

ROLE ON EMPLOYEES' ATTITUDE IN WORK PLACE

Dr. R. GOPINATH **

** *D.Litt. (Business Administration)-Researcher, Madurai Kamaraj University, Tamil Nadu, India, Mobile: 9442200888, E-Mail: dr.raju.gopinath@gmail.com*

ABSTRACT

In recent days importance of employees and their attitude is getting attention; this made numerous studies to analyze the behavior of individual in workplace. Andrade and Drake (2009) also affirm that managing human resource is essential in current scenario. With the methodology of Chronological study of reviews, this study was conducted to assess the behavioral of individuals in workplace, especially focused on job satisfaction, job involvement and organizational commitment. The researcher fined significant relationship between job satisfaction, job involvement and organizational commitment.

Key words: *Job Satisfaction, Job Involvement and Organizational Commitment.*

1. INTRODUCTION

In the current climate of turbulent changes and intensified competition, companies have begun to realize that the employees are their most valuable asset (Glen, 2006; Govaerts *et al.*, 2011; Fulmer & Ployhart, 2014; Vomberg *et al.*, 2015; and Millar *et al.*, 2017). Satisfied and motivated employees are vital for existing business and a key factor that distinguishes successful companies from the alternative. Job involvement, Job satisfaction Involvement and commitment are imperative for productivity and to achieve the organizational goals, more over they are the determinants of employees' work place behavior. Those things even had a role in creating organizational changes and implementation of new technologies also. (Meyer *et al.*, 1998) Regardless of the strategy followed by the company, good, satisfied, involved and committed people are very much required. Nothing can be accompanied without them and nothing can replace the place of intellectual capital (Enrico, 2019).

2. JOB INVOLVEMENT

The term job involvement was first coined by Lodahl & Kejiner (1965). According to (Khan & Nemati, 2011; Lubakaya, 2014) job involvement is the psychological perception of an individual about the work or significance of work in the individual's self-image. Kanungo (1982) find that job involvement be likely to be a function of how much the job can satisfy an employee's immediate needs. Further, he found that individuals who proved high work

involvement considered their jobs, a significant part of their identity. Job involvement is strongly influenced by the perception towards work. Individuals may become involved in their jobs because of the specific qualities of their work (Joby Jose, 2014). Joiner & Bakalis (2006) suggested that job involvement describes how interested, involved, and occupied the employee is in the goals of an organization. Individuals with high degree of job involvement hardly think of leaving their jobs and they will create a predictable future for their organization (Brown, 1996). Gopinath (2019 a) had investigated factors of job involvement among the teaching faculties. Based on the results, it's concluded the job involvement variables influence to the knowledge management very positive manner.

2.1 DETERMINANTS OF JOB INVOLVEMENT

Cheng Chun Hao *et.al.*, (2009) find the following are the critical determinants of Job Involvement.

PERCEIVED ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT

Perceived organizational supports (POS) refers, employees' perception related to the extent to which the organization values the contribution and care about their well-being. (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002) POS indicates the employer's commitment and concern on the employees and is expected to influence the attitudes, behaviors and job involvement of employees. (Cole *et al.*, 2002; and Eisenberger *et al.*, 1986) POS represents the positive value of the organization and care for the employees' welfare. To reciprocate the care employees obliges to return the best to the organizational success. (Cropanzano *et al.*, 2001; Mowday *et al.*, 1982; Rousseau, 1995; and Wayne *et al.*, 1997).

PEER RELATIONSHIP

Peer relationships become more imperative when people are working in a complex working environment that requires team work. Research indicates that aged employees interact with peers more frequently and longer than younger ones, both within organization and out of organization. (Larson & Richards, 1991). Good peer relationship will make the employees to engage in aggressive behavior (Newcomb *et al.*, 1993), and leads to loneliness and depression (Parker *et al.*, 1995). As result, employee with good peer relationship might have better involvement in job than that of others.

GUANXI NETWORK

Guanxi means the system of social network which facilitate business and other business related dealings. The employee with superior guanxi and might have the ability improve the organization's performance. They provide assurance and trust to the organization and create obstructions to the competitors (Vanhonacker, 2004). Guanxi can be defined as a distinct type of relationship which contains trust, favor, dependence and adaptation (Wong, 1998). Farh *et al.*, (1998) found that guanxi relationships promote interpersonal trust among individuals. Obviously employee with these traits might have high level of job involvement.

2.2 CONSEQUENCES OF JOB INVOLVEMENT

TURNOVER AND ABSENTEEISM

Many researchers used job involvement as prime predictor of turnover and absenteeism (Brown, 1996) Job involvement is considered as opposite of perception of disaffection (Argyris, 1964; Kanungo, 1979 & 1982) or it can be said job satisfaction is the foundation for job involvement. Job involvement has negative relationship with job insecurity, in other words the employee with low involvement may perceive more threat of job insecurity, which will leads to job turnover and absenteeism (Greenhalgh & Rosenblatt, 1984).

PRODUCTIVITY

It can be said that when an employee involved in his job enthusiastically, it means they consider their job as an important part of their life (Dubin, 1966) and they recognize their performance significant for their self-worth (Gurin et al., 1960) this means this perception of job involvement plays a significant role in production as these kind of people are driven by performance.

3. JOB SATISFACTION

Satisfaction at work is a complex and ambiguous to define, because it is too subjective and multidimensional. As everyone has their own needs and goals, the satisfaction of a person dependson their personal ambition, role in the company, expectations at work, and their experiences in daily life (Gopinath, 2016). Due to this peculiar character and complication in nature, Job satisfaction has so many researches in the sphere of human resource management and organizational behavior. Researchers at the University of Minnesota concluded that satisfaction curtails from 20 different dimensions including: recognition, compensation, supervision, job security, and advancement on the job (Weiss *et al.*, 1967). Beyth-Marom (2006) emphasized that, when studying job satisfaction, thepeculiarities of human resources management must be considered. The job satisfaction is defined as a “pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job or job experiences” (Schneider & Snyder, 1975; and Locke, 1976). Mobley & Locke (1970); and Spector (1997) defined ‘Job satisfaction and dissatisfaction are functions of the perceived relationship between, what one expects and obtains from one’s job and how much importance or value one attributes to it’. Job satisfaction is a prime component for employee motivation, which is an essential factor for one’s behavior in an organization. It is a combination of any psychological, physiological and environmental circumstances that cause a person honestly satisfied with the job (Hoppock, 1935; and Singhai, 2016). It has the positive outcomes of reducing employee turnover, absenteeism, and augmenting motivation and organizational commitment. Happy employees are extremely important for organizational success. Happiness at work is a foundation for creativity, innovation, organizational commitment and citizenship. We couldn’t even imagine a workplace full of irritable, disgruntled and cranky employees who are deeply unhappy with their jobs, which create so many issues to the organization. (Sumbul Tahir & Sajid, 2019) associated job satisfaction with the organization’s

social responsibilities; he concludes job satisfaction encompasses the extent to which the company can promote the health and well-being of its employees. It also represents the extent to which expectations are and match the real awards. (Davis & Nestrom, 1985; and Spector, 1997) emphasizes that to understand employees attitudes it is important to understand the dimensions of job satisfaction. Weiner (1980) stated that job satisfaction is primarily dependent on the nature of the job itself; job challenges, independence, skill variety and job scope are the major determinants. As a whole Job satisfaction is a subjective process, it is very difficult to define, it is subject to the influenced by the internal and external forces of the organization, it has the power to affect the physical and mental health of the worker, as well as the capability to affect, in their personal and professional behavior (Robbins, 2005).

3.1 FACTORS INFLUENCING JOB SATISFACTION

According to Luthans (2011) following are five factors have been extensively researched and used to measure job satisfaction over the years, they represent the most important features of a job about which employees have emotional opinions. Gopinath (2016 a) studied made an effect to analysis the impact of job satisfaction was evaluated by using work, supervision, pay, promotion and co worker in Job Descriptive Index (JDI) scale (Smith *et al.*, 1969; Gopinath, 2016 b). Main Study concluded significant difference between Job Satisfaction factors related with overall Job satisfaction and there is a positive relationship exists between the factors of job satisfaction (Gopinath, 2016 c).

WORK ITSELF

Luthans (2011) described the work itself as “The extent to which the job provides the individual with interesting tasks, opportunities for learning, and the chance to accept responsibility.” (Luthans, 2011; and Lumley *et al.*, 2011) also insisted that the job satisfaction is high when employees are challenged and given enough opportunity to utilize their skills and knowledge. So we can say the content of the work itself is the prominent factor for job satisfaction.

PAY

Luthans (2011) defined pay as “the amount of financial remuneration that is received and the degree to which this is viewed as equitable vise-versa that of others in the organization” Pay and benefits are considered as multidimensional factors which plays an important role in determining the job satisfaction. Employee is used to interpret their role and importance in an organization in the form of financial allocation only. Neog & Barua (2014) found that salary holds important role in determining the level of job satisfaction compared with other major factors.

PROMOTION

Promotion is perceived as the prospect of advancement within the organization (Luthans, 2011). Based on the various forms of accompanying rewards associated with, promotion

opportunities have a varying effect on job satisfaction. According to Luthans (2011) an individual who is promoted based on performance would experience more satisfaction than one got promoted on seniority basis. The pay, recognition or rewards associated with the promotion would influence the degree of satisfaction, the more the associate benefits the higher the satisfaction. Luthans (2011) in his study, find that the promotional opportunities are like before two decades, the flattening of organizations has the limited promotional opportunities. So employees are reinvigorated, reinforced and given openings for intellectual growth and skills development which may be more important than promotion opportunities.

CO-WORKERS

Research has shown that approachable, supportive and technically sound co-workers are imperative sources of job satisfaction for individuals. Luthan (2011) described the role of co-workers in job satisfaction as the “degree to which fellow workers are technically proficient and socially supportive” And a job that requires the support of co-workers will have higher satisfaction.

SUPERVISION

According to Luthans (2011) supervision is “the abilities of the supervisor to provide technical assistance and behavioral support.” This also plays a role in determinant of job satisfaction. According to Robbins (1993), Lumley *et al.*, (2011) “satisfaction increases when the immediate supervisor is understanding, friendly, offers praise for good performance, listens to employees’ opinions and shows personal interest in them” According to Luthans (2011) there are two types of supervisory styles that influence job satisfaction. One is employee-centeredness, which the supervisor taking personal cares on employees the other dimension influencing the employee to perform. Both have their own impact on job satisfaction.

3.2 CONSEQUENCES OF JOB SATISFACTION

PRODUCTIVITY

Studies revealed a positive relationship between job satisfaction and productivity (Luthans, 1989). According to Ostroff (1992) companies with satisfied work force has more and effective productivity than the companies with fewer satisfied workers. But Robbins *et al.*, (2003) find the positive relationship between job satisfaction and production is not at the same level for all individuals.

TURNOVER INTENTION

The employees with less job satisfaction, may have the intention of turnover, numerous studies have reported a significant negative correlation between job satisfaction and turnover intention (Martin & Roodt, 2008; and Randhawa, 2007). So the reduction in job satisfaction may increase the intention of turnover and the higher the levels of job satisfaction the lower the intention to quit the organization.

4. ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT

Organizational commitment is the employees' state of being committed to assist in the achievement of the organization's goals and includes the employees' levels of identification, involvement, and loyalty towards the organization (Caught & Shadur, 2000; and Mowday *et al.*, 1979). Gopinath (2019 b) concluded the organisational commitment variables findings of that the employee will contribute to the exchange of knowledge; especially the knowledge management practices within the organization regarding the level of their employee's attitude and this will give to the development of work place. When thinking in this way commitment is beyond loyalty, this is the willingness of individual to contribute them for the development of the organization. Miller (2003); and Porter & Steers (1974) are highlighted organizational commitment as a state of relationship which an employee maintains with a particular organization, and with its goals and wishes, and to maintain membership in the organization. It is therefore, the degree in which an employee is willing to maintain association due to interest and his perception towards organization's goals and values. And commitment is closely related with work-related factors like employee turnover, absenteeism and performance (Mowday *et al.*, 1979; and Walton, 1985). A commonly accepted phenomena about organizational commitment is, employees who are strongly committed to an organization and are least likely to quit the organization, hence this is a psychological state that binds an individual to an organization (Meyer & Allen, 1991).

4.1 DETERMINANTS OF ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT

Research found two major classifications in the determinants of organizational commitment. One is Personal characteristics and the next is situational attributes. The first one includes age, experience in the organization, and level of education and gender of employees. Situational attributes are things that are facilitated by organizational policies, structures and practices (Kassahun, 2005). As we have control only on personal characteristics and not on organization related situational factors, let's have a discussion on personal characteristics alone.

AGE

Kassahun (2005) has found a positive relationship between employee's age and levels of commitment. And positive correlation between costs involved in leaving an organization as age increase (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990). Likewise, Meyer and Allen concluded that "older workers become more attitudinally committed to an organization for a variety of reasons, including greater satisfaction with their jobs, having received better positions, and having "cognitively justified" their remaining in an organization".

TENURE

Experience in the organization and the organization commitment has positive relationship especially among senior managers rather than low level and middle level managers. (Kassahun, 2005; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; and Iqbal, 2010) are concluded that the longer employees continue with an organization the greater the commitment. Employees who are beginners in

an organization are expecting to be less committed to the organization compared to the experienced one.

LEVELS OF EDUCATION

Mathieu & Zajac (1990) have found an inverse relationship between education level and organizational commitment. This inverse relationship may be the consequence of, more educated employees use to have high expectations from the organization which is difficult to meet. Iqbal (2010) in his study insisted the same relationship, further he argued that the more educated employee may have more alternative employment opportunities and as such don't have high commitment towards the organization.

GENDER

Earlier research on the effect of gender and commitment state that women have a tendency to be more committed and it was assumed that, this was due to the fact that when they were entering organizations which previously were male dominated, and in such situation woman had to work harder, and have the compulsion to prove that they felt more committed to the organization. Contrary to previous research Mathieu & Zajac, (1990) found in his studies in general there is no consistent relationship between gender and organizational commitment.

4.2. CONSEQUENCES OF ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT

JOB PERFORMANCE

Meyer *et al.*, (2012) found that employee's commitment towards organization was a strong factor connected with job performance.

TURNOVER

Several studies were conducted to predict the relationship between organizational commitment and turnover intention. Mowday *et al.*, (1979) and Muchinsky (2003) stated in their study about the relationship between organizational commitment and turnover intentions, they found organizational commitment has strong negative effect on turnover intention. The recent researches of Lee *et al.*, (1992); Meyer & Allen (1996); and Gunter *et al.*, (2012) were also insisting the negative relationship between turnover intention and organizational commitment. Cohen (1993) in his study suggested the level of organization commitment can be used as a predictor of turnover intention.

5. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN JOB SATISFACTION JOB INVOLVEMENT AND ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT

Ismail & Razak (2016); Gopinath & Kalpana (2019); Ayeni & Phopoola (2007); and Srivastava (2013) are found substantial relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Okpara (2004) in his study proposed that job satisfaction and commitment are crucial determinants of employee turnover, absenteeism, performance and productivity. But, Currihan, 1999; McFarlane *et al.*, 1989, found the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment and its impact on turnover intention is contradictory. Martin &

Roodt, 2008; and Tett & Meyer, 1993 in their study, proposed job satisfaction has strong influence on turnover intention then organization commitment. Baron & Greenberg (2005) are also insisting that job satisfaction among employees is predictor of organizational commitment and it also depends on the organizational related factors and personal factors. Gunlu *et al.*, (2009) in his study among hotel managers found significant relationship between the organizational commitment and job satisfaction, and the extrinsic, intrinsic job satisfaction had a substantial effect on commitment. Mathew (1991) emphasizes that relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment and the influence of commitment on satisfaction. His study underlined that the two variables were reciprocally related, but that the influence of satisfaction on commitment was stronger than commitment on satisfaction. Gopinath (2019 c) examined the association between the Job Involvement and Organizational Commitment. Job satisfaction is recognized as an element of organizational commitment and also that the work environment gives a positive relationship to job satisfaction. It's concluded organizational commitment is extent to which employees are loyal to the organization.

Singh & Gupta (2015) pointed to the similarity of the concepts of job involvement and organizational commitment; both are associated with worker's perception about the job. However, these two constructs different. Job involvement is more associated with psychological identification of worker's opinion on job, while organizational commitment is more associated with worker's attachment to the organization (Brown & Leigh, 1996; and Kanungo, 1979) reported that job involvement is related to organizational commitment and low job-involved employees likely to leave the organization and divert their energy outside the jurisdiction of organization. Whereas, according to Cohen (1999) the individuals with high levels of job involvement are likely to have great commitment towards organization, as they believe they have to compensate the organization for all benefits it has provided to them.

Even though the studies of Currivan (1993); Price & Mueller (1981); Mathieu & Farr (1991); and Martin & Roodt (2008) elucidated reciprocal relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment, the general agreement is that there is a positive relationship between the two concepts (Eliyana *et al.*, 2012; Eslami & Gharakhani, 2012; Lumley *et al.*, 2011; and Matheiu & Zajac, 1990). Overall there are more evidences indicating positive relationship job satisfaction and organizational commitments. We should note that job involvement is not expected to positively influence organizational commitment in all situations. In many cases worker is highly involved in a specific work but not having commitment towards the organization (Blau & Boal, 1987).

CONCLUSION

In today's competitive environment intellectual capital is the important asset of an organization. Accordingly, this study was conducted to predict the employees' work place behavior as it is important today. Job satisfaction, job involvement and organization commitment are the prime determinants of employees' work place behavior (Muharrem Tuna *et al.*, 2016). Thus organizational commitment is considered a decisive constituent to the existence of organizations and it has various outcomes such as productivity and overall performance.

Gopinath (2016 d) Job Satisfaction Employees would make a positive contribution to their respective organization and may lead to increase the effectiveness. Job Satisfaction Employees would make a positive contribution to their respective organization and may lead to increase the effectiveness (Gopinath, 2016 e). And job involvement and job satisfaction has positive relationship with organizational commitment; Mohammed & Eleswed (2013), Kanwar *et al.*, (2012) both are corner stones of organizational commitment, which is the base for organizational success.

REFERENCES

1. Anari, N. N. (2012). Teachers: Emotional Intelligence, Job Satisfaction, and Organizational Commitment. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 24, pp. 256-269.
2. Ayeni, C. O., & Phopoola, S. O. (2007). Work motivation, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment of library personnel in academic and research libraries in Oyo state. Nigeria, *Library Philosophy and Practice*, pp. 366–376.
3. Baron, R. A., & Greenberg, J. (2005). *Behaviour in organisation* (7th ed.). New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
4. Beyth-Marom, R., Harpaz-Gorodeisky, G., Bar-Haim, A., & Godder, E. (2006). Identification, Job Satisfaction and Work Motivation among Tutors at The Open University of Israel. *International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning*, 7(2), pp. 1–13.
5. Blau, G. & Boal, K. (1987) Conceptualizing How Job Involvement and Organizational Commitment Affect Turnover and Absenteeism. *Academy of Management Review*, 12, pp. 288-300.
6. Brown, S.P. (1996). A Meta-Analysis and Review of Organizational Research on Job Involvement. *Psychology Bulletins*, 120, pp. 235–255.
7. Brown, S.P., & Leigh, T.W. (1996). A New Look at Psychological Climate and Its Relationship to Job Involvement, Effort and Performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81, pp. 358-368.
8. Caught & Shadur, (2000). The Measurement Artifact in the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire. *Psychological Reports*, 87(3), pp. 777-788.
9. Cheng Chun Hao, Hsieh Chi Jung, & Ouyang Yenhui, (2009). A Study of the Critical Factors of the Job Involvement of Financial Service Personnel after Financial Tsunami: Take Developing Market (Taiwan) For Example. *African Journal of Business Management*, Vol.3 (12), pp. 798-806.
10. Cohen, A. (1993). Organizational Commitment and Turnover: A Meta-Analysis. *Academy of Management Journal*, 5, pp. 1140 – 1157.
11. Cohen, A. (1999). Relationships among Five Forms of Commitment: An Empirical Assessment. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 20, pp. 285-308.

12. Cole, M. S., Schaninger, W.S., & Harris, S. G. (2002). The workplace social exchange network: a multilevel, conceptual examination. *Group Organization Management*, 27(1): pp. 142-167.
13. Cropanzano, R., Rupp, D. E., Mohler, C.J., & Schminke, M. (2001). Three Roads to Organizational Justice. *Research on personnel Human Resource Management*, Greenwich, pp. 1-113.
14. Currivan, D. B. (1999). The Causal Order of Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment in Models of Employee Turnover. *Human Resource Management Review*, 9(4), pp. 495 – 524.
15. Davis, K., & Nestrom, J. W. (1985). *Human Behavior at Work: Organizational Behavior* (7th ed.). McGraw Hill: New York, p. 109
16. Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutch-Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived Organizational Support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(3): pp. 500-507.
17. Eliyana, A., Yusuf, R. M., & Prabowo, K. (2012). The Influence of Employee's Job Satisfaction Factors on Organizational Commitment. *American Journal of Economics*, 6, pp. 141 - 144.
18. Enrico, C., Mendoza, (2019). The Mediating Role of Job Involvement between Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment in a Small and Medium Sized Business Enterprise. *International Review of Management and Marketing*, 9(5), pp. 74-81.
19. Eslami, J., & Gharakhani, D. (2012). Organizational Commitment and Job Satisfaction. *Journal of Science and Technology*, 2 (2), pp. 85 - 91.
20. Farh, J.L., Tsui, A.S., Xin, K., & Cheng, B.S. (1998). The Influence of Relational Demography and Guanxi: The Chinese Case. *Organisational Science*, 9, pp. 471-488.
21. Glen, C. (2006). Key Skills Retention and Motivation: The War For Talent Still Rages and Retention Is The High Ground. *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 38, pp. 37–45.
22. Gopinath, R. (2016). HRD Factor Managing People Influence to Job Satisfaction with special reference to BSNL Employees in three different SSAs using Modeling. *Global Journal for Research Analysis*, 5(7), pp. 323-326.
23. Gopinath, R. (2019 a). Job Involvement Influence to Knowledge Management–A Study. *International Journal of Research*, 8(5), pp. 1461-1466.
24. Gopinath, R. (2019 b). Impact of Organisational Commitment on Knowledge Management Practices. *International Journal of Research and Analytical Reviews*, 6(2), pp. 701-703.
25. Gopinath, R. (2019 c). Organisational Commitment and Job Satisfaction Relationship–A Study in private Cement Factories. *Suraj Punj Journal for Multidisciplinary Research*, 9(5), pp. 444-447.
26. Gopinath, R., & Kalpana, R. (2019). Employees' Job Satisfaction working at hospitals in Perambalur District. *Journal of Emerging Technologies and Innovative Research*, 6(4), pp. 220-225.

27. Gopinath, R. (2016 a). HRD Factor Managing People Influence to Job Satisfaction with special reference to BSNL Employees in three different SSAs using Modeling. *Global Journal for Research Analysis*, 5(7), pp. 323-326.
28. Gopinath, R. (2016 b). Industrial Relations Impact with Job Satisfaction Using SEM Model with Special Reference to BSNL Employees in Three Different SSAs. *Indian journal of research*, 5(7), pp. 94-97.
29. Gopinath, R. (2016 c). Impact of HRD to Job Satisfaction with special reference to BSNL Employees In three different SSAs using SEM Model. *International Journal of Management (IJM)*, 7(5), pp. 1-9.
30. Gopinath, R. (2016 d). How the Compensation Management and Welfare Measure Influence Job Satisfaction? A Study with special reference in BSNL to three different SSAs using Modeling. *International Journal of Scientific Research*, 5(8), pp. 305-308.
31. Gopinath, R. (2016 e). Is the Employee Health and Safety related to Job Satisfaction? An Inquiry into BSNL Employees with special reference in three different SSAs using Modeling. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management*, 18(7), IV, pp. 135-139.
32. Gordon, J.R. (2002). *Organizational Behavior: A Diagnostic Approach* (Seventh Edition). Upper Saddle River: New Jersey, Pearson Prentice Hall.
33. Govaerts, N., Kyndt, E., Dochy, F., & Baert, H. (2011). Influence of Learning and Working Climate on the Retention of Talented Employees. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 23, pp. 35–55.
34. Gunlu, E., Aksarayli, M., & Percin, N. S. (2009). Job satisfaction and Organizational Commitment of hotel managers in Turkey. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 22(5), pp. 693–717.
35. Gunter, R.M.Y., Haerani, S., & Hasan, M. (2012). The Influence of Affective, Continuance and Normative Commitment on the Turnover Intentions of Nurses at Makassar's Private Hospitals in Indonesia. *African Journal of Business Managements*, 6 (38), pp. 303 - 311.
36. Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. B. (1959). *The Motivation to Work*. New York: New York, John Wiley & Sons.
37. Hoppock, R. (1935). *Job satisfaction*. New York: Harper and Brothers.
38. Ismail, A., & Razak, M. R. A. B. D. (2016). Effect of Job Satisfaction on Organisational Commitment. *Management & Marketing*, 14(1), pp. 25–40.
39. Joby Jose & Panchanatham, N. (2014). Influence of Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment on Job Involvement towards Organizational Effectiveness, *Indian Journal of Applied Research*, 4(1), pp.280-282.
40. Joiner, T. A., & Bakalis, S. (2006). The Antecedents of Organizational Commitment: The Case of Australian Casual Academics. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 20, pp. 439-452.
41. Kanungo, R. N. (1982). Measurement of Job and Work Involvement. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 67(3), pp. 341-349.

42. Iqbal, A. (2010). Empirical Assessment of Demographic Factors, Organizational Ranks and Organizational Commitment. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 5(3), pp. 16-27.
43. Kanungo, R.N. (1979). The Concept of Alienation and Involvement Revisited. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, pp. 119-138.
44. Kanwar, Y.P.S., Singh, A.K. & Kodwani, A.D. (2012). A Study of Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment and Turnover Intent among the IT and ITES Sector Employees. *The Journal of Business Perspective*, 16, pp. 27-35.
45. Kassahun, T. (2005). Level of Organisational Commitment: Its Correlates and Predictors *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 41(1), pp. 29-63.
46. Khan, K., & Nemati, A. R. (2011). Impact of Job involvement on Employee Satisfaction: A Study Based on Medical Doctors Working at Riphah International University Teaching Hospitals in Pakistan. *African Journal of Business Management*, 5(6), pp. 2241-2246.
47. Larson, R.W., & Richards, M.B. (1991). Boredom in the Middle School Years: Blaming Schools Years Blaming Students, *American Journal of Education*, pp. 418-443.
48. Lee, W.L., Ashford, S.J., Walsh, J.P., & Mowday, R.T. (1992). Commitment Propensity, Organizational Commitment, and Voluntary Turnover: A Longitudinal Study of Organizational Entry Processes. *Journal of Management*, 18 (1), pp. 15 - 32.
49. Locke, E. A. & Latham, G.P. (1990). *A Theory of Goal Setting and Task Performance*. Englewood Cliffs: New Jersey, Prentice Hall.
50. Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (2004). What Should We Do About Motivation Theory? Six Recommendations for the Twenty-first Century. *Academic Management Review*. 29, pp. 388–403.
51. Lubakaya, C. W. (2014). Factors Affecting Job Involvement in an Organization: A Case of Nzoia Sugar Company Limited. *International Journal of Innovative Research & Development*. 3 (6), pp. 77-105.
52. Lumley, E.J., Coetzee, M., Tladinyane, R., & Ferreira, N. (2011). Exploring the job satisfaction and organisational commitment of employees in the information technology environment. *Southern African Business Review*, 15 (1), pp. 100 – 118.
53. Lumley, E.J., Coetzee, M., Tladinyane, R., & Ferreira, N. (2011). Exploring the Job Satisfaction and Organisational Commitment of Employees in the Information Technology Environment. *Southern African Business Review*, 15 (1), pp. 100 - 118.
54. Luthans, F. (2005). *Organisational Behaviour* (10 th ed.). Boston: McGraw-Hill.
55. Luthans, F. (2011). *Organizational Behavior an Evidence-Based Approach* (12 th ed.). New York: McGraw - Hill.
56. Martin, A., & Roodt, G. (2008). Perceptions of Organizational Commitment, Job Satisfaction and Turnover Intentions in a Post-Merger South African Tertiary Institution. *South African Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 34 (1), pp. 23 - 31.

57. Mathew, J. E. (1991). A Cross Level Non Recursive Model of the Antecedents of Organisational Commitment and Satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76(5), pp. 607–661.
58. Mathieu, J. E., & Zajac, D. (1990). A Review and Meta-Analysis of the Antecedents, Correlates, and Consequences of Organizational Commitment. *Psychological Bulletin*, 108, pp. 171 - 194.
59. McFarlane Shore, L., & Martin, H. J. (1989). Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment In Relation To Work Performance and Turnover Intentions. *Human Relations*, 42 (7), pp. 625 – 638.
60. Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1997). *Commitment in the Workplace: Theory, Research, and Application*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
61. Meyer, J. P., Allen, N. J., & Gellatly, I. R. (1990). Affective and Continuance Commitment to the Organization: Evaluation of Measures and Analysis of Concurrent and Time-Lagged Relations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75, pp.710-720.
62. Meyer, J.P., & Allen, N.J. (1988). Links between Work Experiences and Organizational Commitment During The First Year of Employment: A Longitudinal Analysis. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 61, pp. 195 - 209.
63. Meyer, J. P., Stanley, L. J., & Parfyonova, N. M. (2012). Employee Commitment in Context: The Nature and Implication of Commitment Profiles. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 80, pp. 1-16.
64. Meyer, J. P., Allen, N. J., & Topolnytsky, L. (1998). Commitment in a changing world of work. *Canadian Psychology /Psychologie Canadienne*, 39(1-2), 83.
65. Millar, C. C., Chen, S., & Waller, L. (2017). Leadership, knowledge and people in knowledge-intensive organisations: implications for HRM theory and practice. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 28, pp. 261–275.
66. Miller, G. A. (2003). The Cognitive Revolution: A Historical Perspective. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 7(3), pp.141–144.
67. Mobley, W. H. (1977). Intermediate Linkages in the Relationship between Job Satisfaction and Employee Turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 62(2), pp. 237-240.
68. Mohammed, F. & Eleswed, M. (2013). Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment: A Correlational Study in Bahrain. *International Journal of Business*, 3, pp. 43-53.
69. Mowday, R.T., Porter, L.W., Steers, R.M., (1982). *Organizational Linkages: The Psychology of Commitment, Absenteeism, and Turnover*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
70. Mowday, R. T., Steers, R. M., & Porter, L. W. (1979). The Measurement of Organizational Commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 14.
71. Neog, B. B., & Barua, M. (2014). Factors Influencing Employee's Job Satisfaction: An Empirical Study among Employees of Automobile Service Workshops in Assam. *The Standard International Journals on Industrial, Financial & Business Management*, 2(7), pp. 305–316.

72. Newcomb, A.F., Bukowski, W.M., & Pattee, L. (1993). Children's Peer Relations: A Meta-Analytic Review Of Popular, Rejected, Neglected, Controversial, And Average Socio Metric Status. *Psychology Bulletins*, 113(1), pp. 99-128.
73. Okpara, J. O. (2004). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment: Are there differences between American and Nigerian managers employed in the US MNCs in Nigeria? In Academy of Business & Administrative Sciences. Switzerland: Rittrecliff College.
74. Ostroff, C. (1992). The Effect of Climate and Personal Influences on Individual Behavior and Attitude in Organizations. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Process*.
75. Parker, J. G., Rubin, K. H., Price, J., & DeRosier, M. E. (1995). Peer Relationships, Child Development, and Adjustment: A developmental psychopathology perspective. *Developmental Psychopathology*, 2 New York: Wiley, pp. 96–161.
76. 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, pp. 603-609.
77. Price, J., & Mueller, C. (1981). A Causal Model of Turnover for Nurses. *Academy of Management Journal*, 34, pp. 543 – 565.
78. Randhawa, G. (2007). Relationship between Job Satisfaction and Turnover Intentions: An Empirical Analysis. *Indian Management Studies Journal*, 11, pp. 149 - 159.
79. Rhoades, L., Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived Organizational Support: A Review of the Literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87: pp. 698-714.
80. Rousseau, D.M. (1995). *Psychological contracts in organizations*. Thousand Oaks. CA: Sage.
81. Schneider, B. & Snyder, R. A. (1975). Some Relationships between Job Satisfaction and Organization Climate. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 60, pp. 318.
82. Singh, A. & Gupta, B. (2015). Job Involvement, Organizational Commitment, Professional Commitment, and Team Commitment: A Study of Generational Diversity. Benchmarking. *An International Journal*, 22, pp. 1192-1211.
83. Singhai, M. (2016). International Science Community Association. Mini Review Paper. *Research Journal of Management*, 5(9), pp. 66–68.
84. Smith, P. C., Kendall, L. M., & Hulin, C. L. (1969). The measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement. Chicago: Rand McNally.
85. Spector, P. E. (1997 b). *Job Satisfaction: Application, Assessment, Causes and Consequences*. Thousand oaks, CA: Sage publications.
86. Stephen P. Robbins, (2005). *Organization Behavior*. (11. ed.) Pearson Prentice Hall.
87. Sumbul Tahir, & Sajid, (2019). Understanding the Job Satisfaction of Indian Academicians. *Management and Labor Studies*, pp. 1-25
88. Tett, R. P., & Meyer, J. P. (1993). Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment, Turnover Intention, and Turnover: Path Analysis Based On Meta-Analytic Findings. *Personnel Psychology*, 46 (2), pp. 259 - 293.

89. Vanhonacker, W. R. (2004). Guanxi Networks in China. *Chinese Business Review*, 31(3), pp. 48–53.
90. Vomberg, A., Homburg, C., & Bornemann, T.(2015).Talented People and Strong Brands: The Contribution of Human Capital and Brand Equity to firm Value. *Strategic Management Journal*, 36, pp. 2122–2131.
91. Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and Motivation*. New York: NY: Wiley.
92. Wayne, W. G., Shore, L.M., & Liden, R.C. (1997). Perceived Organizational Support and Leader-Member Exchange: A Social Exchange Perspective. *Academy of Management Journals*, 40(1), pp. 82-111.
93. Weiss, D. J., Dawis, R. V., England, G. W., & Lofquist, L. H. (1967). Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. Minneapolis: MN. Industrial relations Center, University of Minnesota.
94. Wiener, Y., & Vardi, Y. (1980). Relationships between Job, Organization and Work Outcomes: An Integrative Approach. *Organisational Behavior and Human Performance*, 26: pp. 81-96.
95. Wong, Y. H., (1998). Key To Key Account Management: Relationship (Guanxi) Model. *International Marketing Review*, 15(3), pp. 215–231.