

PalArch's Journal of Archaeology
of Egypt / Egyptology

**"JOB SATISFACTION AND ORGANIZATION COMMITMENT: A
STUDY OF IMPORTANT INDICATORS AND THEIR
RELATIONSHIP"**

Dr Sanjeev Kumar¹, Dr Manoj Kumar²

^{1,2}Assistant Professors, IHTM, M.D. University, Rohtak (Haryana)-India

**Dr Sanjeev Kumar, Dr Manoj Kumar, JOB SATISFACTION AND
ORGANIZATION COMMITMENT: A STUDY OF IMPORTANT
INDICATORS AND THEIR RELATIONSHIP, -- Palarch's Journal Of
Archaeology Of Egypt/Egyptology 17(9). ISSN 1567-214x**

INTRODUCTION

The Hotel Industry in India is one of the fastest growing industries and has seen the biggest explosion in recent years. The Tourism and Hotel Industry is inseparably connected and both serve as fuel in relation to each other's growth. Growing economy and increasing business opportunities in India has served as a boon to India's tourism and hotel industry. 'Incredible India' the attendance campaign and the 'Atithi Devo Bhavah' (ADB) campaign also contributed to growth in domestic and international tourism and consequently the hotel industry. The latest the steps taken by the government have helped the Hotel Industry. The government has also done major efforts to increase investment in the tourism sector by allowing 100% FDI. In addition, 'Incredible India 2.0' aims to show the world as a spiritual and social place and the country is poised to emerge as an important health center in South Asia. India it is one of the fastest growing economies in the world. Growth momentum can be identified by the acceleration of friendly investment policies, structural changes and minority prices. Measures to reduce the law introduced by the central government have increases Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) by registered growth of 8.0% over 2016/17 higher the previous year (HVS, 2017). Programs such as digital marketing, reduce capacity shortages, business development and urban development are the must an easy argument for doing business. According to the Economic Survey of India 2016/17, I The rise in national GDP remains unchanged in recent years, with 2015/16 ending in a 7.6% growth in 2016/17 proves GDP growth by 7.1%. Another institutional change is that are in various categories of executions, such as the Income Tax (GST), these four Labor codes, Insolvency and Bankruptcy Act 2016 and the Mediation and Reconciliation

Act, they are likely to play a major role in the country's economic growth. Significantly, many-The expected GST was launched on 1 July 2017, under the auspices of the Indian hospitality industry must benefit from the same and the same tax, in addition to the easy use of Tax Credit (HVS, 2017).

The human factor is very important in Hotel and Restaurant services and we play an important role in the success or failure of such a hospitality organization (Santa, López-Guzmán and Cañizares, 2014). All service quality features are enhanced by staff only (Augustyn and Ho, 1998). In today's world of marketing and competition, that's rightIt is very difficult for organizations to keep their employees satisfied and honest. Researchers have done a number of studies and concluded responsible for improving employee satisfaction and commitment. Although, a lot of work has been done since the last sixty years in the satisfaction of employees and their organization commitment. However, over the past two decades various researchers have expressed their interest this is a very important topic as it directly affects the life of the organization. Therefore, the researcher has tried to review the lessons related to job satisfaction and organizational commitment especially in the Hotel Industry for the past two decades.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Mowday, Steers and Porter (1979, 1982) outlined organizational commitment as employees' strong bonding with their organization. It is considered as a feeling of being loyal to the organization (Mueller, Wallace, & Price, 1992; Price, Ko, & Mueller, 1997). (Meyer and Allen, 1991 & Dunham, Grube, & Castaneda, 1994) classified organizational commitment as: a) Affective, b) Continuous; c) Normative. Affective commitment is the employees' sentiments towards organizational aims and vision, continuous commitment is employees' need of staying in organization due to the feeling of costs, if leaves the organization and normative commitment is employees' understanding of duties and promises made for the welfare of the organization. (Blau & Boal, 1987) recognized organizational commitment as "an identification with and loyalty to the organization and its goals". Robbins (1998) defined organizational commitment as "the degree to which an employee identifies with a particular organization and its goals, and wishes to maintain membership in the organization". Reyes and Pounder (1990) termed organizational commitment as "a strong belief and intention to identify with organizational value, devote to and stay with the organization".

Greenberg and Baron (1997) defined organizational commitment as a person's emotional and rational response towards the job. Mathews and Shepherd (2002) described organizational commitment as employees' attitude, behavior and an attachment between employees and the organization.

Robbins (2005) defined organizational commitment as identification of one's with the organization and its aims and also his/her desire to be associated with the organization.

As per Hart & Willower (2001) organizational commitment comprises of belief in the organization aims and objectives, wish to work positively for the organization and willingness to be associated with in the organization.

Continuous commitment is the perception of the cost related with leaving a particular course of action. (Meyer and Herscovitch, 2001)

Relationship between individual and organization and attitude and behavior of

workers is considered as organizational commitment. (Mathews and Shepherd, 2002)

Sparrow and cooper (2003) recommended that employees feeling and responsibilities toward the organization is part of normative commitment and connecting with the feelings of loyalty and obligation.

The affective, normative and continuance commitment is connection with organization emotionally, benefits from the current job and becoming loyal to the organization due to the personal beliefs respectively. (Meyer & Allen, 1991; Meyer, Becker, & Vandenberghe, 2004)

Desire to be associated with the organization and continue to work with the same has been conceptualized as affective organizational commitment. (Kimpakorn and Tocquer, 2010)

Organizational commitment may be defined as one's feeling of faithfulness or connection with the organization. (Muchinsky, 2009; Spector, 2008; Morrow, 2011) Kipkebut, (2010), Gaylor, (2004), Rauf, Muhammad; Mohammad, and Islam, (2013) and Meyer, Stanley, and Herscovitch, L. (2002) referred organizational commitment from three points of views which are Behavioral approach or exchange based approach, Attribution Approach and Psychological Approach.

The affective commitment is one of the most important components of organizational commitment as directly affects the financial and attitudinal performance of an organization. (Ferdous *et al.*, 2013; Gong *et al.*, 2009) and it is also where an employee considers himself as a part of an organization and work for the organization.

Kumasey, Delle and Ofei (2014) defined normative commitment "as a feeling of obligation to continue with an organization".

Berberoglu and Secim (2015) advocated that employees who are more committed will definitely work with motivation and shall perform maximum for their organizations.

Organizational commitment can finally be defined as a strong psychological attachment of an employee with the organization and not only psychological but also a behavior where employee contributes for the betterment of the organization in a positive way and importantly, it is a positive stance of employee to the organization. (Nicol, Rounding & MacIntyre, 2011; Agarwala, Arizkuren-Eleta, Castillo, Muñiz-Ferrer & Gartzia, 2014; Ifie, 2014)

In line of above given definitions present study operationalizes the concept of organizational commitment as "bonding and affiliation of employees resulting in a loyalty in term of continuance, normative and affective commitment"

OBJECTIVES OF THE PRESENT STUDY

- To identify various indicators of Organizational Commitment in Hotel Industry.
- To see the relationship between identified indicators of Organizational Commitment in Hotel Industry.

HYPOTHESIS

The objective of the study is to see the relationship between indicators of organizational commitment. Therefore the present study is based on these following hypotheses:

- H₀₁: There is not significant relationship between affective commitment and Organizational commitment.

- H₀1: There is not significant relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment.
- H₀2: There is not a significant relationship between job satisfaction and continuance commitment.
- H₀3: There is not a significant relationship between job satisfaction and affective commitment.
- H₀4: There is not a significant relationship between job satisfaction and normative commitment.

RESEARCH DESIGN

The research design of the current study is exploratory-cum-descriptive-cum-diagnostic in nature. Though, lot of studies have been conducted on job satisfaction and organizational commitment in various fields like Retail, Banking, Education etc. but very limited research has been conducted in Hospitality Industry especially in Indian Context. Therefore, the present study is exploratory in nature. It is descriptive because factors affecting job satisfaction and organizational commitment, identified by other scholars are included. The study is diagnostic as it establishes a relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment.

UNIVERSE OF THE STUDY

Universe of the study comprises of all the hotels operating in India categorized by concerned department/agency.

SURVEY POPULATION

The current study is conducted in Delhi and NCR region. The NCR region comprises of various districts of Uttar Pradesh (Meerut, Muzaffar Nagar, Gaziabaad, Gautam Budh Nagar, Bulandshahr, Bhagpat, Hapur), Haryana (Faridabad, Gurugram, Mahendragarh, Bhiwani, Nuh, Rohtak, Sonapat, Rewari, Jhajjar, Panipat, Palwal, Bhiwani, Jind and Karnal), Rajsthan (Alwar, Bharatpur) and NCT Delhi. For the current study, operational level employees working in various 3*, 4*, 5* and 5*deluxe hotels situated in NCT Delhi, Gurugram, Faridabad and Noida affiliated from Ministry of Tourism (MOT), Government of India were selected. Exhibit 3.1 shows that in different category there are 47 hotels approved from MOT, Govt. of India. Further, table elaborates the names and location of these hotels.

SAMPLE SURVEY

To carry out any study effectively, sample should be selected in a way that it should represent the whole population. For the purpose of present study, a total of 22 hotels out of 47 hotels which are affiliated by Ministry of Tourism, Govt. of India from NCT region, were selected. Rather than using convenient sampling, various factors taken into account while selecting sample for the present study such as brand name, location, area and occupancy level etc.

INDICATORS OF ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT

Factor analysis is performed to identify important dimensions on 20 statements of organization commitment using SPSS software version 20. The higher value of KMO and Bartlett's test (.924) confirms that data is fit for applying factor analysis.

Table: 1

KMO and Bartlett's Test	
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.	.924

Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	4878.527
	Df	190
	Sig.	.000

Table: 2

Total Variance Explained									
Component	Initial Eigen values			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	7.681	38.407	38.407	7.681	38.407	38.407	3.426	17.130	17.130
2	1.696	8.479	46.886	1.696	8.479	46.886	3.129	15.646	32.776
3	1.395	6.974	53.861	1.395	6.974	53.861	2.875	14.373	47.149
4	1.178	5.891	59.751	1.178	5.891	59.751	2.520	12.602	59.751
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.									

Accounting for variance of 17.130 percent and eigen value of 7.681, first factor contains five items namely, It is hard to imagine what shall happen if I leave this job without having any other opportunity, I am afraid that there are too little options available for me, overall cost of leaving this organization at present is very high to me, leaving this organization right now will disturb my life and For the time being I have to be with this organization and labeled as Continuance Commitment which is described as a form of psychological attachment to an employing organization that reflects the employees' perception of the loss he/she would suffer if they were to leave the organization. The item includes employee are not ready to leave the job because of the existing facilities he/she is having in the current organization and have not better opportunities with other organizations, very limited options

available, high cost of leaving, disturbance in personal life due to leaving the organization.

Table: 3

Rotated Component Matrix	Component			
	1	2	3	4
Factor-1 Continuance Commitment				
It is hard to imagine what shall happen if I leave this job without having any other opportunity.	.730			
I am afraid that there are too little options available for me.	.706			
Overall cost of leaving this organization at present is very high to me.	.688			
Leaving this organization right now will disturb my life.	.657			
For the time being I have to be with this organization.	.655			
Factor-2 Affective Commitment				
My organization is family to me.		.769		
I consider the organizational problems as my own.		.743		
I feel proud discussing about my organization.		.697		
I have a strong emotional bonding with the organization.		.687		
I would love to work with this organization for my whole life.		.642		
Factor-3 Normative Commitment				
My values force me to be loyal to the organization.			.781	
To me, an employee should always be loyal to the organization.			.744	
It is unethical to change the organization frequently.			.643	
For me it is a moral obligation to remain loyal to the organization.			.560	
In my opinion, employees switch organizations too often.			.531	
Factor-4 Strong Loyalty				
To me staying with one organization is always better.				.733
Despite of good offer, I will not leave the organization.				.621
It is not possible for me to leave this organization.				.586
I may not be getting more benefits in any other organization.				.572

I cannot be more attached to any other organization				.548
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.				
a. Rotation converged in 7 iterations.				

The second underlying factor extracted with a variance of 15.646 percent and Eigen value of 1.696 is having five items namely My organization is family to me, I consider the organizational problems as my own, I feel proud discussing about my organization, I have a strong emotional bonding with the organization and I would love to work with this organization for my whole life and labeled as Affective Commitment which deals with the strong emotional attachment of a person toward his/ her organization. This factor contains items like emotional attachment of a person with the organization and considers the organization as a family, feel proud to be associated with the organization, strong bonding and high level of commitment.

The third important factor comes out to be Normative Commitment. This factor is accountable for 14.373 percent of variance and eigen value of 1.395 and includes five items: My values force me to be loyal to the organization, To me, an employee should always be loyal to the organization, It is unethical to change the organization frequently and for me, it is a moral obligation to remain loyal to the organization. It includes moral value and loyalty of the employees towards his/her organization. Moreover, employees consider it unethical and it is their moral obligation not to frequently change the organization.

The fourth and last factor with four items To me staying with one organization is always better, Despite of good offer, I will not leave the organization, It is not possible for me to leave this organization, I may not be getting more benefits in any other organization and I cannot be more attached to any other organization is related with employees Strong Loyalty with the organization. In this factor employees do not leave the organization just because of their strong bonding and loyalty with their organization and despite of good opportunities and benefits it is hard for them to switch their jobs. This factor is representing 12.602 percent of variance and Eigen value of 1.178.

**REGRESSION ANALYSIS
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN JOB SATISFACTION AND ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT**

Further, to analyze the third objective i.e. to study the impact of job satisfaction on organizational commitment and testing hypothesis, regression analysis is performed and results of the same are as under:

Table: 4

MODEL SUMMERY OF RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN JOB SATISFACTION AND ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT					
Mo del	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
	.554 ^a	.306	.305	.37233	1.618
a. Predictors: (Constant), Job Satisfaction					
b. Dependent Variable: Organizational Commitment					

The result of regression analysis clearly indicates that there exists a positive and significant relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment. The higher value of R (.554) shows the intensity of relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment variables. However, the value of r^2 (.306) shows that only 30.6% variation is accounted in organizational commitment accounted for by job satisfaction.

Table: 5

ANOVA EXHIBIT OF RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN JOB SATISFACTION AND ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT						
Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig. (p)
1		34.795	1	34.795	250.991	.000 ^b
	Residual	78.742	568	.139		
	Total	113.537	569			
a. Dependent Variable: Organizational Commitment						
b. Predictors: (Constant), Job Satisfaction						

The higher value of F and the associated p value signify the strength of relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment. The value of Sig. (p) rejects our null hypothesis and hence, the alternate hypothesis is accepted i.e. there is a significant relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment.

Table: 6

VALUE OF CO-EFFICIENT OF RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN JOB SATISFACTION AND ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.331	.093		14.301	.000
	Job Satisfaction	.550	.035	.554	15.843	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Organizational Commitment

The regression equation is having a constant value 1.331, job satisfaction coefficient of .550. Therefore, the regression equation is

Organizational commitment = 1.331+ .550 (Job Satisfaction).

So, the above Exhibit shows that there is a positive and significant relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Keeping in view the importance of the relationship, hotels should frame policies in order to strengthen the same because the satisfied and loyal employees always work for the betterment of an organization. Thus, our first hypothesis H₀₁ i.e. there is not a significant relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment is rejected and the alternate hypothesis H₁ is accepted.

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN JOB SATISFACTION AND ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT

Further, to see the relationship between job satisfaction and indicators of organizational commitment i.e. affective commitment, continuance commitment, normative commitment and strong loyalty and for this some hypotheses have been generated. These are:

H₀₂: There is not a significant relationship between job satisfaction and continuance commitment.

H₀₃: There is not a significant relationship between job satisfaction and affective commitment.

H₀₄: There is not a significant relationship between job satisfaction and normative commitment.

H₀₅: There is not a significant relationship between job satisfaction and strong loyalty.

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN JOB SATISFACTION AND CONTINUANCE COMMITMENT

To see the relationship between job satisfaction and continuance commitment which is second hypothesis and to test the same regression analysis has been performed and the result is as under:

Table: 7

MODEL SUMMERY OF RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN JOB SATISFACTION AND CONTINUANCE COMMITMENT				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.999 ^a	.999	.999	.03481837
a. Predictors: (Constant), Factors of Job satisfaction				

A positive and significant relationship has been established between Job satisfaction and continuance commitment (refer exhibit no. 4.66). The value of R (.999) confirms a very strong relationship between the two. Further, *r*² shows that if there is a variance in job satisfaction, it will bring a significant change in continuance commitment i.e. 99.9%.

Table: 8

ANOVA EXHIBIT OF RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN JOB SATISFACTION AND CONTINUANCE COMMITMENT						
Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	568.328	15	37.889	31252.972	.000 ^b
	Residual	.672	554	.001		
	Total	569.000	569			
a. Dependent Variable: Continuance commitment						
b. Predictors: (Constant), Factors of Job satisfaction						

The higher value of F (31252.972) as shown in exhibit 8 suggests the intensity of relationship between job satisfaction and continuance commitment. P value (.000) rejects the null hypothesis and hence it may be concluded that there is a strong relationship between job satisfaction and continuance commitment.

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN JOB SATISFACTION AND AFFECTIVE COMMITMENT

Regression analysis was again applied to evaluate the impact of job satisfaction on affective commitment. The result of analysis is given below:

Table: 9

MODEL SUMMERY OF RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN JOB SATISFACTION AND AFFECTIVE COMMITMENT				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.329 ^a	.108	.084	.95631753
a. Predictors: (Constant), Factors of Job satisfaction				

From the exhibit 9, it is clear that there is a relationship between job satisfaction and affective commitment as confirmed by value of R (.329). It is pertinent to mention here that though the relationship exists between these two variables but degree of relationship is lesser. Value of r^2 shows the proportion of variance in affective commitment accounted for job satisfaction (10.8%). Hence, the organizations should try to increase the satisfaction level of employees so as to increase the affection of employees their organizations.

Table: 10

ANOVA EXHIBIT OF RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN JOB SATISFACTION AND AFFECTIVE COMMITMENT						
Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	61.343	15	4.090	4.472	.000 ^b
	Residual	506.657	554	.915		
	Total	568.000	569			
a. Dependent Variable: Affective Commitment						
b. Predictors: (Constant), Factors of Job satisfaction						

The value of F (4.472) and associated value of p (.000) shows that there is a significant relationship between job satisfaction and affective commitment and rejects our null hypothesis.

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN JOB SATISFACTION AND NORMATIVE COMMITMENT

Table: 11

MODEL SUMMERY OF RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN JOB SATISFACTION AND NORMATIVE COMMITMENT				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.998 ^a	.996	.996	.01601245
a. Predictors: (Constant), Factors of Job satisfaction				

The significant and strong value of R .998 signifies the relationship between job satisfaction and normative commitment. Further, it will bring a change in normative commitment by 99.6% due to the variance in job satisfaction.

Table: 12

ANOVA EXHIBIT OF RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN JOB SATISFACTION AND NORMATIVE COMMITMENT	
--	--

Model	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	34.881	15	2.325	9069.346	.000 ^b
Residual	.142	554	.000		
Total	35.023	569			
a. Dependent Variable: Normative Commitment					
b. Predictors: (Constant), Factors of Job satisfaction					

The null hypothesis i.e. there is not a significant relationship between job satisfaction and normative commitment is rejected as indicated by value of p and hence, alternate hypothesis is accepted which confirms that there exists a positive and significant relationship job satisfaction and normative commitment.

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN JOB SATISFACTION AND STRONG LOYALTY

Table: 13

MODEL SUMMERY OF RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN JOB SATISFACTION AND STRONG LOYALTY				
Model	R		Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.998 ^a	.996	.996	.01576518
a. Predictors: (Constant), Factors of Job satisfaction				

The results from the exhibit 13 conclude that is a strong and positive relationship between job satisfaction and strong loyalty. R value (.998), r^2 (.996) and adjusted R square (.996) shows the proportion of variance in strong loyalty due to change in job satisfaction.

Table: 14

ANOVA EXHIBIT OF RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN JOB SATISFACTION AND STRONG LOYALTY					
Model	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.

1	Regressi on	34.653	15	2.310	9295.0 18	.000 ^b
	Residual	.138	554	.000		
	Total	34.791	569			
a. Dependent Variable: Strong Loyalty						
b. Predictors: (Constant), Factors of Job satisfaction						

In the above Exhibit, F value 9295.018 and associated p value .000 clearly shows the strength of relationship between job satisfaction and strong loyalty.

CONCLUSION

As a result of factor analysis, a total of 15 factors of job satisfaction were extracted which are labeled as *Relationship with the supervisor* , *salary and incentives* , *Performance appraisal system*, *Working conditions*, *Training facilities and weekly off permissible* , *Clarity regarding job goals and peer group working* , *working environment*, *facilities and problem addressing system*, *complaint handling and promotional policies of the organizations*, *Innovation and creativity*, *flow of communication and work assignment*, *Work life balance and equal opportunities*, *Job rotation policy and competencies of co-workers*, *nature of job and professional development* , *flexible timing and efficient co-workers*.

Among these factors *Relationship with the supervisor* is the most important factor. *Flexible Timing & Efficient Co-Workers* and *Nature of Job and professional development* are the least important factors. Whereas, four factors of organizational commitment were also extracted which are *Continuance commitment*, *Affective commitment*, *Normative commitment* and *Strong loyalty*.

The job satisfaction level is not satisfactory. Most of the employees are not satisfied with the monetary and non-monetary benefits like salary structure, increment, incentives and financial reward. Moreover, about 65 % of the employees think that their organizations do not fairly consider their qualifications, experience while framing policies for salary, fringe benefits and reward system. The employees in the sampled organization also completely appreciate their organization in context of effective and efficient departmental communication.

To achieve third objective, regression analysis was performed and found that there exists a positive and significant relationship between Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment. A weak relation exists between the affective commitment and job satisfaction. However, a strong relation exists between the other factors of organizational commitment (continuance commitment, normative commitment, affective commitment and strong loyalty) and job satisfaction.

Hence, from the results mentioned above it may be concluded that there is a positive and significant relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Though, relationship between these two variables is positive and significant but the strength of relationship is not strong enough. Therefore, organizations should pay attention to satisfy their employees and to make them

committed toward the organizations. Committed employee will not only perform better but will be an asset to the organization.

REFERENCES:

- Berberoglu, A., Secim, H. (2015), Organizational commitment and perceived organizational performance among health care professionals: Empirical evidence from a private Hospital in Northern Cyprus. *Journal of Economics and Behavioral Studies*, 7(1), pp 64-71.
- Blau, G., & Boal, K. (1987). Conceptualizing how job involvement and organizational commitment affect turnover and absenteeism. *Academy of Management Review*, 12, pp.288-300.
- Dunham, R. B., Grube, J. A., & Castañeda, M. B. (1994). Organizational commitment: The utility of an integrative definition. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79(3), pp.370-380.
- Green, F., Ashton, D. and Felstead, A. (2001), “Estimating the determinants of supply of computing, problem-solving, communication, social, and teamworking skills”, *Oxford Economic Papers*, Vol. 53, No. 3, p. 406.
- Kimpakorn, N. and Tocquer, G. (2010), “Service brand equity and employee brand commitment,” *Journal of Services Marketing*, Vol. 24 No. 5, pp. 378-388.
- Kipkebut, D. J. (2010) *Organizational commitment and job satisfaction in higher educational institutions: the Kenyan case* (Doctoral dissertation, Middlesex University, United Kingdom). Retrieved from eprints.mdx.ac.uk/6509/1/kirkebut – Organisational commitment
- Ko, J. W., Price, J. L., & Mueller, C. W. (1997). Assessment of Meyer And Allen's Three-Component Model Of Organizational Commitment In South Korea. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82, pp.961–973.
- Mathews BP, Shepherd JL 2002. Dimensionality of Cook and Wall's (1980) British organizational commitment scale. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 75: pp.369-375
- Meyer PJ, Becker TE, Vandenberghe C (2004). Employee commitment and motivation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89: pp.991–1007.
- Meyer, J. P., Stanley, D. J., and Herscovitch, L. (2002) Affective, Continuance, and Normative Commitment to the Organization: A Meta Analysis of Antecedents, Correlates and Consequences, *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 61, pp.20-52. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.2001.1842> on 16/01/2014
- Meyer, J.P. and Herscovitch, L. (2001), “Commitment in the workplace: toward a general model”, *Human Resource Management Review*, Vol. 11 No. 4, pp. 299-326
- Meyer, J.P. and Herscovitch, L. (2001), “Commitment in the workplace: toward a general model”, *Human Resource Management Review*, Vol. 11 No. 4, pp. 299-326

- Mowday, R., Porter, L., & Steers, R. (1982). *Employee–organization linkages: The psychology of commitment, absenteeism, and turnover*. New York: Academic Press.
- Muchinsky, P. M. (2009). *Psychology applied to work* (9th ed.). Summerfield: Hypergraphic Press
- Mueller, C. W., J. E. Wallace & J. L. Price (1992). Employee commitment: Resolving some issues. *Work and Occupations*, 19(3), pp.211-236.
- Nicol, A. A. M., Rounding, K. & MacIntyre, A. (2011). The impact of Social Dominance Orientation and Right-Wing Authoritarianism on the relation between Person–Organization fit with commitment, satisfaction, and turnover intentions. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 51, pp. 893-898.
- R. Hart, Delmar & J. Willower, Donald. (1994). Principals' Organizational Commitment and School Environmental Robustness. *Journal of Educational Research - J EDUC RES.* 87, pp.174-179 10.1080/00220671.1994.9941239.
- Rauf, M., Muhammad Sahed; A., Syed Mohammad, A., and Ul-Islam, M. (2013) Relationship between organizational commitment and job satisfaction of teachers serving as subject specialist at Higher Secondary Schools in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, *Academic Journal of Pakistan*, 8 (2): 144
- Robbins, S. P. (2005). *Organizational Behavior*. New York: Pearson Prentice Hal.
- Robbins, S.P. (1998). *Organizational behavior* (8th ed.) New Jersey: Prentice Hall
- Rogers, J.D., Clow, K.E. and Kash, T.J. (1994), “Increasing job satisfaction of service personnel”, *Journal of Services Marketing*, Vol. 8 No. 1, pp. 14-26
- Sparrow, P.R. & Cooper, C. (2003). *The Employment Relationship: Key challenges for HR*. Oxford: Butterworth Heinemann.
- Williams, L.J. & Hazer, J.T. (1986). Antecedents and consequences of satisfaction and commitment in turnover models: A reanalysis using latent variable structural equation methods. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71, pp.219-23.