

Surveying the relationship of organizational commitment components among managers and employees job satisfaction in Governmental Banks of Ardabil province

Malek Shahamat ¹, Soleiman Iranzadeh ²

¹ Department of Management, East Azarbaijan Science and Research Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tabriz, Iran;

² Department of Management, Tabriz Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tabriz, Iran

Received for publication: 20 February 2013.

Accepted for publication: 01 April 2013.

Abstract

The aim of this study is to recognize the relationship between organizational commitment components among managers and employees' job satisfaction in Governmental Banks of Ardabil province and to analyze it by comparing manager's and employee's organizational commitment and job satisfaction. This study is a correlation. The population of the study includes personnel of 175 governmental banks branches in Ardabil province. The sample size of this research was set at 308 persons (69 of managers and 239 employees), selected from 5 branches of governmental banks in Ardabil province. We selected respondents according to simple random sampling. To data analysis we have used Spearman's correlation coefficient for finding the relationship and intensity between organizational commitment and employee job satisfaction and organizational commitment's components among managers and employee, and Independent Simple T test to study the difference between the amount of organizational commitment and sample job satisfaction. Data collection was done using the following distributed questionnaires: Meyer & Allen's questionnaire including three aspects (emotional, continuance and normative) to measure organizational commitment and measurement of job satisfaction was performed with the help of MSQ questionnaire. The result of this study showed that the relationship between personal job satisfaction and personal organizational commitment in Ardabil province's governmental banks is direct and significant.

Keywords: organizational commitment, emotional commitment, normative commitment, continuous commitment, job satisfaction

Introduction

People bring mental and physical abilities and time to their jobs. Many try to make a difference in their lives and in the lives of others through working. The reason for wanting a job is often considerably more than just a paycheck. Jobs can be looked at as the means used to achieve personal goals. When a job meets or exceeds an individual's expectation, the individual often experiences positive emotions. These positive emotions represent job satisfaction. Job satisfaction in turn is a major contributor to life satisfaction (Smith, Cranny, & Stone, 1992), a personal goal that many find worth pursuing.

Job satisfaction may be compared to another source of life satisfaction – marriage. When people lack marriage satisfaction or experience dissatisfaction in their union, they often get a divorce. It is similar with the relationship between employee and employer. "Take this job and shove it!" is not only a recorded blue-collar anthem by Johnny Paycheck during the 1980s, but also an illustration of the sentiments and actions of many people who are dissatisfied with their jobs overall or with certain aspects of their jobs.

To grasp the meaning of a construct like job satisfaction, it seems logical to look at how it is defined in the literature. The search for a universal defini-

Corresponding author: Malek Shahamat, Department of Management, East Azarbaijan Science and Research Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tabriz, Iran. E-mail: shahamat52@yahoo.com. Tel.: +989144518006.

tion of job satisfaction is not difficult one; it is an impossible one. Even though many researchers define job satisfaction, the definitions vary. The three definitions most commonly referred to among researchers are Hoppock's, Locke's, and Vroom's. In the thirties, Hoppock's (1935) response to the question what is job satisfaction? was: "...any combination of psychological, physiological, and environmental circumstances that causes a person truthfully to say, 'I am satisfied with my job'" (p. 47). Locke's (1976) answer to the same question in the seventies was: "...a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experiences" (p. 1300).

Vroom (1964), who used the terms "job satisfaction" and "job attitudes" interchangeably, defined job satisfaction as "...affective orientations on the part of individuals toward work roles which they are presently occupying" (p. 99). Even though the definitions vary, a commonality among them seems to be that job satisfaction is a job-related emotional reaction.

Spector (1997) presented three reasons to clarify the importance of job satisfaction. First, organizations can be directed by humanitarian values. Based on these values they will attempt to treat their employees honorably and with respect. Job satisfaction assessment can then serve as an indicator of the extent to which employees are dealt with effectively. High levels of job satisfaction could also be a sign of emotional wellness or mental fitness. Second, organizations can take on a utilitarian position in which employees' behavior would be expected to influence organizational operations according to the employees' degree of job satisfaction/dissatisfaction.

Job satisfaction can be expressed through positive behaviors and job dissatisfaction through negative behaviors. Third, job satisfaction can be an indicator of organizational operations.

Three theoretical frameworks of job satisfaction can be identified in the literature. Framework one is based on content theories of job satisfaction. Framework two is grounded in process theories of job satisfaction. Framework three is rooted in situational models of job satisfaction (Thompson & McNamara, 1997).

Content theories

Content theorists assume that fulfillment of needs and attainment of values can lead to job satisfaction (Locke, 1976). Maslow's (1954) need hi-

erarchy theory and Herzberg's motivator-hygiene theory (Herzberg, 1966) are examples of content theories.

Maslow's need hierarchy theory. According to Maslow's (1954) view of individual needs, job satisfaction is said to exist when an individual's needs are met by the job and its environment. The hierarchy of needs focuses on five categories of needs arranged in ascending order of importance. Physiological, safety, belongingness and love are the lower-level needs in the hierarchy. The higher-level needs are esteem and self-actualization. When one need is satisfied, another higher-level need emerges and motivates the person to do something to satisfy it. A satisfied need is no longer a motivator.

Whaba and Bridwell (1976) did an extensive review of the research findings on the need hierarchy concept. The results of their review indicate that there was no clear evidence showing that human needs are classified into five categories, or that these categories are structured in a special hierarchy. Even though hardly any research evidence was discovered in support of the theory, it enjoys wide acceptance.

Herzberg's Motivator-Hygiene Theory. The study of job satisfaction became more sophisticated with the introduction of Herzberg's motivator-hygiene theory (Herzberg, 1966; Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1959). This theory focuses attention upon the work itself as a principal source of job satisfaction. To Herzberg the concept of job satisfaction has two dimensions, namely intrinsic and extrinsic factors. Intrinsic factors are also known as motivators or satisfiers, and extrinsic factors as hygiene, dissatisfiers, or maintenance factors. The motivators relate to job content (work itself) and include achievement, recognition, work itself, responsibility and advancement. The hygiene relates to job context (work environment) and involve, for example, company policy and administration, supervision, salary, interpersonal relations, and working conditions. Motivators are related to job satisfaction when present but not to dissatisfaction when absent. Hygiene are associated with job dissatisfaction when absent but not with satisfaction when present.

Before the emergence of the motivator-hygiene theory, only single scales had been used to measure job satisfaction. Scores on the high end of the scale reflected high levels of job satisfaction, whereas scores on the low end represented high dissatisfaction. Research based on the motivator-hygiene

theory should apply different scales for job satisfaction and dissatisfaction because the opposite of job satisfaction is no job satisfaction and the opposite of job dissatisfaction is no job dissatisfaction (Iiacqua, Schumacher, & Li, 1995).

Assessing the motivator-hygiene theory, Locke, Fitzpatrick, and White (1983) pointed out that Herzberg's theory is method dependent. Herzberg used what is known as the critical incident technique in the development of his theory. This type of research approach has been the only one consistently leading to results confirming the theory. The results of other applied methods have indicated that hygiene indeed can be associated with job satisfaction and motivators with job dissatisfaction.

Process theories

Process theorists assume that job satisfaction can be explained by investigating the interaction of variables such as expectancies, values, and needs (Gruneberg, 1979). Vroom's expectancy theory (1982) and Adams' equity theory (1963) are representative of the second framework.

Vroom's Expectancy Theory; Vroom's (1982) expectancy theory suggests that people not only are driven by needs but also make choices about what they will or will not do. The theory reposts that individuals make work-related decisions on the basis of their perceived abilities to perform tasks and receive rewards. Vroom established an equation with three variables to explain this decision process. The three variables are expectancy, instrumentality, and valence.

Expectancy is the degree of confidence a person has in his or her ability to perform a task successfully. Instrumentality is the degree of confidence a person has that if the task is performed successfully, he or she will be rewarded appropriately. Valence is the value a person places on expected rewards.

Expectancy, instrumentality, and valence are given probability values. Because the model is multiplicative, all three variables must have high positive values to imply motivated performance choices. If any of the variables approaches zero, the probability of motivated performance also approaches zero. When all three values are high, motivation to perform is also high. Vroom's (1982) expectancy theory suggests that both situational and personality variables produce job satisfaction.

Adams' Equity Theory; the primary research on equity theory was done by Adams (1963). Equity theory proposes that workers compare their own

outcome/input ratio (the ratio of the outcomes they receive from their jobs and from the organization to the inputs they contribute) to the outcome/input ratio of another person. Adams called this other person "referent." The referent is simply another worker or group of workers perceived to be similar to one. Unequal ratios create job dissatisfaction and motivate the worker to restore equity.

When ratios are equal, workers experience job satisfaction and are motivated to maintain their current ratio of outcomes and inputs or raise their inputs if they want their outcomes to increase.

Outcomes include pay, fringe benefits, status, opportunities for advancement, job security, and anything else that workers desire and receive from an organization. Inputs include special skills, training, education, work experience, effort on the job, time, and anything else that workers perceive that they contribute to an organization.

Situational models

Situational theorists assume that the interaction of variables such as task characteristics, organizational characteristics, and individual characteristics influences job satisfaction (Hoy, & Miskel, 1996). Examples of models are the situational occurrences theory of job satisfaction (Quarstein, McAfee, & Glassman, 1992) and Glisson and Durick's (1988) predictors of job satisfaction.

Situational Occurrences Theory. The situational occurrences theory of job satisfaction was proposed by Quarstein, McAfee, and Glassman (1992). The two main components of the theory are situational characteristics and situational occurrences. Examples of situational characteristics are pay, promotional opportunities, working conditions, company policies, and supervision. Individuals tend to evaluate situational characteristics before they accept a job.

Situational occurrences tend to be evaluated after accepting a job. Situational occurrences can be positive or negative. Positive occurrences include, for example, giving employees some time off because of exceptional work or placing a microwave in the work place. Negative occurrences include, for example, confusing email messages, rude remarks from coworkers, and copiers which seem to break down a great deal. Quartstein *et al.* (1992) hypothesized that overall job satisfaction is a function of a combination of situational characteristics and situational occurrences. The findings of their study supported the hypothesis. According to the research-

ers, a combination of situational characteristics and situational occurrences can be a stronger predictor of overall job satisfaction than each factor by itself.

Predictors of Job Satisfaction: Glisson and Durick (1988) examined simultaneously the ability of multiple variables from three categories (worker, job, and organizational characteristics) to predict both job satisfaction and organizational commitment. They proposed that job tasks would be excellent predictors of job satisfaction, characteristics of workers poor predictors, and characteristics of the organization moderate predictors. Their findings supported the traditional emphasis on job characteristics as determinants of job satisfaction, and to a lesser extent, the more recent examinations of organizational determinants.

Assessment of job satisfaction might identify various levels of satisfaction among organizational departments and, therefore, be helpful in pinning down areas in need of improvement. Spector (1997) believed that each one of the reasons is validation enough of the significance of job satisfaction and that the combination of the reasons provides an understanding of the focus on job satisfaction.

Spector, of course, is only one of many researchers, scholars, and writers who addressed the importance of job satisfaction. His reasons appear to be representative of many views on the importance of the concept in other major works (i.e., Bruce & Blackburn, 1992; Cranny *et al.*, 1992; Gruneberg, 1976; Hopkins, 1935) dealing with job satisfaction.

Organizational scientists have developed many definitions of organizational commitment, and numerous scales to measure them. Exemplary of this work is Meyer & Allen's model of commitment, which was developed to integrate numerous definitions of commitment that had proliferated in the research literature. According to Meyer and Allen's (1991) three-component model of commitment, prior research indicated that there are three "mind sets" which can characterize an employee's commitment to the organization:

Emotional Commitment: EC is defined as the employee's emotional attachment to the organization. As a result, he or she strongly identifies with the goals of the organization and desires to remain a part of the organization. This employee commits to the organization because he/she "wants to". In developing this concept, Meyer and Allen drew largely on Mowday, Porter, and Steers's (1982) concept of commitment.

Continuance Commitment (CC): The individual commits to the organization because he/she perceives

high costs of losing organizational membership (cf. Becker's 1960 "side bet theory"), including economic losses (such as pension accruals) and social costs (friendship ties with co-workers) that would have to be given up. The employee remains a member of the organization because he/she "has to".

Normative Commitment (NC): The individual commits to and remains with an organization because of feelings of obligation. For instance, the organization may have invested resources in training an employee who then feels an obligation to put forth effort on the job and stay with the organization to 'repay the debt.' It may also reflect an internalized norm, developed before the person joins the organization through family or other socialization processes, that one should be loyal to one's organization. The employee stays with the organization because he/she "ought to".

Note that according to Meyer and Allen, these components of commitment are not mutually exclusive: an employee can simultaneously be committed to the organization in an emotional, normative, and continuance sense, at varying levels of intensity. This idea led Meyer and Herscovitch (2001) to argue that at any point in time, an employee has a "commitment profile" that reflects high or low levels of all three of these mind-sets, and that different profiles have different effects on workplace behavior such as job performance, absenteeism, and the chance that they will quit.

Rubin and Buttlar (1992) conducted a study to examine the organizational commitment of high school library media specialists in Ohio. They employed Mowday, Porter and Steers's (1982) organizational commitment questionnaire.

Employees whose commitment to the organization is said to be of the normative type remains in the organization simply because they believe they ought to. The factor structure of Allen and Meyer's (1996) organizational commitment scale has been examined in several studies. Some of these studies include measures from all the three components (affective, continuance, and normative) whilst others focus only on affective commitment measure and/or continuance commitment measure.

Studies have provided empirical support to demonstrate that the components are indeed distinguishable from one another (Dunham, Grube, & Castaneda, 1994; Mc Gee, & Ford, 1987, and Reilly, & Orsak, 1991). To date, no empirical effort has been made to test and validate Allen and Meyer's (1996) organizational commitment scale in

a library setting, let alone in a Malaysia academic library setting. Only two studies have been reported in the library and information science literature that dealt with the topic of organizational commitment (Hovekamp, 1994; Rubin, & Buttlar, 1992).

The aim of this study is to recognize the relationship of organizational commitment components among managers and employees job satisfaction in Governmental Banks of Ardabil Province and to compare them together to compare manager's organizational commitment and employee.

Research hypothesis

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

1. There is a significant difference between employees and manager's job satisfaction.

2. There is a significant difference between employees and manager's organizational commitment.

3. There is a significant relationship between personnel's organizational commitment and job satisfaction.

4. There is a significant relationship between manager's organizational commitment and job satisfaction.

5. There is a significant relationship between personnel's organizational commitment and job satisfaction.

5-1- There is a relationship between personnel's emotional commitment and job satisfaction

5-2- There is a relationship between personnel's continuous commitment and employees job satisfaction.

5-3- There is a relationship personnel's normative commitment between and employees job satisfaction.

Methodology

This study is a correlation. The population of the study includes personnel of 175 governmental banks branches in Ardabil province. The sample size of this research was set at 308 persons (69 of managers and 239 employees), selected from 5 Branches of governmental banks in Ardabil province. We selected respondents according to simple random sampling (See table 1).

Table 1. Research environment and sample size.

n	Method	N	Governmental Banks	
35		178	Refah bank	1
118	$\frac{\text{valid}}{N} \times n$	599	Melli bank	2
71		359	Agricultural bank	3
31	$\frac{178}{1562} \times 308 \cong 35$	155	Maskan bank	4
53		271	Sepah bank	5
308		1562	Total	

Table 2. Profile of the respondents.

	f	%	
Gender	Males	248	81
	Female	56	18
	Missing	4	1
Work experience	Under 5	78	25
	6-10	143	46
	11-15	54	18
	16-20	13	4
	> 20 years	16	5
	Missing	2	0.64
Degree	Diploma	124	40
	Associate Degree	59	19
	BA	99	32
	MA or upper	45	15
	Missing	12	4

Data collection was done using the distributed questionnaires: Meyer & Allen's questionnaires including 3 aspects (emotional, continuance and normative) to measurement organizational commitment and measurement job satisfaction used (MSQ) Questionnaire.

To data analysis we have used Spearman's correlation coefficient for finding relationship and intensity between organizational commitment and employee job satisfaction and organizational commitment's components among the managers and employee. Independent Simple T test used to study difference between the amount of organizational commitment and sample job satisfaction.

Results and conclusions

Descriptive analysis

A majority (81%) of the 308 respondents are males, and the 18% are female. The highest Works Experience of respondents (46%) includes those between 6-10 years and the smallest one those between 16-20 years (4%) (See table 2). Also, the highest respondents degree reserved to diplomas.

Hypotheses Analysis

H1. There is a significant difference between employee's and manager's job satisfaction.

According to table 3, the Levene's Test for Equal variances yields a p-value of .325. This means that the difference between the variances is statistically insignificant and one should use the statistics in the first row. The p-value .338, greater than 0.05, indicates that there is not significant different between average job satisfaction for employees and managers. The 95% confidence interval for the difference between two means is (-1.808, 0.622). (This is for the average job satisfaction of managers minus average job satisfaction of employees, because we have defined Group 1 as managers and Group 2 as employees in step 4.)

Table 3. The results of an Independent Samples Test difference between employee's and manager's job satisfaction.

		Independent Samples Test								
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances			t-test for Equality of Means					
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower		Upper
job satisfaction	Equal variances assumed	.970	.325	-.960	306	.338	-.59281	.61763	-1.8081	.62253
	Equal variances not assumed			-.984	114.46	.327	-.59281	.60253	-1.7864	.60074

Table 4. The results of Independent Samples Test difference between employees and manager's organizational commitment.

		Independent Samples Test								
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances			t-test for Equality of Means					
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower		Upper
commitment	Equal variances assumed	3.18	0.76	-2.786	306	.006	-3.59984	1.29226	-6.14268	-1.05701
	Equal variances not assumed			-3.124	133.44	.002	-3.59984	1.15214	-5.87867	-1.32101

H2. There is a significant difference between employees and manager's organizational commitment.

According to table 4, the Levene's Test for Equal variances yields a p-value of .076. This means that the difference between the variances is statistically insignificant and one should use the statistics in the first row. The p-value .006, less than 0.05, indicates that there is significant different between average organizational commitment for employees and managers. The 95% confidence interval for the difference between two means is (-1.808, 0.622). (This is for the average organizational commitment of managers minus average organizational commitment of employees, because we have defined Group 1 as managers and Group 2 as employees in step 4.)

Table 5. The results of a correlation coefficient between organizational commitment and employees' job satisfaction.

Spearman's Correlations		
organizational commitment and employees' job satisfaction	Correlation Coefficient	.262
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	239

H3. There is a significant relationship between organizational commitment and employees' job satisfaction.

According to Table 5, p- value is .262. So, the correlation coefficient between organizational commitment and job satisfaction in the $p \leq 0.05$ has been significant, we can say that there is a correlation coefficient between organizational commitment and job satisfaction. The coefficient of determination of 6.86% of the variance in organizational commitment is employees' job satisfaction.

H4. There is a significant relationship between manager's organizational commitment and job satisfaction.

According to Table 6, p- value is 0.560. So, the correlation coefficient between organizational commitment and manager's job satisfaction in the $p \leq 0.05$ has been significant, we can say that there is a correlation coefficient between organizational commitment and job satisfaction. The coefficient of determination of 31.36% of the variance in organizational commitment is manager's job satisfaction.

Table 6. The results of a correlation coefficient between organizational commitment and manager's job satisfaction.

Spearman's Correlations		
organizational commitment and manager's job satisfaction	Correlation Coefficient	.560
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	69

H5. There is a significant relationship between personnel's organizational commitment and job satisfaction.

According to Table 7, p- value is 0.327. So, the correlation coefficient between organizational commitment and personnel's job satisfaction in the $p \leq 0.05$ has been significant, we can say that there is a correlation coefficient between organizational commitment and job satisfaction. The coefficient of determination of 10.69% of the variance in organizational commitment is personnel's job satisfaction

Table 7. The results of a correlation coefficient between organizational commitment and personnel's job satisfaction.

Spearman's Correlations		
organizational commitment and personnel's job satisfaction	Correlation Coefficient	.327
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	308

Table 8. The results of a correlation coefficient between emotional commitment and personnel's job satisfaction.

Spearman's Correlations		
emotional commitment and personnel's job satisfaction	Correlation Coefficient	.320**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	308

H5.1. There is a relationship between personnel's emotional commitment and job satisfaction.

According to Table 8, p- value is 0.320. So, the correlation coefficient between emotional commitment and personnel's job satisfaction in the $p \leq 0.05$ has been significant, we can say that there is

a correlation coefficient between emotional commitment and job satisfaction. The coefficient of determination of 10.69% of the variance in emotional commitment is personnel's job satisfaction.

Table 9. The results of a correlation coefficient between continuous commitment and personnel's job satisfaction

Spearman's Correlations		
continuous commitment and personnel's job satisfaction	Correlation Coefficient	.253**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	308

H5.2. There is a relationship between personnel's continuous commitment and employee's job satisfaction.

According to Table 9, p- value is 0.253. So, the correlation coefficient between continuous commitment and personnel's job satisfaction in the $p \leq 0.05$ has been significant, we can say that there is a correlation coefficient between continuous commitment and job satisfaction. The coefficient of determination of 6.40% of the variance in continuous commitment is personnel's job satisfaction

Table 10. The results of a correlation coefficient between normative commitment and personnel's job satisfaction.

Spearman's Correlations		
normative commitment and personnel's job satisfaction	Correlation Coefficient	.158**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.006
	N	308

H5.3. There is a relationship between personnel's normative commitment and employee's job satisfaction.

According to Table 10, p- value is 0.158. So, the correlation coefficient between normative commitment and personnel's job satisfaction in the $p \leq 0.05$ has been significant, we can say that there is a correlation coefficient between normative commitment and job satisfaction. The coefficient of determination of 2.49 % of the variance in normative commitment is personnel's job satisfaction

The result of this study showed that the relationship between personal job satisfaction and personal organizational commitment in Ardabil province's governmental banks is direct and significant.

References

- Adams J.S., 1963. Toward an understanding of inequity. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*. 67(5): 422-436.
- Alnajjar A., 1996. The relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment among employees in the United Arab Emirates. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 3(1):124-130.
- Bruce W.M., & Blackburn J. W., 1992. Balancing job satisfaction and performance.
- Cohen A., 2007. Commitment before and after: An evaluation and reconceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*. 3: 356-375.
- Cranny C.J., Smith P.C., & Stone E.F., 1992. *Job satisfaction: How people feel about their jobs and how it affects their performance*. Lexington Books, New York.
- Dunham R.B., Grube J.A., & Castaneda M.B., 1994. Organizational commitment: The utility of an integrative definition. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 79(3): 370-380.
- Fingan J., 2000. The impact of person and organizational values on organizational commitment. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*. 73:149
- Chang H.T., Chi M.W., & Miao M.C., 2007. Testing the relationship between three component organizational/occupational commitment and organizational/occupational turnover intention using a none-recursive model. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*. 2:320-335.
- Glisson C., & Durick M., 1988. Predictors of job satisfaction and organizational commitment in human service organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*. 33(1): 61-81.
- Gruneberg M.M., 1979. *Understanding job satisfaction*. The Macmillan, New York.
- Hall D.T., Schneider B. & Nygren H.T., 1970. Personal factors in organizational identification. *Administrative Science Quarterly*. 15: 176-190
- Herzberg F., 1966. *Work and the nature of man*. Thomas Y. Crowell Publishers, New York.
- Herzberg F., Mausner B., & Snyderman B., 1959. *The motivation to work (2nd Ed.)*. John Wiley & Sons, New York.

- Hoppock R., 1935. *Job satisfaction*. Harper & Brothers Publishers, New York.
- Hovekamp T.M., 1994. Organizational commitment of professional employees in union and nonunion research libraries. *College & Research Libraries*, 43.
- Hoy W.K., & Miskel C.E., 1996. *Educational administration: Theory, research, and practice* (5th Ed.). McGraw-Hill, New York.
- Iacqua J.A., Schumacher P., & Li H.C., 1995. Factors contributing to job satisfaction in higher education. *Education*. 116(1): 51-61.
- Judge T., Heller A., Daniel. Mount M.K., 2002. Five factor model of personality and job satisfaction: A meta- analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 87(23): 530-544.
- Laka- M.R., 2004, Modeling the relationship between organizational commitment, leadership style, human resources management practices and organizational trust. University Retrieved
- Locke E.A., 1976. The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), *the handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 1297-1349). Rand McNally, Chicago, IL.
- Locke E.A., Fitzpatrick W., & White F.M., 1983. Job satisfaction and role clarity among university and college faculty. *The Review of Higher Education*, 6(4): 343-365.
- Maslow A.H., 1954. *Motivation and personality*. Harper & Brothers Publishers, New York.
- McGee G.M., & Ford R.C., 1987. Two (or more?) dimensions of organizational commitment: Reexamination of the affective and continuance scales. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 74: 424-432
- Meyer J.P., & Allen N.J., 1991. A three component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*. 1: 61- 89
- Meyer J.P., & Herscovitch L., 2001. Commitment in the workplace: Toward a general model. *Human Resource Management Review*. 11: 299–326.
- Mowday R.T., Steers R.M., & Porter L.W., 1979. The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 14: 224-247
- Mowday R.T., Steers R.M., & Porter L.W., 1982. Employee- organization linkages: the psychology of commitment, absenteeism and turnover. Academic Press, New York.
- Quarstein V.A., McAfee R. B., & Glassman M., 1992. The situational occurrences theory of job satisfaction. *Human Relations*. 45: 859-873.
- Reilly & Orsak (1991). A career stage analysis of career and organizational commitment in nursing. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 39 (3): 311-330
- Robbins S.P., 2005. *Organizational Behavior*, 11 ed. Prentice-Hall, New York.
- Rubin R., & Buttlar L., 1992. A study of the organizational commitment of high school library media specialists in Ohio. *Library Quarterly*. 62(3): 306- 324
- Salancik G.R., 1977. Commitment and control of organizational behaviour and beliefs. In B. M. Staw and G. R. Salancik (Eds.), *New Directions in Organizational Behaviour* (pp. 420-453). St Clair Press, Chicago.
- Smith P.C., Cranny C.J., & Stone E.F., 1992. *Job satisfaction: How people feel about their jobs and how it affects their performance*. Lexington Books, New York.
- Smith P.L., Smits S.J., & Hoy F., 1998. Employee work attitudes: The subtle influence of gender. *Human Relations*. 51(5): 649-666.
- Spector P.E., 1997. *Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, causes, and consequences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Suliman A.M., & Isles P.A., 2000a. Is continuance commitment beneficial to organization's commitment-performance relationship: A new look, *Journal of Managerial development*. 5: 407-426.
- Thompson D., & McNamara J., 1997. Job satisfaction in educational organizations: A synthesis of research findings. *Educational Administration Quarterly*. 33(1): 1-31.
- Vroom V.H., 1964. *Work and motivation*. John Wiley & Sons, New York.
- Wahba M.A., & Bridwell L.G., 1976. Maslow reconsidered: A review of research on the need hierarchy theory. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*. 15(2): 212-240.
- Yukthamarani P., 2009. Organizational commitment, Member Since: Feb, From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia.