

ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT AS A MEDIATOR OF ORGANIZATIONAL PRODUCTIVITY AND JOB SATISFACTION : THE CASE OF MANUFACTURING ORGANIZATION

Dr. Pankaj Tripathi*, **Dr. Vivek Kumar Shahi****, **Dr. Govind Singh ***** **Alok Pratap Singh******, **Dr. Manjeet Mishra*******

*Assistant Professor , Department of Psychology,University of Allahabad,Prayagraj

**Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Digvijai Nath Post Graduate College, Gorakhpur

***Guest Faculty, Department of Psychology,Prof. Rajendra Singh (Rajju Bhaiya) University, Prayagraj

****Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology,Feroze Gandhi College,Raebareli,Lucknow University

*****MD (Organon of Medicine) Bakson Homeopathic College, Noida

Abstract

Objective: This study aimed to examine the relationship between job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and organizational productivity. Further, the objective study was to investigate organizational commitment as a mediator between job satisfaction and organizational productivity. **Method:** The sample consisted of 266 employees at the manufacturing company in Gurgaon, India. The age range was from 25 to 52 years. Data was collected through questionnaires that tapped information regarding demographics-gender, age, and designation; organizational commitment (9 items, Bozeman and Perrew's (2001), job satisfaction, (5 items, Camman, Fichman, Jenkins, and Flesh (1984), and organizational productivity (5 items, Spreitzer and Mishra (1999). Responses were obtained on a five-point scale ranging 'strongly disagree' (1) to 'strongly agree' (5). **Results:** SPSS 26 is used for statistical analysis. In the first step, according to the results of the data tables, analyses are done to determine the descriptive statistics. In the second step, correlation analysis was done. In the last step, testing mediation with the PROCESS macro (Hayes, 2013a,2013b). Results showed that job satisfaction and organizational commitment showed a positive and significant relationship. It also revealed that organizational commitment and job satisfaction also showed a positive and significant relationship with Organizational productivity and organizational commitment significantly mediates the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational productivity.

Keywords: Organizational commitment, job satisfaction, organizational productivity

1. Introduction and Literature review

As we know that several researches has been done in the area of organizational behavior related to work attitudes. Job satisfaction is an attractive component in any job or organization from

perspective, individual and organization. This research includes both individual and organization, which includes job satisfaction, organizational commitment and organizational productivity.

1.1. Job satisfaction

The concept of job satisfaction was well-defined in numerous ways, according to Locke, (1976), "a pleasant or optimistic emotional state due to job evaluation or work experience." Syeyen and Van Wk (1999) described that job satisfaction is a sense of hope that comes from understanding a person's work. Mwamwenda (1995) identifies the relationship between job satisfaction and productivity, loyalty, activity and working hours. Job satisfaction is the sum of pleasure or job satisfaction (Dubrin, 1997). Job satisfaction is the result of the employee's perception of how well their work is what is considered important (Luthans, 2002).

Job satisfaction is a very significant attribute which is commonly measured by organizations. Organizational scholars have long been interested in why some people reports being very satisfied with their jobs, while others express much lower levels of satisfaction. (Locke, 1976). The drive to understand and explain job satisfaction has been motivated by useful and practical reasons, as it could increase productivity, enhance organizational commitment, lower absenteeism and turnover, and ultimately, increase organizational effectiveness. Job satisfaction is just how people relate to their work and various aspects of their work. This is the degree to which people like (satisfaction) or dislike (dissatisfaction) aspects of their work or work, such as "work for themselves", "pay", "promotion of opportunities", "control", and "cooperation" (Spector 1997). Job satisfaction in the modern world can be defined as one of the most important but debated problems in the business world. This means the general attitude of the employee towards his work. It is a pleasant or positive emotional state that comes from assessing your work or work experience. He also shows how satisfied the person is with his work.

Extensive literature about job-satisfaction is available which has been done across a variety of work settings. Job-satisfaction is one of the determinants of effective management in organization. Job satisfaction can be broken down into three general areas: the values that an individual has or wants, the perception of how the organization meets these values and their relative importance to the individual (Locke, 1976). Job satisfaction has been linked to positive workplace outcomes such as increased organizational commitment, with workers having high levels of job satisfaction being more likely to be committed to the organization (Brown and Peterson, 1993). Furthermore, individuals with higher levels of job satisfaction are less likely to seek out a different job (Sager, 1994) or to leave the organization (Boles, Johnson, and Hair, 1997).

1.2. Organizational commitment

Commitment is a multidimensional concept in which affecting and normative commitment are considered comparatively more necessary from an organizational point of view. A variety of definition and measures of organizational commitment have been set forth (Meyer & Allen, 1984; Morrow, 1983; Mowday, Porter & Steers, 1982). According to Meyer, Allen and their colleagues viewed affective, normative, continuance commitment as attitudinal commitment.

The normative commitment has been found to be distinct from affective commitment (Meyer & Allen, 1997). Allen and Meyer (1990) defined affective commitment as an employee's emotional attachment to 'identification with and involvement in the organization'; continuance commitment sometimes termed calculative commitment (Hackett, Bycio, & Hausdorf, 1994). Mathieu & Zajac, (1990) as commitment based on the costs that employee associate with leaving the organization', and normative commitment as an employee's feelings of obligation to remain with the organization. In contrast to affective and continuance, normative commitment focuses on the right or moral things to do (Weiner, 1982) and concentrates on the obligation and /or moral attachment of employees which is produced by the socialization of employees to the organization's goals and values (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Weiner, 1982). organizational commitment is generally considered to include three broad components: an acceptance of the organization's goals, a willingness to work hard for the organization, and a desire to remain with the organization (Steers and Porter, 1979).

Meyer and Allen (1991) assign the obligations of employees to three groups: a) emotional commitment; (b) standing commitments; and (c) a regulatory obligation. Employees with a strong emotional commitment continue to work with the organization as they want. Employees with a permanent commitment remain in the organization because they have to do so. Employees with a high level of regulatory responsibility remain in the organization because they think they should stay in it. Many studies have shown that emotional commitment is positively related to employee responsibilities. (Whitener & Walz, 1993; Somers, 1995; Jaros 1997). With a high level of employee commitment, low turnover, and this employee will work better with fewer work placements (Price & Mueller, 1981). There are certain things that really affect employee responsibilities, such as workload, less recognition, and less reward. Dorgan (1994) defines performance and performance characteristics, including quality as a guiding principle. Epitropaki and Martin (2005) have shown a positive relationship between work status and emotional commitment. Addae and Wang (2006) identify a negative relationship between employee commitment and stress. Irving and Coleman (2003) have shown a positive relationship between stress and commitment to continue. Somers (2009) showed a slight link between work stress and work duration.

Each organization must make a full commitment to its employees to achieve excellent results over time (Mowday, Porter & Steers, 1982). Employees working in a team are currently acting as entrepreneurs, and each team member strives to be the best among all others (Mowday et al. 1982). Increasing employee commitment within an organization will ultimately improve the productivity of your employees. In the past, organizations provided security to their employees to increase their commitment to the organization and increase their productivity (Abelson, 1976). Higher employee commitment within an organization for individual projects or business is seen as the main reason for increasing employee productivity, which leads to organizational success. Employee productivity can also be improved when employees are more satisfied with their work and responsibilities. Their satisfaction may depend on the pay system, organizational culture, and knowledge of employee exchange (Mowday et al. 1982). For four decades, ongoing employee participation surveys and their impact on employee performance and efficiency have been ongoing. (Becker, 1960).

1.3. Organizational Productivity

Productivity is a measure of effectiveness of the transformation process indicating how the resources are being utilized. It can be interpreted as relationship between the physical resources used in production and the units of output produced in a specified period of time. From one perspective on organizational productivity, productivity may be defined as follows:

$$\text{Productivity} = \text{Output} / \text{Input}$$

This applies in an enterprise, to a sector of economic activity or the economy as a whole. The term “productivity” can be used to assess or measure the extent to which certain output can be extracted from a given input. In a typical enterprise the output is normally defined in term of products or services rendered. In a manufacturing concern, products are expressed in numbers, by value and by conformity to predetermined quality standards. In a service rendered, in a travel agency, it could be value of tickets per customer and so on. Both manufacturing and service enterprise should be equally interested in consumers; or users’ satisfaction, such as number of complaints or rejects.

1.4. Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment, and Organizational Productivity

Job satisfaction and organizational commitment have been shown to be positively related to performance (Benkhoff, 1997), and negatively related to turnover (Clugston, 2000; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990) and turnover intent (Lum, Kervin, Clark, Reid & Sirola, 1998). The massive popular of study shows a positive relationship between satisfaction and commitment (Aranya, Kushnir & Valency, 1986; Boshoff & Mels, 1995; Harrison & Hubbard, 1998; Johnston et al., 1990; Knoop, 1995; Kreitner & Kinicki, 1992; Norris & Niebuhr, 1984; Ting, 1997) and their relationship has an influence on performance and turnover intent (Benkhoff, 1997; Clugston, 2000; , Lum, et al., 1998; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990).

Several studies have been conducted which demonstrated the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment. A study conducted in five Lebanese banks by Dirani and Kuchinke (2011) on the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment, results showed that job satisfaction and organizational commitment were significantly correlated and satisfaction was a predictor of commitment (Malik, Nawab, Naeem and Danish (2010); Suma and Lesha (2013); Ahmad and Oranya (2010).

In a study carried out by Aydogdu and Asikgil (2011) on the employees working in the service and production industry, results showed a significant relationship between affective commitment and job satisfaction. Results also showed that there is a significant relationship between job satisfaction and normative commitment. Aydogdu and Asigil (2011) showed that a significant and positive relationship between job satisfaction and continuance commitment. In contrast, study conducted by Ahmad and Oranya (2010) showed that there is no significant correlation between job satisfaction and continuance commitment. In the past various empirical investigations has showed that there is a low correlation between job satisfaction, commitment, and the intention to leave an organization, which suggests that no direct relationship exists. There are satisfied, committed employees who decide to leave, and dissatisfied, ambivalent employees who steadfastly remain at their jobs (Norizan, 2012).

1.5. Motivation for the present study

The above literature review provides evidence of direct relationships between organizational productivity on one hand, and job satisfaction, and organizational commitment on the other. In fact, studies have suggested that organizational commitment help mediate the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational productivity. The present study aimed to examine the relationship between of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and organizational productivity. Further, the objective study was to investigate the organizational commitment as mediator between job satisfaction and organizational productivity .

1.6. Objectives of the study

Following are the objectives of this study:

1. To measure the level of job satisfaction, organizational commitment and organizational productivity of manufacturing organization employees.
2. To examine the relationship between job satisfaction, organizational commitment and organizational productivity of manufacturing organization employees.

1.7. Hypotheses

H1 Job satisfaction of the employees have a positive relationship on organizational commitment.

H2 Organizational commitments of the employees have a positive relationship on organizational productivity.

H3 Job satisfaction of the employees have a positive relationship on organizational productivity.

H4 Organizational commitment mediates the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational productivity.

2. Methodology

2.1. Sample and Procedure

This study use self-administered questionnaires were distributed to collect individual data on the respondents. The sample consisted of 266 employees from manufacturing industries in Gurgaon, India. The mean age of the employees was 36.44 years. 31.88% of employees were B.E. /B. Tech, 5.79% were B.C.A., 44.79% were M. Tech and 17.39% of employees were M.C.A.

2.2. Measures

The instruments were designed for individual level unit of analysis. Each respondent in the study was required to complete three measures: organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and organizational productivity. Responses were obtained on a five point scale ranging 'strongly disagree' (1) to 'strongly agree' (5).

Job satisfaction- Job satisfaction was measured through a three item, 5- point scale questionnaire that was adapted from the work of Camman, Fichman, Jenkins, and Flesh (1984). A sample item is —Working for this organization is very satisfying to me. Responses were

obtained on a five point scale ranging strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5). Cronbach alpha for this scale is .91.

Organizational productivity- Organizational productivity was measured through a 5- item scale taken from the work of Spreitzer and Mishra (1999). Responses were obtained on a five point scale ranging from ‘strongly disagree’ (1) to ‘strongly agree’ (5). Cronbach alpha for this scale was .81.

Organizational commitment- Organizational commitment was measured using Bozeman and Perrew’s (2001), nine item scale having 5-point response category. A sample item is —I am proud to tell others that I am part of this organization. Responses were obtained on a five point scale ranging ‘strongly disagree’ (1) to ‘strongly agree’ (5). Cronbach alpha for this scale was 0.82.

3. Results

3.1. Data analyses

SPSS 26 is used for statistical analysis. In the first step, according to the results of the data tables, analyses are done to determine the descriptive statistics. In the second step, correlation analysis was done. In the last step, testing mediation with the PROCESS macro (Hayes, 2013a,2013b).

Means, standard deviation, range and scale reliabilities all variables are provided in Table 1.

Table 1 Descriptive statistics for total sample.

Variables	M	SD	Range	α
Job Satisfaction	9.11	4.77	3-15	.91
Organizational Productivity	16.28	5.26	6-25	.81
Organizational Commitment	28.63	8.32	15-40	.82

Notes. N = 266.

Table 2 Correlations of key variables.

Variables	1	2	3
Job Satisfaction	-	.34**	.35**
Organizational Productivity	.42**	-	.46**
Organizational Commitment	.35**	.46**	-

Notes.

** $p < .01$, N = 266.

Table 2 shows that correlations among the main variables in our study. Based on theoretical and empirical estimations, bivariate correlations between organizational commitment and job satisfaction are positive. Bivariate correlations between organizational commitment and organizational productivity, job satisfaction and organizational productivity are positive.

Table 2 also shows that Pearson correlation coefficient ($r = 0.35$) between job satisfaction and organizational commitment of employees is significant at 0.01 level (as $p < 0.01$), so the

research hypothesis stating that there is significant correlation between job satisfaction and organizational commitment of manufacturing organization employees is accepted and it is concluded that there is significant correlation between job satisfaction and organizational commitment of manufacturing organization employees (Yucel, 2012, Y. Markovits et al., 2007, Brown and Peterson, 1993). Pearson correlation coefficient ($r = 0.42$) between job satisfaction and organizational productivity of employees is significant at 0.01 level (as $p < 0.01$), so the research hypothesis stating that there is significant correlation between job satisfaction and organizational productivity of manufacturing organization employees is accepted (Kornhanser and Sharp, 1976, Smith and Cranny, 1968). Also, the third relationship tested and identified from the above table was between organizational commitment and organizational productivity. From the sig value i.e. 0.46 is > 0.05 , which shows that there is positive correlation between organizational commitment and organizational productivity, so third research hypothesis are also accepted that organizational commitment have a positive relationship on organizational productivity (Ussahawanitchakit, 2008).

Table 3. Mediation analysis to identify direct and indirect effects between Job Satisfaction and Organizational Productivity.

Effect	Path	Coefficient	SE	95% CL	
				LL	UL
Direct effect of JS on OC	a	1.4967***	.0548	1.3887	1.6047
Direct effect of OC on OP	b	.4887***	.0302	.4292	.5481
Total effect of JS on OP, without accounting for OC	c	.9138***	.3779	.8391	.9885
Direct effect of JS on OP, when accounting for OC	c'	.1824***	.0526	.0789	.2859
Total indirect effect	ab	.6636	.0473	.5709	.7564
Organizational productivity total effect model ($R^2 = .68^{***}$)					

Notes.

Coefficient, nonstandardized B coefficients; SE, standard errors; CI, bias-corrected and accelerated 95% confidence interval; LL, lower limit; UL, upper limit; JS, job satisfaction; OC, organizational commitment; OP, organizational productivity; 5000 bootstrap samples.

*** $p < .001$., $N = 266$.

We created a mediation model (Hayes, 2013) using organizational commitment as mediator. In mediation, mediators are assumed to have a direct effect on each other (Hayes, 2013), and the independent variable (job satisfaction) is assumed to influence mediator in a serial way that ultimately influences the dependent variable (organizational productivity). As illustrated in Fig.

1, a total effect (c) refers to the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational productivity without controlling for mediator; a direct effect (c'), to the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational productivity after controlling for mediator; a total indirect effect (ab), to the role of mediator in the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational productivity. The results showed significant total (c) or direct effects (c') of job satisfaction on organizational productivity (Table 3). The total indirect effects of job satisfaction (ab) were statistically significant, since the 95% confidence interval (CI) of the point estimate did not cross zero. One significant specific indirect effect was also found, there was a significant indirect pathway for job satisfaction through organizational commitment (ab). Greater job satisfaction was associated with organizational commitment, which was itself associated with greater organizational productivity.

4. Discussion

We conclude from our study results that the relationship between job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and organizational productivity is very complex. Job satisfaction is one of the factors that contribute to organizational productivity. These findings conclude that empirically, job dissatisfaction has an indirect effect on organizational productivity through organizational commitment. Organizational commitment is said to be an important variable in the discussion of organizational productivity because it is a popular belief that employees are more committed, so organizational productivity will enhance. The findings of the study also showed that job satisfaction was positively related to organizational commitment, and it conforms to the previous findings (Porter, Steers, Mowday, & Boulian, 1974). Slattery & Selvarajan (2005) observed the relations between job satisfaction, Organizational commitment, and turnover intention among temporary employees and found that positive associations between job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Several studies have focused directly on testing the causal relationship between Job Satisfaction and Organizational commitment (Bateman & Strasser, 1984; Curry et al., 1986; Dossett & Suszko, 1990; Farkas & Tetrick, 1989). Satisfied employees are expected to be committed to the organization and have a strong belief in achieving its objectives. The results of this study indicate that organizational commitment is directly related to job satisfaction.

Organizational commitment has been found to correlate higher with organizational productivity. Both of these variables, namely job satisfaction and organizational commitment are considered to have a positive effect on organizational productivity. Job satisfaction and organizational commitment has always been reported to be positively associated with organizational productivity. According to (Perryer, Jordan, Firms, & Travaglione 2010) committed employees are a more significant personal contribution to the organization and perform better for the organization (Perryer, Jordan, Firms, & Travaglione 2010). The implications of this study contribute to knowledge about the antecedents of organizational productivity.

5. Conclusion

The results of this study support the basic assumption underlying this study that, when employees are satisfied with their work and feel committed to the organization. This study, it can be concluded that the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational productivity

is mediated by organizational commitment. This has suggestions not only for future research, but also to accomplish the organization. The findings of this study indicate that research on organizational commitment has increased and continues to become increasingly important for the researchers.

This study has several limitations. The main limitation of this study is the reliance on a small sample size. Small sample size may limit the generalizability of the respondents of this research. Our respondents came from a variety of organizations as opposed to samples taken from the two organizations. This study tested the mediation model based on cross-sectional data. The results found in this study should be regarded as tentative and require further testing before generalizations can be made. More empirical research is needed to validate the results and conclusions of this research. A larger sample size would make the results better. Longitudinal research designs that will measure organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover intention variables at more than one point of time are also essential for clarifying their relationship.

REFERENCE

1. Abelson, R. P. (1976). Script processing in attitude formation and decision making.
2. Addae, H. M., & Wang, X. (2006). Stress at work: Linear and curvilinear effects of psychological-, job-, and organization-related factors: An exploratory study of Trinidad and Tobago. *International journal of stress management*, 13(4), 476.
3. Ahmad, N., & Oranye, N. O. (2010). Empowerment, job satisfaction and organizational commitment: a comparative analysis of nurses working in Malaysia and England. *Journal of nursing management*, 18(5), 582-591.
4. Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1990). Organizational socialization tactics: A longitudinal analysis of links to newcomers' commitment and role orientation. *Academy of management journal*, 33(4), 847-858.
5. Aranya, N., Kushnir, T., & Valency, A. (1986). Organizational commitment in a male dominated profession. *Human Relations*, 39(5), 433-448.
6. Aydogdu, S., & Asikgil, B. (2011). An empirical study of the relationship among job satisfaction, organizational commitment and turnover intention. *International review of management and marketing*, 1(3), 43.
7. Babakus, E., Cravens, D. W., Johnston, M., & Moncrief, W. C. (1996). Examining the role of organizational variables in the salesperson job satisfaction model. *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management*, 16(3), 33-46.
8. Bateman, T. S., & Strasser, S. (1984). A longitudinal analysis of the antecedents of organizational commitment. *Academy of management journal*, 27(1), 95-112.
9. Becker, H. S. (1960). Notes on the concept of commitment. *American journal of Sociology*, 66(1), 32-40.

10. Benkhoff, B. (1997). Better performance through organizational identification: a test of outcomes and antecedents based on social identity theory. *The search for competitiveness and its implications for employment*, 159-179.
11. Benkhoff, B. (1997). Disentangling organizational commitment. *Personnel review*.
12. Boles, J. S., Johnston, M. W., and Hair, J. F. 1997. "Role Stress, Work-Family Conflict and Emotional Exhaustion: Inter-Relationships and Effects on Some Work-Related Consequences." *Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management*. 17 (Winter): 17-28.
13. Boshoff, C., & Mels, G. (1995). A causal model to evaluate the relationships among supervision, role stress, organizational commitment and internal service quality. *European Journal of marketing*.
14. Brown, S. P., & Peterson, R. A. (1993). Antecedents and consequences of salesperson job satisfaction: Meta-analysis and assessment of causal effects. *Journal of marketing research*, 30(1), 63-77.
15. Brown, S. P., & Peterson, R. A. (1993). Antecedents and consequences of salesperson job satisfaction: Meta-analysis and assessment of causal effects. *Journal of marketing research*, 30(1), 63-77.
16. Clugston, M. (2000). The mediating effects of multidimensional commitment on job satisfaction and intent to leave. *Journal of organizational behavior*, 21(4), 477-486.
17. Clugston, M. (2000). The mediating effects of multidimensional commitment on job satisfaction and intent to leave. *Journal of organizational behavior*, 21(4), 477-486.
18. Curry, J. P., Wakefield, D. S., Price, J. L., & Mueller, C. W. (1986). On the causal ordering of job satisfaction and organizational commitment. *Academy of management journal*, 29(4), 847-858.
19. Dirani, K. M., & Kuchinke, K. P. (2011). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment: validating the Arabic satisfaction and commitment questionnaire (ASCQ), testing the correlations, and investigating the effects of demographic variables in the Lebanese banking sector. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 22(05), 1180-1202.
20. Dorgan, C.E. (1994). Productivity link to the indoor environment estimated relative to Ashrae 1962-1989, Proceedings of Health Buildings, Budapest, 94, 461-472.
21. Dossett, D. J., & Suszko, M. (1990). Re-examining the causal direction between job satisfaction and organizational commitment. SIOP'90 (*Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology '90*).

22. DuBrin, A. J., & DuBrin, A. J. (1997). *Fundamentals of organizational behavior: An applied approach*. South-Western College Pub..
23. Eby, L. T., Freeman, D. M., Rush, M. C., & Lance, C. E. (1999). Motivational bases of affective organizational commitment: A partial test of an integrative theoretical model. *Journal of occupational and organizational psychology*, 72(4), 463-483.
24. Epitropaki, O., & Martin, R. (2005). From ideal to real: a longitudinal study of the role of implicit leadership theories on leader-member exchanges and employee outcomes. *Journal of applied psychology*, 90(4), 659.
25. Farkas, A. J., & Tetrick, L. E. (1989). A three-wave longitudinal analysis of the causal ordering of satisfaction and commitment on turnover decisions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74(6), 855.
26. Hackett, R. D., Bycio, P., & Hausdorf, P. A. (1994). Further assessments of Meyer and Allen's (1991) three-component model of organizational commitment. *Journal of applied psychology*, 79(1), 15.
27. Hallberg, U. E., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2006). "Same same" but different? Can work engagement be discriminated from job involvement and organizational commitment?. *European psychologist*, 11(2), 119-127.
28. Harrison, J. K., & Hubbard, R. (1998). Antecedents to organizational commitment among Mexican employees of a US firm in Mexico. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 138(5), 609-623.
29. Hayes, A. F. (2013). *Methodology in the social sciences*.
30. Irving, P. G., & Coleman, D. F. (2003). The moderating effect of different forms of commitment on role ambiguity-job tension relations. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences/Revue Canadienne des Sciences de l'Administration*, 20(2), 97-106.
31. Jaros, S. J. (1997). An assessment of Meyer and Allen's (1991) three-component model of organizational commitment and turnover intentions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 51(3), 319-337. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1006/jybe.1995.1553>.
32. Johnston, M. W., Parasuraman, A., Futrell, C. M., & Black, W. C. (1990). A longitudinal assessment of the impact of selected organizational influences on salespeople's organizational commitment during early employment. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 27(3), 333-344.
33. Knoop, R. (1995). Relationships among job involvement, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment for nurses. *The journal of psychology*, 129(6), 643-649.

34. Kornhanuser, F., & Sharp, P. (1976). Job satisfaction and motivation of employees in industrial sector. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 145, 323-342.
35. Kreitner, R., & Kinicki, A. (1992). *Organizational Behavior* Boston: Richard, D. Irwin.
36. Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology*. Chicago: RandMc Nally, 2(5), 360-580.
37. Lum, L., Kervin, J., Clark, K., Reid, F., & Sirola, W. (1998). Explaining nursing turnover intent: job satisfaction, pay satisfaction, or organizational commitment?. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*, 19(3), 305-320.
38. Lum, L., Kervin, J., Clark, K., Reid, F., & Sirola, W. (1998). Explaining nursing turnover intent: job satisfaction, pay satisfaction, or organizational commitment?. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*, 19(3), 305-320.
39. Luthans, F. (2002). The need for and meaning of positive organizational behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*, 23(6), 695-706.
40. Malik, M. E., Nawab, S., Naeem, B., & Danish, R. Q. (2010). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment of university teachers in public sector of Pakistan. *International journal of business and management*, 5(6), 17.
41. Markovits, Y., Davis, A. J., & Van Dick, R. (2007). Organizational commitment profiles and job satisfaction among Greek private and public sector employees. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, 7(1), 77-99.
42. Mathieu, J. E., & Zajac, D. M. (1990). A review and meta-analysis of the antecedents, correlates, and consequences of organizational commitment. *Psychological bulletin*, 108(2), 171.
43. Mathieu, J. E., & Zajac, D. M. (1990). A review and meta-analysis of the antecedents, correlates, and consequences of organizational commitment. *Psychological bulletin*, 108(2), 171.
44. Mathieu, J. E., & Zajac, D. M. (1990). A review and meta-analysis of the antecedents, correlates, and consequences of organizational commitment. *Psychological bulletin*, 108(2), 171.
45. Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1984). Testing the "side-bet theory" of organizational commitment: Some methodological considerations. *Journal of applied psychology*, 69(3), 372.

46. Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human resource management review*, 1(1), 61-89.
47. Minear, R. A., & Morrow, C. M. (1983). Raw water bromide: levels and relationship to distribution of trihalomethanes in finished drinking water.
48. Mowday, R. T., Porter, L. W., & Steers, R. (1982). Organizational linkages: The psychology of commitment, absenteeism, and turnover.
49. Mowday, R. T., Steers, R. M., & Porter, L. W. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of vocational behavior*, 14(2), 224-247.
50. Mowday, R. T., Steers, R. M., & Porter, L. W. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of vocational behavior*, 14(2), 224-247.
51. Mowday, R., Porter, L., & Steers, R. (1982). Organizational linkages: the psychology of commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 14(4), 224-247.
52. Mwamwenda, T. S. (1995). Job satisfaction among secondary school teachers in Transkei. *South African Journal of Education*, 15(2), 84-87.
53. Norizan, I. (2012). *Organizational commitment and job satisfaction among staff of higher learning education institutions in Kelantan* (Doctoral dissertation, Universiti Utara Malaysia).
54. Norris, D. R., & Niebuhr, R. E. (1984). Professionalism, organizational commitment and job satisfaction in an accounting organization. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 9(1), 49-59.
55. Pathak, H. P. (2015). Job satisfaction of employees in commercial banks. *Journal of Nepalese Business Studies*, 9(1), 63-76.
56. Perryer, C., Jordan, C., Firms, I., & Travaglione, A. (2010). Predicting turnover intentions. *Management Research Review*.
57. Porter, L. W., Steers, R. M., Mowday, R. T., & Boulian, P. V. (1974). Organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover among psychiatric technicians. *Journal of applied psychology*, 59(5), 603.
58. Price, J. L., & Mueller, C. W. (1981). A causal model of turnover for nurses. *Academy of management journal*, 24(3), 543-565.
59. Slattery, J. P., & Rajan Selvarajan, T. T. (2005). Antecedents to temporary employee's turnover intention. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 12(1), 53-66.
60. Smith, P. C., & Cranny, C. J. (1968). Psychology of men at work. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 19(1), 467-496.

61. Somers, M. J. (1995). Organizational commitment, turnover and absenteeism: An examination of direct and interaction effects. *Journal of organizational Behavior*, 16(1), 49-58.
62. Somers, M. J. (2009). The combined influence of affective, continuance and normative commitment on employee withdrawal. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 74(1), 75-81.
63. Suma, S., & Lesha, J. (2013). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment: the case of Shkodra municipality. *European Scientific Journal*, 9 (17), 41-51.
64. Ting, Y. (1997). Determinants of job satisfaction of federal government employees. *public personnel management*, 26(3), 313-334.
65. Weiner, Y. (1982). Commitment in organization: A normative view. *Academy of Management Review*, 7,418-428.
66. Whitener, E. M., & Walz, P. M. (1993). Exchange theory determinants of affective and continuance commitment and turnover. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 42(3), 265-281.
67. Wittig-Berman, U., & Lang, D. 1990. Organizational commitment and its outcomes: Differing effects of value commitment and continuance commitment on stress reactions, alienation and organization-serving behaviors. *Work and Stress*, 4, 167-177
68. Yücel, İ. (2012). Examining the relationships among job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intention: An empirical study.