motowidlo, S.J. (1993), "Expanding the criterion domain to include elements of contextual performance", in Schitt, N., Borman, W.C. and Associates, A. (Eds), *Personnel Selection in Organizations*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA, pp. 71-98.
- Borman, W.C. and Motowidlo, S.J. (1997), "Task performance and contextual performance: the meaning for personnel selection research", *Human Performance*, Vol. 10 No. 2, pp. 99-109.
- Borman, W., Penner, L., Allen, T. and Motowidlo, S. (2001), "Personality predictors of citizenship performance", *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, Vol. 9 Nos 1/2, pp. 52-69.
- Carlos, V.S. and Rodrigues, R.G. (2016), "Development and validation of a self-reported measure of job performance", *Social Indicators Research*, Vol. 126 No. 1, pp. 279-307.
- Carmon, A.F., Miller, A.N., Raile, A.N. and Roers, M.M. (2010), "Fusing family and firm: employee perceptions of perceived homophily, organizational justice, organizational identification, and organizational commitment in family businesses", *Journal of Family Business Strategy*, Vol. 1 No. 4, pp. 210-223.
- Chrisman, J.J., Chua, J.H. and Sharma, P. (2003), "Current trends and future directions in family business management studies: toward a theory of the family business", *Coleman White Paper Series*.
- Chrisman, J.J., Chua, J.H., Pearson, A.W. and Barnett, T.R. (2012), "Family involvement, family influence, and family centered noneconomic goals in small firms", *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Vol. 36 No. 2, pp. 267-293.
- Chirico, F., Sirmon, D., Sciascia, S. and Mazzola, P. (2011), "Resource orchestration in family firms: investigating how entrepreneurial orientation, generational involvement, and participative strategy affect performance", *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, Vol. 5 No. 4, pp. 307-326.
- Chua, J.H., Chrisman, J.J. and Sharma, P. (1999), "Defining the family-owned firm by behaviour", *Entrepreneurship: Theory & Practice*, Vol. 23 No. 4, pp. 19-39.

- Churchill, N.C. and Hatten, K.J. (1987), "Non-market-based transfers of wealth and power: a research framework for family businesses", *American Journal of Small Business*, Vol. 11 No. 3, pp. 51-64.
- Cichy, R.F., Kim, S.H. and Cha, J. (2009), "The relationship between emotional intelligence and contextual performance: application to automated and vending service industry executives", *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality & Tourism*, Vol. 8 No. 2, pp. 170-183.
- Collins, L. and O'Regan, N. (2011), "Editorial: the evolving field of family business", *Journal of Family Business Management*, Vol. 1 No. 1, pp. 5-13.
- Cook, J. and Wall, T. (1980), "New work attitude measures of trust, organizational commitment and personal need non-fulfillment", *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, Vol. 53 No. 1, pp. 39-52.
- Cunha, M.P., Rego, A., Cunha, R.C. and Cabral-Cardoso, C. (2003), *Manual de Comportamento Organizacional e Gestão*, Editora RH, Lisboa.
- Danes, S., Rueter, M., Kwon, H. and Doherty, W. (2002), "Family FIRO model: an application to family business", *Family Business Review*, Vol. 15 No. 1, pp. 31-43.
- Dawson, D., Sharma, P., Irving, P.G., Marcus, J. and Chirico, F. (2015), "Predictors of later-generation family members' commitment to family enterprises", *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Vol. 39 No. 3, pp. 545-569.
- De Massis, A., Frattini, F. and Lichtenthaler, U. (2013), "Research on technological innovation in family firms: present debates and future directions", *Family Business Review*, Vol. 26 No. 1, pp. 10-31.
- De Quijano, S., Navarro, J. and Cornejo, J. (2000), "Un modelo integrado de compromiso e identificación con la organización: análisis del cuestionario ASHICI", *Revista De Psicología Social Aplicada*, Vol. 10, pp. 27-60.
- DeVellis, R.F. (1991), *Scale Development: Theory and Applications*, SAGE Publications, Newbury Park, CA.
- Dyer, W.G. and Whetten, D.A. (2006), "Family firms and social responsibility: preliminary evidence from the SP 500", *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Vol. 30 No. 6, pp. 785-802.
- Eddleston, K.A., Kellermanns, F.W. and Sarathy, R. (2008), "Resource configurations in family firms: linking resources, strategic planning and technological opportunities to performance", *Journal of Management Studies*, Vol. 45 No. 1, pp. 26-50.
- Erdem, F. and Baser, G.G. (2010), "Family and business values of regional family firms: a qualitative research", *International Journal of Islamic and Middle Eastern Finance and Management*, Vol. 3 No. 1, pp. 47-64.
- Erdem, F. and Erdem, S. (2011), "Functional strategies and practices of small and medium-sized family businesses", *International Journal of Islamic and Middle Eastern Finance and Management*, Vol. 4 No. 2, pp. 174-185.
- Finegold, D., Mohrman, S. and Spreitzer, G.M. (2002), "Age effects on the predictors of technical workers' commitment and willingness to turnover", *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 23 No. 5, pp. 655-674.
- Franco, M. and Haase, H. (2012), "A comparative study of cooperative relationships in family and non-family businesses", *African Journal of Business Management*, Vol. 6 No. 44, pp. 10873-10887.
- Gellatly, I.R. and Irving, P.G. (2001), "Personality, autonomy, and contextual performance of managers", *Human Performance*, Vol. 14 No. 3, pp. 231-245.
- Habbersohn, T.G., Williams, M. and MacMillan, J.C. (2003), "A unified systems perspective on family firm performance", *Journal of Business Venturing*, Vol. 18, pp. 451-465.
- Hair, J., Black, B., Babin, B., Anderson, R. and Tatham, R. (2010), *Multivariate Data Analysis*, Upper Saddle River, Pearson Prentice Hall, New Jersey.
- Hamilton, L.C. (2006), *Statistics with STATA*, Cengage, Belmont, CA.

- Hatak, I., Kautonen, T., Fink, M. and Kansikas, J. (2016), "Innovativeness and family-firm performance: the moderating effect of family commitment", *Technological Forecasting & Social Change*, Vol. 102, pp. 120-131.
- Hattrup, K., O'Connell, M. and Peter, W. (1998), "Prediction of multidimensional criteria: distinguish task and contextual performance", *Human Performance*, Vol. 11 No. 4, pp. 305-319.
- Hsu, L.C. and Chang, H.C. (2011), "The role of behavioral strategic controls in family firm innovation", *Industry & Innovation*, Vol. 18 No. 7, pp. 709-727.
- Iles, P., Foster, A. and Tinline, G. (1996), "The changing relationship between work commitment, personal flexibility and employability: an evaluation", *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, Vol. 11 No. 8, pp. 18-35.
- Khandelwal, K. (2009), "Organizational commitment in multinationals: a dynamic interplay among personal, organizational and societal factors", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 2 No. 1, pp. 99-122.
- Lastovicka, J.L. and Fernandez, K.V. (2005), "Three paths to disposition: the movement of meaningful possessions to strangers", *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 31 No. 4, pp. 813-823.
- Locke, E.A., Latham, G. and Erez, M. (1988), "Resolving scientific disputes by the joint design of crucial experiments by the antagonists: application to Erez – latham dispute regarding participation in goal setting", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 73 No. 4, pp. 753-772.
- Marques, C.A. and Cunha, M.P. (1996), *Comportamento Organizacional e Gestão de Empresas*, D. Quixote, Lisboa.
- Memili, E., Zellweger, T.M. and Fang, H.C. (2013), "The determinants of family owner – managers' affective organizational commitment. Interdisciplinary Journal of Applied Family Studies", *Family Relations*, Vol. 62 No. 3, pp. 443-456.
- Meyer, J.P. and Allen, N.J. (1991), "A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment", *Human Resource Management Review*, Vol. 1 No. 1, pp. 61-89.
- Meyer, J.P. and Allen, N.J. (1997), *Commitment in the Workplace: Theory, Research, and Application*, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Meyer, J.P., Stanley, D.J., Herscovitch, L. and Topolnysky, L. (2002), "Affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization: a meta-analysis of antecedents, correlates, and consequences", *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol. 61 No. 1, pp. 20-52.
- Miller, D. and Le Breton-Miller, I. (2006), "Family governance and firm performance: agency, stewardship, and capabilities", *Family Business Review*, Vol. 19 No. 1, pp. 73-87.
- Morrow, P. (1993), *The Theory and Measurement of Work Commitment*, Jai Press, Greenwich.
- Mowday, R.T., Steers, R.M. and Porter, L.W. (1979), "The measurement of organizational commitment", *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol. 14 No. 2, pp. 224-247.
- Nascimento, J., Lopes, A. and Salgueiro, M.F. (2008), "Estudo sobre a validação do "modelo de comportamento organizacional" de Meyer & Allen para o context português", *Comportamento Organizacional e Gestão*, Vol. 14 No. 1, pp. 118-133.
- Neubaum, D.O., Dibrell, C. and Craig, J.B. (2012), "Balancing natural environmental concerns of internal and external stakeholders in family and non-family business", *Journal of Family Business Strategy*, Vol. 3 No. 1, pp. 28-37.
- Nunnally, J.C. (1978), *Psychometric Theory*, McGraw-Hill, New York, NY.
- Pearson, A.W., Bergiel, E. and Barnett, T. (2014), "Expanding the study of organizational behaviour in family business: adapting team theory to explore family firms", *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, Vol. 23 No. 5, pp. 657-664.
- Pérez-Cabañero, C., González-Cruz, T. and Cruz-Ros, S. (2012), "Do family SME managers value marketing capabilities' contribution to firm performance?", *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, Vol. 30 No. 2, pp. 116-142.

- Pinto, C., Rodrigues, J., Santos, A., Melo, L., Moreira, M. and Rodrigues, R. (2009), *Fundamentos De Gestão*, Editorial Presença, Lisboa.
- Rego, A. (2002), *Comportamentos de Cidadania nas Organizações*, McGraw Hill, Lisboa.
- Sá, G.E. (2000), *Comprometimento organizacional e qualidade de vida no trabalho em uma empresa de economia mista do Estado de Minas Gerais*, CEPEAD/UFMG/UNIMONTES, Dissertação apresentada a FACE. Belo Horizonte.
- Samad, S. (2005), "Unraveling the organizational commitment and job performance relationship: exploring the moderating effect of job satisfaction", *The Business Review*, Vol. 4 No. 2, pp. 79-84.
- Schjoedt, L., Monsen, E., Pearson, A., Barnett, T. and Chrisman, J.J. (2013), "New venture and family business teams: understanding team formation, composition, behaviors, and performance", *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Vol. 37 No. 1, pp. 1-15.
- Sharma, P. and Irving, P.G. (2005), "Four bases of family business successor commitment: antecedents and consequences", *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Vol. 29 No. 1, pp. 13-34.
- Tagiuri, R. and Davis, J.A. (1996), "Bivalent attributes of the family firm", *Family Business Review*, Vol. 9 No. 2, pp. 199-208.
- Thomson, M. (2006), "Human brands: investigating antecedents to consumers' strong attachments to celebrities", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 70 No. 3, pp. 104-119.
- van Dick, R., Christ, O., Stellmacher, J., Wagner, U., Ahlswede, O., Grubba, C., Hauptmeier, M., Höhfeld, C., Moltzen, K. and Tissington, P.A. (2004), "Should I stay or should I go?: explaining turnover intentions with organizational identification and job satisfaction", *British Journal of Management*, Vol. 15 No. 4, pp. 351-360.
- van Scotter, J.R. and Motowidlo, S.J. (1996), "Interpersonal facilitation and job dedication as separate facets of contextual performance", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 81 No. 5, pp. 525-531.
- Vergara, S.C. (2000), *Gestão De Pessoas*, Atlas, São Paulo.
- Viswesvaran, C. and Ones, D.S. (2000), "Perspectives on models of job performance", *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, Vol. 8 No. 4, pp. 216-226.
- Vallejo, M.C. and Langa, D. (2010), "Effects of family socialization in the organizational commitment of the family firms from the moral economy perspective", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 96 No. 1, pp. 49-62.
- Wang, H., Law, K.S. and Chen, Z.K. (2008), "Leader-member exchange, employee performance, and work outcomes: an empirical study in the Chinese context", *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol. 19 No. 10, pp. 1809-1824.
- Wright, T.A. and Bonett, D.G. (2002), "The moderating effects of employee tenure on the relation between organizational commitment and job performance: a meta-analysis", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 87 No. 6, pp. 1183-1190.
- Zahra, S.A., Hayton, J.C., Neubaum, D.O., Dibrell, C. and Craig, J. (2008), "Culture of family commitment and strategic flexibility: the moderating effect of stewardship", *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Vol. 32 No. 6, pp. 1035-1054.
- Zellweger, T.M., Eddleston, K.A. and Kellermans, F.W. (2010), "Exploring the concept of familiness: introducing family firm identity", *Journal of Family Business Strategy*, Vol. 1 No. 1, pp. 54-63.

Further reading

- Meyer, J.P., Allen, N.J. and Smith, C.A. (1993), "Commitment to organizations and occupations: extension and test of a three-component conceptualization", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 78 No. 4, pp. 538-551.
- St. James, H. (1999), "What can the family contribute to business? Examining contractual relationships", *Family Business Review*, Vol. 12 No. 1, pp. 61-72.
- Thomas, L. and Ganster, D. (1995), "Impact of family supportive work variables on work-family conflict and strain: a control perspective", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 80 No. 1, pp. 6-15.

About the authors

Mário Franco is an Assistant Professor of Entrepreneurship and SME Administration at the Department of Management and Economics, Beira Interior University, Portugal. He received his PhD in Management from Beira Interior University in 2002. In 1997, he was a doctoral candidate and participated in the European Doctoral Programme in Entrepreneurship and Small Business Management in Spain and Sweden. His research focuses on strategic alliances, business networks, innovation and business creation. He is also a member of a Research Center (CEFAGE-UBI) and currently involved in several research projects on SMEs. Mário Franco is the corresponding author and can be contacted at: mfranco@ubi.pt

Solange Franco is a PhD student in Sociology at the Department of Sociology, the University of Beira Interior, Portugal. She received her Master in Social Entrepreneurship and Service from the same University in 2008. Her research focuses on domestic violence and health sociology.

For instructions on how to order reprints of this article, please visit our website:

www.emeraldgroupublishing.com/licensing/reprints.htm

Or contact us for further details: permissions@emeraldinsight.com