

Exploring the Relationship Between Job Satisfaction and It's Factors with Affecting Commitment: A Study of Indian Managers

Dr. Bhajan Lal

Assistant Professor, Institute of Management, Nirma University, India.

Abstract

The commitment of the employees has comprised of three bases namely; cognitive, cost based, and norms/obligation which are obtained through the positive attitude and feeling of affiliation of employees. To investigate the cause and effect of said relationship, the present paper is an attempt to explore the relationship between job satisfaction and affective commitment. The paper also explored the in-depth relationship between various job facets and affective commitment. To obtain the desired result for the purpose of data collection convenient sampling was used. The regression (backward elimination) method was employed to identify to most positive significant facets of job satisfaction towards affective commitment. A total of 306 responses were analysed for the study. The results of the study provided mixed results. The findings of the study suggested pay, supervision, reward, operating-procedure, and work-itself as the most significant facets, whereas other facets like benefits, communication, promotion, and co-worker were found insignificant. The paper suggests that organisations should have put extra effort to explain available benefits, ensure proper communication systems, provide ample growth opportunities, and create a good interpersonal environment to gain more psychological commitment of the employees. The paper also discussed the future implications of the study.

Keywords: Job Satisfaction, Affective Commitment, Pay, Backward Regression, Descriptive Analysis

Background of the Study

In today's competitive environment it is a very big challenge for the organisations to maintain a pool of talented people for the long term with them. To deal with this situation, the human resource (HR) department plays a crucial role in the framing of good HR practice (Alniaçık et al., 2012). It is already claimed that for organisational sustainability, organisations need a loyal workforce which can help the organisation in achieving long term goals.

Organisations always strive to maximise the loyalty of the employees (Hausknecht et al., 2009; Reiche, 2008). If employees feel that they have not been treated fairly or they are not satisfied with the different job facets, it is very tough for the organisations to obtain loyalty from employees and if things are vice-versa, employees are likely to display a higher level of commitment (DeConinck, & Stilwell, 2004) and would stay with the organisation for a long period. Mowday et al. (1982) have also claimed satisfaction with job and its facets as the main determinants for employee's commitment. An ample amount of exiting studies also supported the same notion (Brown & Peterson, 1993; Johnston et al., 1990; Martin & Bennett, 1996; Schwepker, 2001).

Job satisfaction has been attributed as one of the important job attitudes and it has been also branded as a crucial element for organisational productivity and performance (Mathieu, 1991). Job satisfaction also verified by the various social science researchers that fulfillment with the aspects of the job significantly influences performance, loyalty, intent to leave, and absenteeism ((Baron, 1986; Maghradi, 1999). This is an interesting theme where the relationship between perception, attitude, and behaviour has been explored (Rifai; 2005). Considering the concept the theme of the paper has been decided where we have intended to measure the effect of facts of job satisfaction on affective commitment.

Organisational commitment has been the focal point of social scientists from last for the last four decades (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990) as it has shown an ability to predict many work and non-work behaviour (Hackett, Bycio, & Hausdorf, 1994; Meyer et al., 1989; Randall, Fedor, & Longenecker, 1990). Though some raised concern over its applicability (Mowday, 1998), it accepted that truth organisational commitment still an important notion to study (Rousseau, 1998). The definition of organisational commitment has been refined over the years. Based on the early conceptualisation of organisational commitment (Becker, 1960; Porter et al., 1974), Meyer and Allen (1984) offered a 3 component model for organisational commitment and the components were affective commitment (AC), continuance commitment (CC), and

normative commitment (NC). AC explained the psychological attachment with the organisation (Allen & Meyer, 1990), CC refer commitment which is based on cost with leaving the organisation (Allen & Meyer, 1990) and CC represents commitment based on norms and obligation or family pressure to stay with organisation (Allen & Meyer, 1996). Despite the multifunctionality of the construct, there are only a few studies that have studied all three (Randall et al., 1990) and claimed AC is the main dimension that leads to the organisational commitment in a wider sense (Somers, 1995).

Hypotheses Development

Satisfaction with the job not only influenced the organisational commitment (Lam & Zhang, 2003) but its facets also impacted the affective, normative, and continuance commitment (Testa, 2001). Smith (1969) has also explored the relationship between affective commitment and facets of job satisfaction and found a significant influence of job dimensions like job autonomy, promotion, pay co-worker, supervision on the psychological attachment of employees. The same relation was also proposed by (Meyer et al., 1993). Satisfaction with pay also influences the employees' loyalty and his stay with organisation (Kubo & Saka 2002; May et al. 2002). Reward satisfaction also performs as a strong influencer on the affective commitment of the employees (Forstenlechner & Lettice; 2007; Horwitz et al. 2003).

A study conducted by Alvi & Ahmed (1987) has proposed that if a person seeks more opportunity in the organisation tend to stay with the organisation for a longer period. Weng et al. (2010) also confirmed career growth opportunities in the organisation has influences on employee's affective commitment. Opportunities to learn (Ng et al; 2006), opportunities for self-development (Liu & Wang, 2001), and promotional opportunities (Long et al, 2002) have validated the effect on employee loyalty.

Notable literature has identified a strong association between co-worker and supervisor support with organisational commitment (Becker & Billings, 1993; Vandenberghe, Bentein, & Stinglhamber, 2004). But few distinguished pieces of evidence have proved that this relation is there due to affective commitment (Becker & Kernan, 2003; Clugston, Howell, & Dorfman, 2000). A study conducted by Gerstner and Day (1997) to measure the effect of superior-subordinate communication and relationship on affective commitment has found a strong relationship between the analysed variable. McCormack et al. (2006) have investigated a significant effect of supervision and co-worker support on affective commitment. Operating procedures of the organisational also play a vital role in the retention of the employees. Mowday et al, (1982) also supported that perceived organisational support has a significant impact on the psychological attachment of the employee. Based on the above discussion I proposed the following hypotheses for the present study.

- Hypotheses: H₁. Job Satisfaction has a positive significant influence on Affective Commitment.
 - H_{1a}: Pay Satisfaction has a positive significant influence on Affective Commitment.
 - H_{1b}: Promotion Satisfaction has a significant influence on Affective Commitment.
 - H_{1c}: Supervision Satisfaction a significant influence on Affective Commitment.
 - H_{1d}: Benefits Satisfaction a positive significant influence on Affective Commitment.
 - H_{1e}: Reward Satisfaction a positive significant influence on Affective Commitment.
 - H_{1f}: Operating Procedure Satisfaction a significant influence on Affective Commitment.
 - H_{1g}: Co-worker Satisfaction a significant influence on Affective Commitment.
 - H_{1h}: Work-itself Satisfaction has a significant influence on Affective Commitment.
 - H_{1i}: Communication Satisfaction has a significant influence on Affective Commitment.
 -

Research Methodology

- Objective: The main objective of the study is to explore the relationship between job satisfaction and its facets with affective commitment.
- Hypotheses: H₁. Job Satisfaction has a positive significant influence on Affective Commitment.
 - H_{1a}: Pay Satisfaction has a positive significant influence on Affective Commitment.
 - H_{1b}: Promotion Satisfaction has a significant influence on Affective Commitment.
 - H_{1c}: Supervision Satisfaction a significant influence on Affective Commitment.
 - H_{1d}: Benefits Satisfaction a positive significant influence on Affective Commitment.
 - H_{1e}: Reward Satisfaction a positive significant influence on Affective Commitment.
 - H_{1f}: Operating Procedure Satisfaction a significant influence on Affective Commitment.

- H_{1g}: Co-worker Satisfaction a significant influence on Affective Commitment.
 - H_{1h}: Work-itself Satisfaction has a significant influence on Affective Commitment.
 - H_{1i}: Communication Satisfaction has a significant influence on Affective Commitment.
- Research Design and sample characteristics: The present study is more descriptive. The response obtained from the respondents is cross-sectional.
 - Sampling: Convenient sampling was used to obtain responses from the target audience. Few online responses also added to the response sheet. Initially, 700 questionnaires were distributed, out of which 350 were received. Further, due to the incompleteness of the questionnaires more 44 questionnaires were eliminated and finally, 306 complete responses of the responses were used for final analysis.
 - Target Population: Senior and Middle-level executives from the corporates with 100 crores per annum turnover.
 - Instruments: JSS was developed by Spector (2015) was used to measure the satisfaction level of employees on 9 different facets namely Coworkers, Pay, Promotion, Benefits Supervision, Reward, Work itself, Operating Procedures and Communication.
 - Affective Commitment was measured by using OC scale developed by Meyer and Allen (1997)
 - Data Analysis: Multiple Regression(Backward, Elimination), correlation, descriptive statistics

Analysis and Interpretation

Table No.1: Demographic Details of the Respondents

Variables	Group	Number	%
Age in Years	<30	124	40.5
	30-40	88	28.8
	40>	94	30.7
Gender	Female	51	16.7
	Male	255	83.3
Education	UG	158	51.6
	PG	148	48.4
Marital Status	Unmarried	82	26.8
	Married	224	73.2
Experience	<8	139	45.4
	8-16	85	27.8
	16>	82	26.8
Total	N	306	100

Source: Primary Data

Table No. 1 represents the respondent's demographic details, in which <30 years of age respondents are in the majority with 40.5% representation in the responses, followed by age brackets 30-40(88, 28.8%) and 40> (94, 30.7%) respectively. The study is subjugated by males 255 (83.3%) in comparison with females 51(16.7%). Most of the respondents are married which is 73.2% of the sample population. The sample population is also having an educational background of UG 158 (51.6%) and PG 148 (48.4%). The sample population is also dominated by the experience categories who are having experience <8 years

that is 45.4%. Table No.2 represents the descriptive analysis of analysed variables which includes the mean and standard deviation of collected responses.

Variables	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Affective Commitment	21.1503	4.15088	306
Pay	13.4935	2.51324	306
Promotion	13.4314	2.80577	306
Supervision	14.2745	2.90559	306
Benefits	12.7353	3.05660	306
Reward	12.9804	2.60761	306
Operating	12.2614	2.53053	306
Co-worker	13.7157	2.70777	306
Work-itself	14.9118	2.77732	306
Communication	12.8072	3.09925	306

Source: Primary Data

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
AFFECTIVE (1)	1										
Pay (2)	.365**	1									
Promotion (3)	.318**	.402**	1								
Supervision (4)	.406**	.279**	.368**	1							
Benefits (5)	.244**	.344**	.258**	.278**	1						
Reward (6)	.343**	.302**	.340**	.341**	.335**	1					
Operating (7)	-.014	.142*	.200**	-.015	.311**	.354**	1				
Co-worker (8)	.280**	.188**	.252**	.360**	.244**	.252**	.202**	1			
Work-itself (9)	.443**	.368**	.365**	.471**	.245**	.277**	-.069	.352**	1		
Communication (10)	.304**	.205**	.176**	.369**	.216**	.213**	-.034	.285**	.464**	1	
JS (11)	.508**	.595**	.628**	.659**	.616**	.631**	.373**	.588**	.660**	.565**	1

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
 * . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Source: Primary Data

It can be seen from Table No.3 that all variables association are highly correlated with each other on 0.01 level and 0.05 level except two associations, which are representing a negative association between affective commitment and operating procedure (-.014) and communication and operating procedure(-.034).

Table No.4 represents the model summary for different models obtained through the backward elimination process used to run the regression analysis. In Table, no.4 different adjusted R² values are given .302, .303, .303, .302 .298 which means the different composition of the independent variables explains the variance towards the dependent variable affective commitment. To find whether theses compositions with explained variance are significant or not can be seen from table no.5 which are representing the significance value for a different model. From table No. 5 it can be clearly understood that obtained models for the analysis are significant on a 99% confidence level. From table no. 6 different models are presented which were obtained through regression (backward elimination method). In this method on every step most insignificant variable removed by the software until the best models with all significant factors have not remained. For a better understanding of all models with their factors composition and significance presented in a clear manner by which can conclude whether obtained results are as per hypotheses or not.

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std.error of the Estimate
1	.568 ^a	.323	.302	3.46800
2	.567 ^b	.321	.303	3.46525
3	.565 ^c	.319	.303	3.46591
4	.562 ^d	.316	.302	3.46695
5	.557 ^e	.310	.298	3.47679

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	1695.083	9	188.343	15.660	.000 ^b
	Residual	3560.002	296	12.027		
	Total	5255.085	305			
2	Regression	1688.720	8	211.090	17.579	.000 ^c
	Residual	3566.365	297	12.008		
	Total	5255.085	305			
3	Regression	1675.354	7	239.336	19.924	.000 ^d
	Residual	3579.731	298	12.013		
	Total	5255.085	305			
4	Regression	1661.185	6	276.864	23.034	.000 ^e
	Residual	3593.900	299	12.020		
	Total	5255.085	305			
5	Regression	1628.664	5	325.733	26.947	.000 ^f
	Residual	3626.421	300	12.088		
	Total	5255.085	305			

Source: Primary Data

Model		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
		Beta			Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)		3.024	.003		
	Pay	.161	2.872	.004	.729	1.371
	Promotion	.065	1.138	.256	.706	1.416
	Supervision	.131	2.191	.029	.640	1.562
	Benefits	.040	.727	.468	.746	1.341
	Reward	.177	3.097	.002	.697	1.435
	Operating	-.125	-2.229	.027	.727	1.375
	Co-worker	.079	1.445	.150	.766	1.306
	Work-itself	.178	2.833	.005	.582	1.718
	Communication	.055	.992	.322	.737	1.358
2	(Constant)		3.023	.003		
	Pay	.169	3.078	.002	.759	1.318
	Promotion	.065	1.144	.254	.706	1.416
	Supervision	.136	2.287	.023	.648	1.543
	Reward	.182	3.189	.002	.704	1.421
	Operating	-.115	-2.118	.035	.771	1.296
	Co-worker	.081	1.482	.139	.767	1.303
	Work-itself	.180	2.868	.004	.583	1.715
	Communication	.059	1.055	.292	.741	1.349
	3	(Constant)		3.193	.002	
Pay		.170	3.103	.002	.759	1.318

	Promotion	.062	1.086	.278	.709	1.411
	Supervision	.145	2.473	.014	.663	1.508
	Reward	.185	3.260	.001	.707	1.415
	Operating	-.118	-2.167	.031	.773	1.294
	Co-worker	.087	1.609	.109	.777	1.287
	Work-itself	.200	3.344	.001	.642	1.558
4	(Constant)		3.260	.001		
	Pay	.185	3.468	.001	.806	1.240
	Supervision	.156	2.704	.007	.684	1.462
	Reward	.192	3.393	.001	.715	1.399
	Operating	-.109	-2.032	.043	.789	1.267
	Co-worker	.089	1.645	.101	.778	1.286
	Work-itself	.210	3.554	.000	.658	1.520
5	(Constant)		3.626	.000		
	Pay	.184	3.443	.001	.806	1.240
	Supervision	.178	3.141	.002	.720	1.390
	Reward	.195	3.430	.001	.715	1.398
	Operating	-.090	-1.713	.038	.828	1.208
	Work-itself	.232	4.030	.000	.695	1.440

Dependent Variable: Affective Commitment

Source: Primary Data

Models 1 (Pay,Promotion,Supervision Benefits, Reward, Operating, Co-worker, Work-itself, Communication for Adjusted R² .302, F value 15.660; p<.001) Models 2 (Pay,Promotion,Supervision Reward Operating, Co-worker, Work-itself, Communication for Adjusted R² .303, F value 17.579; p<.001) Models 3 (Pay,Promotion,Supervision Reward Operating, Co-worker, Work-itself, for Adjusted R² .303, F value 19.924; p<.001) Models 4 (Pay, Supervision Reward Operating, Co-worker, Work-itself, for Adjusted R² .302, F value 23.034; p<.001) Models 5 (Pay, Supervision ,Reward Operating, Work-itself, for Adjusted R² .298, F value 26.947; p<.001). From table no. 6 it can be seen clearly that the most insignificant variable is removed from the model from every step of the analysis. It can be seen benefits satisfaction (.468) has been removed from the first step of the analysis due to non-significance. Subsequently, communication satisfaction (.292), Promotion(.278), and co-worker satisfaction (.101) have been removed from further steps due to non-significance.

Model		Beta In	t	Sig.	Partial Correlation	Collinearity Statistics		
						Tolerance	VIF	Minimum Tolerance
2	Benefits	.040 ^b	.727	.468	.042	.746	1.341	.582
3	Benefits	.045 ^c	.810	.419	.047	.751	1.332	.639
	Communication	.059 ^c	1.055	.292	.061	.741	1.349	.583
4	Benefits	.045 ^d	.812	.418	.047	.751	1.332	.655
	Communication	.055 ^d	.992	.322	.057	.744	1.345	.599
	Promotion	.062 ^d	1.086	.278	.063	.709	1.411	.642
5	Benefits	.050 ^e	.901	.368	.052	.753	1.328	.690
	Communication	.064 ^e	1.163	.246	.067	.753	1.329	.621
	Promotion	.065 ^e	1.137	.257	.066	.709	1.410	.675
	Co-worker	.089 ^e	1.645	.101	.095	.778	1.286	.658

Source: Primary Data

Based on the regression (backward elimination) analysis obtained results are presented in table no. 7. Which is also providing details about accepted and rejected hypotheses for the present study.

Table No.7		
Hypothesis No.	Hypothesis	Accept/Reject
1	H _{1j} : Job Satisfaction has a positive significant influence on Affective Commitment	Accepted
2	H _{1a} : Pay Satisfaction has a positive significant influence on Affective Commitment.	Accepted
3	H _{1b} : Promotion Satisfaction has a positive significant influence on Affective Commitment	Rejected
4	H _{1c} : Supervision Satisfaction has a positive significant influence on Affective Commitment	Accepted
5	H _{1d} : Benefits Satisfaction has a positive significant influence on Affective Commitment	Rejected
6	H _{1e} : Reward Satisfaction has a positive significant influence on Affective Commitment.	Accepted
7	H _{1f} : Operating Procedure Satisfaction has a positive significant influence on Affective Commitment	Accepted
8	H _{1g} : Co-worker Satisfaction has a positive significant influence on Affective Commitment	Rejected
9	H _{1h} : Work-itself Satisfaction has a positive significant influence on Affective Commitment.	Accepted
10	H _{1i} : Communication Satisfaction has a positive significant influence on Affective Commitment	Rejected

Discussion and Conclusion

In the present study, I have examined the relationship between job satisfaction and affective commitments. I have also analysed the impact of facets of job satisfaction on affective commitment. The finding of the study provides the mixed result for the framed hypotheses. Pay, supervision, reward, operating-procedure, and work-itself were found as the positive significant predictors of affective commitment and benefits, communication, promotion, and co-worker were found insignificant. The outcome of the present study is supported by the finding of (Lam & Zhang, 2003). Our findings of the study are in line with Smith (1969) who have also postulated job autonomy, pay, supervision satisfaction have a positive significant impact on the attachment of the employee. Our study finding contradicting the finding of Alvi&Ahmed (1987) which showed a positive relationship between promotion and affective commitment. Various studies like (Forstenlechner&Lettice; 2007; Horwitz et al. 2003) also provide support to the existing outcome of the study, which states a strong association between reward and benefits satisfaction with intent to stay with the organisation. Findings of Becker&Kernan (2003) also supported the outcome of the study. Mowday et al, (1982) also confirmed in their study where perceived organisational support and procedures have a positive influence on the psychology of the employees. The finding of the present provides new insights for the Indian employers that where they need to focus more on the strength the association of employees with the organisation.

The present study is not free from limitation like responses were collected through convenient sampling, so there are higher chances of self-serving biases of employees while they have filled the responses. Data collected through pure random sampling can provide better results. To ensure more legitimacy of such kind of study, a longitudinal study can provide a better exploration of the said relationship. The present study is restricted to middle and senior-level executives, the same relationships can be explored after adding lower-level employees' responses as well. In the present study linear relationship was analyzed for the independent and dependent variables. The results can be different checked after adding a few moderating and mediating variables. Adding more responses may provide a different results as well.

References

1. Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1996). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: An examination of construct validity. *Journal of vocational behavior*, 49(3), 252-276.
2. Alnaçık, Ü., Alnaçık, E., Akçin, K., & Erat, S. (2012). Relationships between career motivation, affective commitment and job satisfaction. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 58, 355-362.
3. Alvi, S. A., & Ahmed, S. W. (1987). Assessing organizational commitment in a developing country: Pakistan, a case study. *Human Relations*, 40(5), 267-280.
4. Baron, R. (1986). *Behaviour in organisations*. Newton, MA: Allyn and Bacon
5. Becker, T. E., & Billings, R. S. (1993). Profiles of commitment: An empirical test. *Journal of organizational behavior*, 14(2), 177-190.
6. Becker, H. S. (1960). Notes on the concept of commitment. *American journal of Sociology*, 66(1), 32-40.
7. Becker, T. E., & Kernan, M. C. (2003). Matching commitment to supervisors and organizations to in-role and extra-role performance. *Human performance*, 16(4), 327-348.
8. 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, 64-77.
9. Babin Dhas, D., & Vetrivel, S. C. (2020). Work Life Balance among Medium Size
10. Industrialized Employees. *Test Engineering and Management*, 82(2), 9753–9757.
11. Babin Dhas, D., & Vetrivel, S. C. (2020). Innovator Find Producer to Merge Expertise and
12. Finance New Projects. *Test Engineering and Management*, 83(4), 17760–17768.
13. Babin Dhas, D., & Vetrivel, S. C. (2020). Substantiate the Intervention Effect of Work-Life
14. Balance in SME's With Special Reference in Chennai. *Test Engineering and*
15. *Management*, 83(4), 17769–17781.
16. Babin Dhas, D., & Karthikeyan, P. (2015). Work-Life Balance Challenges and Solutions:
17. Overview. *International Journal of Research in Humanities and Social Studies*, 2(12), 10-19.
18. Clugston, M., Howell, J. P., & Dorfman, P. W. (2000). Does cultural socialization predict multiple bases and foci of commitment?. *Journal of management*, 26(1), 5-30.
19. DeConinck, J. B., & Stilwell, C. D. (2004). Incorporating organizational justice, role states, pay satisfaction and supervisor satisfaction in a model of turnover intentions. *Journal of Business Research*, 57(3), 225-231.
20. D,Babin Dhas., & S.C Vetrivel. (2020). Precursors of Job Satisfaction With Reference To
21. MSME Sector in Chennai. *Sylwan*, 164(3), 410–440.
22. D.Babin Dhas., & S.C Vetrivel. (2020). Challenges and Circumstances of Medium Size
23. Enterprises Employees Work Life Balance. *International Journal of Psychosocial*
24. *Rehabilitation*, 24(10), 1604-1609.
25. D.Babin Dhas., & S.C Vetrivel. (2020). Information Technology Helped Entrepreneurs to
26. Flourish. *International Journal of Psychosocial Rehabilitation*, 24(10), 1596-1603.
27. D.Babin Dhas. (2015), A Report on the Importance of Work-Life Balance. *International*
28. *Journal of Applied Engineering Research*, 10(9), 21659-21665.
29. D.Babin Dhas., & S.C Vetrivel. (2020). Cyberspace Has Greatly Helped Entrepreneurs to
30. Flourish. *Journal of Critical Reviews*, 7(2), 149-152.
31. Forstenlechner, I., and Lettice, F. (2007), 'Cultural Differences in Motivating Global Knowledge Workers,' *Equal Opportunities International*, 26 (8), 823–833
32. Gerstner, C. R., & Day, D. V. (1997). Meta-Analytic review of leader–member exchange theory: Correlates and construct issues. *Journal of applied psychology*, 82(6), 827.
33. 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.

34. Hausknecht, J. P., Rodda, J., & Howard, M. J. (2009). Targeted employee retention: Performance-based and job-related differences in reported reasons for staying. *Human Resource Management, 48*(2), 269-288.
35. Horwitz, F. M., Heng, C. T., & Quazi, H. A. (2003). Finders, keepers? Attracting, motivating and retaining knowledge workers. *Human resource management journal, 13*(4), 23-44.
36. 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, 333-344*.
37. Kubo, I., & Saka, A. (2002). An inquiry into the motivations of knowledge workers in the Japanese financial industry. *Journal of Knowledge Management*.
38. Lam, T., & Zhang, H. Q. (2003). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment in the Hong Kong fast-food industry. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*.
39. Liu, X. P., & Wang, Z. M. (2001). The study of organizational commitment and its development mechanism. *Nankai Business Review, 4*(6), 58-62.
40. Long, L., Fang, L., & Ling, W. (2002). Organizational career management: measurement and its effects on employees' behavior and feeling in china. *Acta Psychologica Sinica, 34*(01), 98-106.
41. Maghrabi, A. S. (1999). Assessing the effect of job satisfaction on managers. *International Journal of Value-Based Management, 12*(1), 1-12.
42. Martin, C.L., Bennett, N. (1996). The role of justice judgments in explaining the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment. *Group and Organization Management 21* (1), 84-104
43. Mathieu, J. E. (1991). A cross-level nonrecursive model of the antecedents of organizational commitment and satisfaction. *Journal of applied psychology, 76*(5), 607.
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. May, T. Y. M., Koczkodaj, M., & Frenkel, S. J. (2002). Organizational and occupational commitment: Knowledge workers in large corporations. *Journal of Management Studies, 39*(6), 775-801.
46. Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1997). *Commitment in the workplace: Theory, research, and application*. Sage.
47. Meyer, J. P., Allen, N. J., & Smith, C. A. (1993). Commitment to organizations and occupations: Extension and test of a three-component conceptualization. *Journal of applied psychology, 78*(4), 538.
48. Meyer, J. P., Paunonen, S. V., Gellatly, I. R., Goffin, R. D., & Jackson, D. N. (1989). Organizational commitment and job performance: It's the nature of the commitment that counts. *Journal of applied Psychology, 74*(1), 152.
49. Mowday, R. T., Porter, L. W., & Steers, R. M. (1982). *Employee-organization linkages: The psychology of commitment, absenteeism, and turnover* (Vol. 153). New York: Academic Press
50. Ng, Thomas WH, Marcus M. Butts, Robert J. Vandenberg, David M. DeJoy, and Mark G. Wilson. "Effects of management communication, opportunity for learning, and work schedule flexibility on organizational commitment." *Journal of Vocational Behavior 68*, no. 3 (2006): 474-489.
51. Randall, D. M., Fedor, A. B., & Longenecker, C. O. (1990). The behavioral expression of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 36*, 210-224.
52. Reiche, B. S. (2008). The configuration of employee retention practices in multinational corporations' foreign subsidiaries. *International Business Review, 17*(6), 676-687.
53. Rifai, H. A. (2005). A Test of the Relationships among Perceptions of Justice, Job satisfaction, Affective Commitment and Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *GadjahMada International Journal of Business, 7*(2).
54. Schwepker Jr, C.H. (2001). Ethical climate's relationship to job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intention in the sales force. *Journal of Business Research, 54*, 39-52

55. Smith, P. C. (1969). The measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement: A strategy for the study of attitudes.
56. Spector, P. E. (1997). *Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, causes, and consequences* (Vol. 3). Sage publications.
57. S.C.Vetrivel., V.Krishnamoorthy., Babin Dhas. D., & P. Dinesh. (2020) Anxiety Management in Retail Stores Employees. *International Journal of Psychosocial Rehabilitation*, 24(10), 1648-1658.
58. S.C.Vetrivel., V.Krishnamoorthy., & Babin Dhas, D. (2020). Drivers of Employee Engagement to Job Satisfaction in Modern Industries. *International Journal of Psychosocial Rehabilitation*, 24(10), 1637-1647.
59. S.C.Vetrivel., V.Krishnamoorthy., Babin Dhas, D., & Jawahar kumar, P.K. (2020). Patients Satisfaction over In-house Pharmacy at Hospitals in Coimbatore- Tamil Nadu. *International Journal of Psychosocial Rehabilitation*, 24(10), 1628-1636.
60. Testa, M. R. (2001). Organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and effort in the service environment. *The Journal of Psychology*, 135(2), 226-236.
61. Vandenberghe, C., Bentein, K., & Stinglhamber, F. (2004). Affective commitment to the organization, supervisor, and work group: Antecedents and outcomes. *Journal of vocational behavior*, 64(1), 47-71.
62. Weng, Q., McElroy, J. C., Morrow, P. C., & Liu, R. (2010). The relationship between career growth and organizational commitment. *Journal of vocational behavior*, 77(3), 391-400.
63. 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.
64. 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.
65. Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1996). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: An examination of construct validity. *Journal of vocational behavior*, 49(3), 252-276.
66. Somers, M. J. (1995). Organizational commitment, turnover and absenteeism: An examination of direct and interaction effects. *Journal of organizational Behavior*, 16(1), 49-58.
67. Mowday, R. T. (1998). Reflections on the study and relevance of organizational commitment. *Human resource management review*, 8(4), 387-401.
68. Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of occupational psychology*, 63(1), 1-18.
69. McCormack, D., Casimir, G., Djurkovic, N., & Yang, L. (2006). The concurrent effects of workplace bullying, satisfaction with supervisor, and satisfaction with co-workers on affective commitment among schoolteachers in China. *International Journal of Conflict Management*.