

Organizational Commitment of Administrator and Faculty of State Universities in Region III

Katherine B. Parangat, Domingo C. Edaño

Abstract- The study focused on the investigation of the extent of organizational commitment among administrators and faculty members in selected State Universities (SUs) in Region III. Descriptive research design was utilized by the researcher in the analysis and interpretation of data. The questionnaire was the main instrument in gathering data and were adapted from the works of Meyer & Parfyonova (2010) Three Component Model of Organizational Commitment. Govindasamy (2009) Factors Influencing Organizational Commitment. They have done in depth study on the subject matters. Major findings reveal that administrator and faculty-respondents agreed that Continuance Commitment and Normative Commitment exist in State Universities in Region III while moderately agreed on the existence of Affective Commitment. Both the administrator and faculty-respondents agreed that Leadership Traits, Employee Relations, Knowledge Sharing, Task Orientation, Compensation and Incentives, Performance Management and Promotion; and Opportunities of Training and Development are factors affecting the extent of organizational commitment in State Universities in Region III. A significant difference determined in the assessment of extent of organizational commitment between administrators and faculty respondents in terms of normative commitment; leadership traits, employee relations, knowledge sharing and performance management and promotion. In light of the findings of the study, it is recommended that the management's human resource policies can find new creative ways to support, motivate, provide more flexibility to employees' work and ideas are received thus making them really significant members of the workforce and commit further in the institution. The university management confer extra workload and task (e.g. designation and assignment) to employees provided they are well compensated and are satisfied, confirm to employees their many obligations but with freedom and the empowerment in completing their assigned tasks as long as this is not abused and in-line with the organization's policies. Assure employees that university plans (e.g., faculty development) manifest equality and equity. Guarantee the active promotion of exchange of knowledge to build sufficient cooperation in various colleges and departments and to benefit from work experience with each other. Give the employees the liberty to take part on decision making that can help or contribute to attainment of goals.

Keywords – organizational commitment, affective, continuance, normative

1 INTRODUCTION

Organizational commitment is an important area of study to many researchers and organizations like higher education institution because the outcomes of this behavior or value may help to determine many work related interaction of the employees. It is mainly related to the employee's desire to continue working with the particular organization. As such, researchers and practitioners are ever so keen and interested to understand the factors that may influence an individual's decision to stay or leave the organization. The key to sustainable economic development and technological advancement for any nation is a well-educated manpower [1] and the importance of universities in creating most specialized and skilled intellectuals cannot be neglected [2]. Higher Education Institution (HEI) serve as the main "factory" providing and developing such manpower and, in this sense, is inseparable from promoting economic development. Therefore, the better the quality of those "factories", the better the quality of manpower and the higher level of economic development can be achieved.

Organizational commitment is one of the most prominent work attitudes examined in the work and organizational literature. The study of organizational commitment is an important and integral part of the literature on management and organizational behavior for a long time [3]. Among the first studies on organizational commitment were conducted by [4], where they studied on Organizational commitment and turnover among psychiatric technicians. also studied on the measure of organization commitment. Studies have shown that Organizational Commitment have received considerable attention due to the importance that managers place on retaining.

This study is hoped to provide some valuable insights to State Universities and Colleges of Region III which seeks to create the appropriate enabling working environment or establish the significant organizational practices to encourage employees to be committed to their current organization and continue their service with them. The findings of this study will significantly contribute specifically to school administrators/managers, faculty members and other employees, parents and students.

1.2 OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The study determined the organizational commitment of administrators and faculty in state universities in Region III.

Specifically the study aimed to determine the extent of organizational commitment that exist in State Universities in Region III; factors affecting the extent of organizational commitment; test the significant difference in the assessed extent of organization commitment between administrators and faculty respondents and test the significant difference in the assessed factors affecting the extent of organizational commitment between administrators and faculty respondents.

2 METHODS

2.1 Research Design

The methodology which was adapted by the researcher is descriptive method and quantitative in its analysis. Descriptive research includes surveys and fact-finding enquiries of different kinds. Descriptive research is a type of quantitative research that involves making careful description of educational phenomena [6]. The main characteristic of this method is that the researcher has no control over the variables; he can only report what has happened or what is happening [7]. Quantitative research is a formal, objective, systematic process in which numerical data is used to obtain information about the world [8]. Quantitative research is based on the measurement of quantity or amount. It is applicable to phenomena that can be expressed in terms of quantity [9].

2.2 Respondents

The subjects of the study included a total of 404 respondents. Eighty six (86) educational administrators/managers from all levels of the organization and three hundred eighteen (404) instructors/professors drawn from the selected State Universities in Region III.

The sample size from the State Universities was derived using the non – probability convenience sampling technique. This method is appropriate, convenient and for time-and-cost effectiveness. The desired number of subjects in this sample was closely coupled to the study design and data analysis procedures. Non – probability sampling technique is employed when the research requires the subjects to be selected base on their expertise or who are in the best position to provide the required information [7].

2.3 Instrument

The questions for the survey questionnaire were adapted from the works of [10]. Three Component Model of Organizational Commitment [3] Factors Influencing Organizational Commitment. They have done in depth study on the subject matters. The items/indicators were

then amended and re-worded to suit the context of this study. The items/indicators in the survey were listed in random order so as not to lead on the respondents. Some questions were also negatively worded so as to maintain a reasonable balance as suggested [11].

2.4 Data Collection

Having found the instrument valid and reliable, the researcher sought the permission and approval of the six (6) Presidents of the state universities in Region III to administer the questionnaires.

The researcher personally distributes the instrument to the participants. The instrument was collected three days after. The objective of the study was explained to the participants and the confidentiality of their responses will also be prioritized to assure a 100% retrieval of the instrument.

Data collected from the questionnaire were tallied, analyzed, interpreted and summarized accordingly. Descriptive statistical techniques such as frequency counts, simple percentage, mean were used. Analysis of Variance was computed to test the significant difference of in the assessed extent of organization commitment between administrators and faculty respondents and the significant difference in the assessed factors affecting the extent of organizational commitment between administrators and faculty respondents.

The 5 – point rating, the Likert scale, and the corresponding qualitative interpretation was used in the evaluation of the perception on the extent of organizational commitment of the respondents: 4.20-5.00 – Strongly Agree (SA)/Always (A); 3.40 – 4.19 – Agree (A)/Frequent (F); 2.60 – 3.39 – Moderately Agree (MA)/Sometime (So); 1.80 – 2.59 – Strongly Disagree (D)/Seldom (Se) and 1.00 – 1.79 – Disagree (SD)/ Never (N).

3 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1 shows the assessment on the extent of respondents on the organizational commitment in terms of affective commitment.

Administrators Strongly Agreed (SA) in “I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization” with a weighted mean of (4.44, rank 1). “This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me” (4.11, rank 2) and “I really feel as if this organization’s problems are my own” (3.99, rank 3) were to be Agreed (A). They Disagreed (D) on “I do not feel “emotionally attached” to this organization” (2.52, rank 4); “I do not feel a strong sense of “belonging” to my organization” (2.33, rank 5); and “I do not feel like “part of the family” at my organization” (2.13, rank 6).

Faculty-respondents Agreed (A) on “I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization” with a weighted mean of (4.13, rank 1); “This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me” (4.07, rank 2) and “I really feel as if this organization’s problems are my own” (3.66, rank 3). Faculty respondents Moderately Agreed (MA) on “I do not feel a strong sense of “belonging” to my organization” (2.65, rank 4) and “I do not feel “emotionally attached” to this organization” (2.61, rank 5). They disagreed (D) on “I do not feel like “part of the family” at my organization” (2.51, rank 6).

For the affective commitment, both the administrator and faculty respondents most agreed manifestations was the happiness they experience for the rest of their career in the institution. This could mean that affective commitment manifest among the respondents through contentment and joy.

Apparently, both the administrators and faculty members prefer to stay committed in their respective institution not because of material remuneration but because of positive emotional reason and strong attachment. This is consistent with [12] who stated that an

affective commitment occurs when employees commit because they want to, not because they have to. According to [13] this is the type of commitment in which employees have emotional attachment their employing organizations. Affective commitment exists according to [14] when employees feel emotionally linked, identified, and involved with the organization. The finding of the study of [16] indicated that increased affective organizational commitment has been positively associated with valuable organizational outcomes, including job performance ratings, decreased intent to search for new jobs and reduced turnover. This type of commitment is indispensable for building a successful and sustainable organization [16]. On the other hand, both the administrator and faculty respondents disagreed on the feeling that they are not “part of the family” in the organization. This could also mean that this indicator affective commitment do not manifest or is not a practice in their respective institution. The management of state university in Region III guarantees that their employees who belong or part of different departments still are taken care of and guided just like members of a family.

Table 1. Extent of Organizational Commitment

	Affective Commitment	Administrator			Faculty		
		WM	VI	Rank	WM	VI	Rank
1.	I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization.	4.44	SA	1	4.13	A	1
2.	I really feel as if this organization’s problems are my own.	3.99	A	3	3.66	A	3
3.	I do not feel a strong sense of “belonging” to my organization.	2.33	D	5	2.65	MA	4
4.	I do not feel “emotionally attached” to this organization.	2.52	D	4	2.61	MA	5
5.	I do not feel like “part of the family” at my organization	2.13	D	6	2.51	D	6
6.	This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me.	4.11	A	2	4.07	A	2
Composite Mean		3.25	MA		3.27	MA	

* SA-Strongly Agree; A-Agree; MA – Moderately Agree; D – Disagree;

Table 2 shows the assessment on the extent of respondents on the organizational commitment in terms of continuance commitment.

For administrator-respondents, they Agreed (A) on “It would be very hard for me to leave my organization right now, even if I wanted to” with a weighted mean of (3.96, rank 1) and “Too much of my life would be disrupted if I decided I wanted to leave my organization now” (3.66, rank 2) and “Right now, staying with my organization is a matter of necessity as much as desire (3.58, rank 3). The administrator - respondents Moderately Agreed (MA) on

“I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving this organization” (3.35, rank 4); “If I had not already put so much of myself into this organization, I might consider working elsewhere” (3.35, rank 4) and “One of the few negative consequences of leaving this organization would be the scarcity of available alternatives” (3.08, rank 6).

The faculty-respondents Agreed (A) on “Right now, staying with my organization is a matter of necessity as much as desire” (3.74, rank 1) and “It would be very hard for me to leave my organization right now, even if I wanted to” with a weighted mean of (3.72, rank 2). They Moderately Agreed (MA) on “Too much of my life would be disrupted if I decided I wanted to leave my organization now” (3.34, rank 3); “If I had not already put so much of myself into this organization, I might consider working elsewhere” (3.28, rank 4); “I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving this organization” (3.25, rank 5); and “One of the few negative consequences of leaving this organization would be the scarcity of available alternatives” (3.12, rank 6).

For Continuance Commitment, the administrator respondents most agreed indicator was the hard feeling of leaving the organization right now even if they wanted to. This could mean that administrators have already established strong bond, friendship and/or camaraderie with other employees of the institution. Other reason could be attributed on having established the worth of their job as educator and as educational manager. On the other hand the faculty respondents manifested continuance commitment by approving that staying with

the organization is a matter of necessity as much as desire. This finding signifies that they preferred to work and stay in the university because they have needs and wants that have to be satisfied. Staying in that institution will address these concerns. This type of commitment according to [14] happens when the employees stay in the organization because of recognition of the costs associated with leaving the organization. [10] argued that employees are obligated to their organizations because of the consequences they are likely to face when they leave these organizations. Other factor to development of continuance commitment according to [12] is the feeling the personal sacrifices that come with leaving are considerably high. The administrator and faculty respondents have moderately agreed and the least manifested indicator of continuance commitment was the negative consequence of leaving the organization was lack of alternatives (e.g., job vacancy, enough compensation, good working environment, etc.). Both groups of respondents may have contemplated leaving the institution but for some reasons and lack of career options outside the institution. One of the factors to continuance commitment according to [12] is lack of another job to replace the one that they have left. [19] proposed the idea of leaving an organization is a source of stress for individuals who remain due to the fear of losing valuable advantages. On the other hand, [20] showed that continuance commitment based on economic exchanges should be promoted and continuance commitment based on low job alternatives should not be encouraged.

Table 2. Extent of Organizational Commitment

	Continuance Commitment	Administrator			Faculty		
		WM	VI	Rank	WM	VI	Rank
1.	Right now, staying with my organization is a matter of necessity as much as desire.	3.58	A	3	3.74	A	1
2.	It would be very hard for me to leave my organization right now, even if I wanted to.	3.96	A	1	3.72	A	2
3.	Too much of my life would be disrupted if I decided I wanted to leave my organization now.	3.66	A	2	3.34	MA	3
4.	I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving this organization.	3.35	MA	4	3.25	MA	5
5.	If I had not already put so much of myself into this organization, I might consider working elsewhere.	3.35	MA	4	3.28	MA	4
6.	One of the few negative consequences of leaving this organization would be the scarcity of available alternatives.	3.08	A	6	3.12	MA	6
Composite Mean		3.50	A		3.41	A	

* SA-Strongly Agree; A-Agree; MA – Moderately Agree; D – Disagree;

Table 3 shows the assessment on the extent of respondents on the organizational commitment in terms of normative commitment.

The administrator-respondents Strongly Agreed (A) on “I would not leave my organization right now because I have a sense of obligation to the people in it” (4.34, rank 1); “This organization deserves my loyalty” (4.31, rank 2); and

“I owe a great deal to my organization” (4.24, rank 3). They Agreed on “I would feel guilty if I left my organization now” (3.95, rank 4) and “Even if it were to my advantage, I do not feel it would be right to leave my organization now” (3.52, rank 5). Respondents Moderately Agreed (MA) on “I do not feel any obligation to remain with my current employer” (2.73, rank 6).

The faculty-respondents Agreed (A) “This organization deserves my loyalty” (4.12, rank 1); “I would not leave my organization right now because I have a sense of obligation to the people in it” (4.06, rank 2); “I owe a great deal to my organization” (3.97, rank 3) and “I would feel guilty if I left my organization now” (3.46, rank 4). They Moderately Agreed (MA) on “Even if it were to my advantage, I do not feel it would be right to leave my organization now” (3.33, rank 5) and “I do not feel any obligation to remain with my current employer” (2.69, rank 6).

Administrator respondents’ have strongly agreed that leaving the organization now was not considered because of their sense of obligation to the people and works in the organization. This indicator was the strongly approved by the administrator respondents among the constructs of normative commitment. Having sense of obligation to the organization is a manifestation of normative commitment. There exist among the administrators of selected state universities in Region III high sense of obligation and responsibility. [10] stressed that in the context of normative commitment, employees are committed because of some moral obligations. [21] argue that “this form of commitment is deeply rooted in and influenced by the socialization process, and the values and beliefs stemming from family, school and community environment. For [20] employees may commit to their employing organizations

because of lack of better alternatives or consequences related to failing to commit

Faculty respondents on the other hand mostly agreed that their organization deserves their loyalty which has become one of the reasons to stay in the institution. The faculty respondents manifest confidence that they can give devotion of service to the organization and to their clients (students) which can be considered enough reason to stay in their organization. [15] stressed that employees may commit to their employing organization because they are aware that their expertise is needed.

Both of the administrator and faculty member respondents have moderately agreed on the manifestations of normative commitment stating a feeling of no obligation to remain with the current employer. This could mean that this particular indicator barely exists in their respective institution and this does not characterize the kind of commitment they have in their work place. [14] stated that normative commitment occurs when an individual feels the need to reciprocate after receiving some benefits from an organization. It is the extent to which employees have a moral obligation to stay in the organization. If these are not satisfied employees feel no reason to stay in the organization. [22] stressed that normative commitment exists when employees have the feeling that to stay in the organization is the “right” or “moral” thing to do.

Table 3. Extent of Organizational Commitment

	Normative Commitment	Administrator			Faculty		
		WM	DE	Rank	WM	DE	Rank
1	I do not feel any obligation to remain with my current employer.	2.73	MA	6	2.69	MA	6
2	Even if it were to my advantage, I do not feel it would be right to leave my organization now.	3.52	A	5	3.33	MA	5
3	I would feel guilty if I left my organization now	3.95	A	4	3.46	A	4
4	This organization deserves my loyalty.	4.31	SA	2	4.12	A	1
5	I would not leave my organization right now because I have a sense of obligation to the people in it	4.34	SA	1	4.06	A	2
6	I owe a great deal to my organization.	4.24	SA	3	3.97	A	3
Composite Mean		3.85	A		3.61	A	

* SA-Strongly Agree; A-Agree; MA – Moderately Agree; D – Disagree;

Table 4 shows the factors affecting the extent of organizational commitment in terms of leadership traits. The administrator-respondents Strongly Agreed (SA) on “The top management members in this organization are friendly and approachable” (4.21, rank 1). They Agreed (A) on “The management stimulates development of skills among the employees” (4.07, rank 2); “The management

looks out for the welfare of the employees” (4.02, rank 3); “Members of the management team are always available when their help and support is needed by the employees” (3.95, rank 4); “There is effective communication in management and employees” (3.95, rank 4); “The top management members in this organization try to make employees’ job more pleasant” (3.89, rank 6); and “The management treats all employees as equals” (3.80, rank 7).

The faculty-respondents Agreed (A) in “The top management members in this organization are friendly and approachable” (3.55, rank 1); “The management stimulates development of skills among the employees” (3.70, rank 2); “Members of the management team are always available when their help and support is needed by the employees” (3.61, rank 4); “There is effective communication in management and employees”(3.61, rank 4); “The top management members in this organization try to make employees’ job more pleasant” (3.55, rank 5); and “The management looks out for the welfare of the employees” (3.53, rank 6). They Moderately Agreed (MA) on “The management treats all employees as equals” (3.39, rank 7).

As for the leadership traits factor, the administrator and faculty respondents have strongly agreed that having top management members in the organization who

are friendly and approachable and having a management stimulating their skills to be the influential indicators that can affect organizational commitment. This could also mean that friendliness and welcoming attitudes of organization heads/superiors influence the respondents’ commitment. In terms of supervisory support, previous studies confirm that appropriate relation between job

demands of employees and supervisor control reduces stress level at the workplace, thus increase commitment [23]. Workers may be more likely` to be committed to an organization that cares about and values them [24]. According to [21] there is a big possibility that employees will stay at this organization if their heads/supervisors provide challenges and opportunities for the employees.

The administrator and faculty respondents have agreed that management treating all employees as equals to be the least of the leadership traits factor that can influence commitment in the organization. There can be instances in their respective institutions that some employees are not considered similarly or even if they are treated equally, this trait/indicator does not significantly affect their commitment in the institution. This is consistent with a study in Pakistan by [25] who found that supervision was positively correlated with organizational commitment. Likewise, the results from the previous study [26] suggest that academic heads should provide support for other workers in terms of giving information and assistance which in turn increases their sense of connection and commitment with the university. However, according to [21] if the organization fails to provide opportunities to employees, there is a big chance that the employee starts to look for other companies.

Table 4. Factors Affecting Extent of Organizational Commitment

	Leadership Traits	Administrator			Faculty		
		WM	DE	Rank	WM	DE	Rank
1	The top management members in this organization are friendly and approachable.	4.21	SA	1	3.93	A	1
2	The top management members in this organization try to make employees’ job more pleasant	3.89	A	6	3.55	A	5
3	The management treats all employees as equals	3.80	A	7	3.39	MA	7
4	The management looks out for the welfare of the employees	4.02	A	3	3.53	A	6
5	Members of the management team are always available when their help and support is needed by the employees	3.95	A	4	3.61	A	4
6	There is effective communication in management and employees	3.95	A	4	3.61	A	4
7	The management stimulates development of skills among the employees	4.07	A	2	3.7	A	2
Composite Mean		3.95	A		3.62	A	

* SA-Strongly Agree; A-Agree; MA – Moderately Agree; D – Disagree;

Table 5 shows the factors affecting the organizational commitment in terms of employee relations. The faculty-respondents Agreed (A) on “The organization stimulates cooperation within the unit/department” (3.79, rank 1); “The organization appreciates cooperation within the unit/department” (3.78, rank 2); “The organization actively promotes exchange of knowledge within the business units” (3.69 rank 3); “The organization appreciate

exchange of knowledge within the business units” (3.61 rank 4); and “There is sufficient cooperation in various business units in the organization” (3.58, rank 5).

The organization that stimulates cooperation within the unit/department was the most agreed employee relations factor that influences the organizational commitment by both of the administrator and faculty respondents. This signifies that respondents believe that being employed in an organization and/or institution that gives worth on cooperation and collaboration would affect their commitment. The findings of [2] and [27] were consistent to the present findings. [2] concluded that both,

academics and administrative personnel were more committed and more satisfied when the university applied positive work practices [27]

employees who a friendly and supportive relationship with their co-workers develop a strong, positive commitment. Therefore, employee relations are positively associated with affective organizational commitment.

For the administrator respondents, the least agreed indicator for employee relations factor that affects commitment was that organization actively promotes exchange of knowledge within the business units, while for the faculty member, the indicator stating that sufficient cooperation in various business units in the organization

was the least agreed. The findings revealed that the active promotion of exchange of knowledge and enough cooperation were least to influence the administrator and faculty respondents' organizational commitment. [3] have confirmed that attachment to organization or organizational commitment is greatest among the employees with considerable cooperation in accomplishing tasks. Malik, et al. (2010) found that when university employees value the nature of the relationship with their co-workers such as teamwork giving of assistance and collaboration, the higher the level of commitment for the organization they express.

Table 5. Factors Affecting Extent of Organizational Commitment

	Employee Relations	Administrator			Faculty		
		WM	DE	Rank	WM	DE	Rank
1	The organization stimulates cooperation within the unit/department	4.21	SA	1	3.79	A	1
2	The organization appreciates cooperation within the unit/department	4.14	A	2	3.78	A	2
3	The organization actively promotes exchange of knowledge within the business units	3.66	A	5	3.69	A	3
4	The organization appreciate exchange of knowledge within the business units	3.81	A	4	3.61	A	4
5	There is sufficient cooperation in various business units in the organization	3.95	A	3	3.58	A	5
Composite Mean		3.96	A		3.69	A	

* SA-Strongly Agree; A-Agree; MA – Moderately Agree; D – Disagree;

Table 6 shows the factors affecting the organizational commitment in terms of knowledge sharing.

The administrator-respondents Agreed (A) on “The organization shares business proposals and report with each other” (3.99, rank 1); “The organization shares manuals, models and methodologies with employees”

(3.97 rank 2); “The organization shares expertise obtained from education and training with each other” (3.92, rank 3); “The organization shares know how from work experience with each other” (3.79 rank 4).

The faculty-respondents Agreed (A) on “The organization shares business proposals and report with each other” (3.68, rank 1); “The organization shares expertise obtained from education and training with each other” (3.65, rank 2); “The organization shares manuals, models and methodologies with employees” (3.64, rank 3);

and “The organization shares know how from work experience with each other” (3.62, rank 4).

The organization that shares business proposals and report with the employees was agreed upon by the administrator and faculty member respondents as the most approved knowledge sharing factor that can affect their organizational commitment. This could mean that the respondents practice and give due importance on a collaborative management style in their respective university. The employees partake on important issues, agenda and plans of the institution. These particular reasons can affect commitment. [28] have found in their research that knowledge sharing does contribute towards organizational commitment among employees. It is a motivational concept, where employees feel tempted to strive towards a challenging goal. Also, it shows the personal energy that employees bring to their work [29] In other words, employees want to succeed and they do everything involved with it with high energy. [30] specified that when the work performed by the employees

is meaningful, when they are confident in their abilities, their awareness level regarding the boundaries of decision making and about the importance of outcomes from their work. On the other hand, the least preferred indicator of knowledge sharing factor that affects organizational commitment as by the administrator and faculty respondents was having an organization that shares know how from work experience with each other. This finding can be attributed to an educational institution having numerous and complex group/department. Each member has own area of expertise which limits the individual to share technical knowledge with others. [31]

employees can better fulfill their obligations towards the client when they are empowered, feel the obligation, and desire to service. This is supported by the finding of [32] stating that employee is willing to invest effort to one's work and is persistent, even in cases when the work is challenging. On the other hand, [2] proved empirically that regular feedback on employees' actions, works and performances are positively and significantly correlated with organizational commitment.

Table 6. Factors Affecting Extent of Organizational Commitment

	Knowledge Sharing	Administrator			Faculty		
		WM	DE	Rank	WM	DE	Rank
1	The organization shares business proposals and report with each other	3.99	A	1	3.68	A	1
2	The organization shares manuals, models and methodologies with employees.	3.94	A	2	3.64	A	3
3	The organization shares know how from work experience with each other.	3.79	A	4	3.62	A	4
4	The organization shares expertise obtained from education and training with each other	3.92	A	3	3.65	A	2
Composite Mean		3.92	A		3.65	A	

* SA-Strongly Agree; A-Agree; MA – Moderately Agree; D – Disagree;

Table 7 shows the respondents on the factors affecting the organizational commitment in terms of task orientation.

The administrator-respondents Agreed (A) on “The organization allows me enough freedom to do what I want on my job” (3.84, rank 1); “The organization often allows me to decide which tasks to perform” (3.82, rank 2); and “The organization often allows ne freedom to choose on how I do my work” (3.40, rank 3). The Moderately Agreed

(MA) on “In this organization, the level of my job is non-repetitive” (3.36, rank 4) and “The organization allows me little freedom to make work related decisions” (2.88, rank 5).

The faculty-respondents Agreed (A) on “The organization allows me enough freedom to do what I want on my job” (3.66, rank 1); “The organization often allows me to decide which tasks to perform” (3.554, rank 2); and “The organization often allows ne freedom to choose on how I do my work” (3.48, rank 3); on “In this organization,

the level of my job is non-repetitive” (3.43, rank 4). They Moderately Agreed (MA) on “The organization allows me little freedom to make work related decisions” (3.26, rank 5).

The task orientation factor stating that an organization that allows enough freedom to do what the employees want on their job was the indicator most agreed by both of the administrator and faculty member respondents that could influence greatly the extent of their commitment in their respective institution. Revealed from the finding that the respondents value independent decision making, hence, making this the most important task orientation factor of commitment. This is consistent with [33] conclusion that keeping employees involved in the decision making of all organization related issues is also a factor leading to higher level of organizational commitment. Employees who are offered challenging, exciting and interesting work tend to be more involved and satisfied, and are in turn more committed to their organization and are less likely to leave their organization [34]. [29] concluded that heads and subordinates can develop dedication to work when there is strong involvement, positive feelings like inspiration, significance, pride and enthusiasm.

Both the respondents however moderately agreed on the indicator stating that an organization allows little freedom to make work related decisions. This indicator obtained the least computed weighted mean. This result signifies that the respondents really values their freedom and are self-directed and prefer to work autonomously towards achieving organizations' goals. The study of [35] on task autonomy showed that the sense of power or control over the task at hand is vital which allows the employee freedom to manage his or her task at hand. For

[36] there is a need to empower employees since it is one of the most important factors in providing services to clients. [37] argued that empowerment is positive because it involves giving power to employees and managers making them more responsible and decision makers and control more over their jobs.

Table 7. Factors Affecting Extent of Organizational Commitment

	Task Orientation	Administrator			Faculty		
		WM	DE	Rank	WM	DE	Rank
1	In this organization, the level of my job is non-repetitive	3.36	MA	4	3.43	A	4
2	The organization allows me little freedom to make work related decisions	2.88	MA	5	3.26	MA	5
3	The organization often allows me to decide which tasks to perform	3.82	A	2	3.54	A	2
4	The organization allows me enough freedom to do what I want on my job	3.84	A	1	3.66	A	1
5	The organization often allows ne freedom to choose on how I do my work	3.4	A	3	3.48	A	3
Composite Mean		3.46	A		3.47	A	

* SA-Strongly Agree; A-Agree; MA – Moderately Agree; D – Disagree;

Table 8 shows the respondents on the factors affecting the organizational commitment in terms of compensation and incentives.

The administrator-respondents Agree (A) on “The organization’s incentive system encourages us to reach organizations goals” (3.93, rank 1); “The organization’s incentive system encourages the employees to vigorously

pursue organizational objectives” (3.84, rank 2); “The organization’s reward system really recognizes the people who contribute the most” (3.72, rank 3); and “The organization’s incentive system is fair at rewarding people

who accomplish objectives” (3.66, rank 4). They Moderately Agreed (MA) on “The organization’s incentive system is at odds with our organization goals” (2.75, rank 6) and “In this organization, persons who achieve organization goals are rewarded the same as those who do not achieve organizational goals” (3.07, rank 5).

The faculty-respondents Agree (A) on “The organization’s incentive system encourages us to reach

organizations goals” (3.52, rank 1); “The organization’s incentive system encourages the employees to vigorously pursue organizational objectives” (3.48, rank 2); “In this organization, persons who achieve organization goals are rewarded the same as those who do not achieve organizational goals” (3.42, rank 3); and “The organization’s reward system really recognizes the people who contribute the most” (3.42, rank 4). They Moderately Agreed (MA) on “The organization’s incentive system is fair at rewarding people who accomplish objectives” (3.36, rank 5); and “The organization’s incentive system is at odds with our organization goals” (3.36, rank 6).

The organization’s incentive system encourages to reach organizations goals was the indicator most agreed by both of the administrator and faculty member respondents that could affect the extent of their commitment in their respective organizations. This particular compensation and incentive factor was believed to inspire and boosts employees to stay in their institution. Remuneration or compensation according to [38] is one of the important contractual and implied agreements between an employer and an employee. [39] found that the level of employee’s organizational commitment can be

affected by extrinsic or intrinsic rewards. Therefore,, if the reward system is created and used wisely taking those into consideration, it can be used to affect existing employees’ organizational commitment. [34] concluded that employees may express greater commitment and tend to remain with the organization when they feel that their capabilities, efforts and performance.

The least agreed indicator that could influence both the administrators and faulty members’ commitment was that their organizations’ incentive system are at odds with their organization goals. Contributions are recognized and appreciated if an organization does not pay equitably

compared to others, it may risk losing the compensation package. This particular compensation and incentive factor was believed to have minimal influence on the respondents’ organizational commitment. [21] argued that institutions can, however, make their employees committed to themselves if they take care of the matters important for the employees. [34] stated that employees will stay if they are rewarded fairly and adequately. Most often these compensation packages are in line with the institution’s strategies and are usually made known to the employees.

Table 8. Factors Affecting Extent of Organizational Commitment

	Compensation and Incentives	Administrator			Faculty		
		WM	DE	Rank	WM	DE	Rank
1	The organization’s incentive system encourages the employees to vigorously pursue organizational objectives	3.84	A	2	3.48	A	2
2	The organization’s incentive system is fair at rewarding people who accomplish objectives	3.66	A	4	3.36	MA	5
3	The organization’s reward system really recognizes the people who contribute the most	3.72	A	3	3.42	A	4
4	The organization’s incentive system encourages us to reach organizations goals.	3.93	A	1	3.52	Agree	1
5	The organization’s incentive system is at odds with our organization goals	2.75	MA	6	3.36	MA	6
6	In this organization, persons who achieve organization goals are rewarded the same as those who do not achieve organizational goals	3.07	MA	5	3.42	A	3
Composite Mean		3.49	A		3.43	A	

* SA-Strongly Agree; A-Agree; MA – Moderately Agree; D – Disagree;

Table 9. Factors Affecting Extent of Organizational Commitment

	Performance Management and Promotion Factor	Administrator			Faculty		
		WM	DE	Rank	WM	DE	Rank
1	There is favoritism in performance evaluation in this organization	2.84	MA	4	3.29	MA	4
2	The management follows a “pick and choose” policy promotion	3.05	MA	2	3.23	MA	5
3	Only certain individuals are entertained for promotional opportunities	2.96	MA	3	3.40	Agree	3
4	Yearly assessment depends upon the kind of relationship employees have with their supervisors, not the work they perform	3.06	MA	1	3.50	Agree	1
5	Promotion in this organization largely depends upon what kind of relationship one has with the top management.	2.84	MA	4	3.45	Agree	2
Composite Mean		2.95	MA		3.37	A	

* SA-Strongly Agree; A-Agree; MA – Moderately Agree; D – Disagree;

Table 9 shows the respondents on the factors affecting the organizational commitment in terms of performance management and promotion.

The administrator-respondents Moderately Agreed (MA) on “The management follows a “pick and choose” policy promotion” (3.42, rank 4); “Only certain individuals are entertained for promotional opportunities” (3.52, rank 1); “There favoritism in performance evaluation in this organization” (3.48, rank 2); “Yearly assessment depends upon the kind of relationship employees have with their supervisors, not the work they perform” (3.42, rank 3) and “Promotion in this organization largely depends upon what kind of relationship one has with the top management” (3.42, rank 3).

The faculty-respondents Agreed (MA) “Yearly assessment depends upon the kind of relationship employees have with their supervisors, not the work they perform” (3.50, rank 1) and “Promotion in this organization largely depends upon what kind of relationship one has with the top management” (3.45, rank 2); “Only certain individuals are entertained for promotional opportunities” (3.40, rank 3). They Moderately Agreed (MA) on “There is favoritism in performance evaluation in this organization” (3.29, rank 4) and “The management follows a “pick and choose” policy promotion” (3.23, rank 5).

Yearly assessment depends upon the kind of relationship employees have with their superiors, not the work they perform was most approved performance management and promotion factor by both the administrators and faculty members that can affect their organizational commitment. From this finding, it is

assumed that this is a potential indicator to the commitment. According to [21], [40] distribution of organizational rewards such promotion, status, and performance evaluations have tremendous impact on organizational commitment. Despite experiencing work-life conflict, employees may maintain relatively high levels of organizational commitment according to [34] provided that they perceive the procedures used to plan and implement organizational decisions are fair.

The administrators moderately agreed on the indicator of performance management and promotion factor of organizational commitment stating that favoritism in performance evaluation in promotion largely depends on what kind of relationship an employee has with the top management. This indicator was the least agreed issue that affect respondents’ commitment in their respective institutions. This could mean that the performances of employees are considered by the administrators when giving promotion instead. This is consistent of [3] who argued that the top management team is usually the mediator between the employees and the organization itself. Thus, the role of these key people is vital in establishing the sort of relationship an employee establishes with the organization.

The management follows a “pick and choose” policy promotion was least agreed by the faculty respondents as indicator of promotional factor that would affect their commitment. This could mean that their respective institution follow a clear merit system of promotion. In a study by [41], results have suggested that employees were more likely to express high affective commitment when they the performance management and promotion as fair.

Table 10. Factors Affecting Extent of Organizational Commitment

	Opportunities of Training and Development	Administrator			Faculty		
		WM	DE	Rank	WM	DE	Rank
1	Our organization has a low level of skill compared to other institution	2.4	D	5	2.8	MA	5
2	At this organization, some employees lack important skills	2.89	MA	4	3.21	MA	4
3	Organization employees receives training and development of skills in a regular basis.	3.91	A	2	3.52	A	3
4	The management at this organization believes that continual training and upgrading of employees’ skills is important	4.13	A	1	3.86	A	1
5	Employees at this organization have skills that are above average	3.73	A	3	3.65	A	2
Composite Mean		3.41	A		3.41	A	

* SA-Strongly Agree; A-Agree; MA – Moderately Agree; D – Disagree;

Table 10 shows the respondents on the factors affecting the organizational commitment in terms of opportunities of training and development.

The administrator-respondents Agreed (A) on “The management at this organization believes that continual training and upgrading of employees’ skills is important” (4.13, rank 1); “Organization employees receives training and development of skills in a regular basis” (3.91, rank 2); and “Employees at this organization have skills that are above average” (3.73, rank 3). They Moderately Agreed (MA) on “Our organization has a low level of skill compared to other institution” (2.89, rank 4). And for “At this organization, some employees lack important skills” (2.40, rank 5) was Disagree (D) by the administrator - respondents.

The faculty-respondents Agreed (A) on “The management at this organization believes that continual training and upgrading of employees’ skills is important” (3.86, rank 1);, “Employees at this organization have skills that are above average” (3.65, rank 2); and “Organization employees receives training and development of skills in a regular basis” (3.52, rank 3). They Moderately Agreed (MA) on “At this organization, some employees lack important skills” (3.21, rank 4) and “Our organization has a low level of skill compared to other institution” (2.80, rank 5).

The management of the organization that believes in continual training and upgrading of employees’ skills was the most agreed opportunities of training and development factor that influence organizational commitment among the administrators and the faculty

member respondents. The practice of an institution of continuous training and professional growth of its employees was believed by the respondents to have an influence on commitment employees was believed by the respondents to have an influence on commitment. In parallel to these were the findings of [18] who stressed that career development has a direct influence on the achievement of job satisfaction and career commitment and [42] who stated that stated that career advancement and autonomy will maximize commitment and thus minimize turnover. On the other hand [43] argued that career management overall is very important factor for organizational commitment. If companies help their employees with that, they may become more committed to their organizations. This is because it helps them to understand the company values and support them. [42] suggests that employees that have advanced would put more effort into their work. The organization or company policies play an important role in providing career opportunities.

However, the administrator respondents disagreed and the faculty respondents moderately agreed on the indicator stating that their organization having a low level of skill compared to other institution as an opportunity of training and development indicator that can affect their commitment in the institution. This could also mean that the respondents do not look upon their respective institution as low level or inferior compared to other institution. This is consistent with [38] that training and development has contributed towards organizational commitment Therefore, it is necessary to empower employee through training activities because these will help to enhance their skills and pride and commitment to the organization. Findings show that overall employees are more committed if they are satisfied with how their needs for on-going development are met.

Table 11. Significant Difference on the Extent of Organizational Commitment

Organizational Commitment	Administrators	Faculty	t computed	p - value	HI	D
Affective	3.25	3.27	0.25	0.80	NS	Accept
Continuance	3.50	3.41	0.91	0.36	NS	Accept
Normative	3.85	3.60	2.94	0.00	HS	Reject

** *p-value*<0.01 Highly Significant (HS) ; * *p-value*<0.05 Significant (S)

Table 11 shows the t – test on significant difference in the assessed extent of organization commitment between administrators and faculty respondents.

The computed p value for normative p is less than the 0.01 alpha level of significance. The data provide sufficient evidence that there was a highly significant difference in the assessed extent of organizational commitment between administrators and faculty respondents in terms of

normative commitment. Null hypothesis is rejected in terms of normative commitment.

On the other hand the computed significance value for affective and continuance were greater than the 0.05 alpha level of significance. The data provide sufficient evidence that there is no significant difference in the assessed extent

of organizational commitment between administrators and faculty respondents in terms of affective and continuance commitment. Null hypothesis is accepted in terms of affective and continuance commitment.

Table 12. Significant Difference on Factors Affecting the Extent of Organizational Commitment

Factors	Administrator	Faculty	t computed	P - value	HI	D
Leadership Traits	3.99	3.62	3.95	0.00	HS	Reject
Employee Relations	3.96	3.69	2.9	0.00	HS	Reject
Knowledge Sharing	3.91	3.65	2.73	0.01	HS	Reject
Task Orientation	3.46	3.47	0.17	0.87	NS	Accept
Compensation and Incentives	3.49	3.43	0.76	0.44	NS	Accept
Performance Management and Promotion	2.95	3.37	4.76	0.00	HS	Reject
Opportunities of Training and Development	3.41	3.41	0.08	0.93	NS	Accept

** *p-value*<0.01 Highly Significant (HS) ; * *p-value*<0.05 Significant (S)

Table 12 shows the t – test on significant difference in the assessed factors affecting the extent of organization commitment between administrators and faculty respondents.

The computed significance value for leadership traits; employee relations; knowledge sharing and performance

management and promotion are all less than the 0.01 alpha level of significance. The data provide sufficient evidence that there was a highly significant difference in the assessed factors affecting the extent of organizational commitment between administrators and faculty respondents in terms of leadership traits, employee relations, knowledge sharing and performance management and promotion.

Null hypothesis is rejected in terms of leadership traits, employee relations, knowledge sharing and performance management and promotion. On the other hand the computed significance value for task orientation; compensation and incentives and opportunities of training and development were greater than the 0.05 alpha level of significance. The data provide sufficient evidence that there is no significant difference in the assessed factors affecting the extent of organizational commitment between administrators and faculty respondents in terms of for task orientation; compensation and incentives and opportunities of training and development. Null hypothesis is accepted in terms of for

task orientation; compensation and incentives and opportunities of training and development.

4 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

Respondents agreed that Continuance Commitment and Normative Commitment exist in State Universities in Region III while they moderately agreed on Affective Commitment. The respondents agreed that Leadership Traits, Employee Relations, Knowledge Sharing, Task Orientation, Compensation and Incentives, Performance Management and Promotion; and Opportunities of Training and Development are factors affecting the

extent of organizational commitment in State Universities in Region III. There is a significant difference in the assessed extent of organizational commitment between administrators and faculty respondents in terms of normative commitment. There is a significant difference in the assessed factors affecting the extent of organizational commitment between administrators and faculty respondents in terms of leadership traits, employee relations, knowledge sharing and performance management and promotion.

It is recommended that the university may confer extra workload and task (e.g. designation and assignment) to employees provided they are well compensated and are

satisfied, thus making the employees stay committed in the organization at all times. The management of the university has to confirm to employees their many obligations but with freedom and the empowerment in completing their assigned tasks as long as this is not abused and in-line with the organization's policies. Assure employees that university plans (e.g., faculty development) manifest equality and equity. The university management has to guarantee the active promotion of exchange of knowledge to build sufficient cooperation in various colleges and departments and to benefit from work experience with each other. The organization may give university employees the liberty to take part on decision making that can help or contribute to attainment of goals. The university management has to ensure that actions and plans are instituted towards enhancing skills of employees and developing their pride.

5 REFERENCES

- [1]. Ng'ethe, J.M., Iravo, M.E., & Namusonge, G.S. (2012). *Determinants of academic staff retention in public universities in Kenya: Empirical review. International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 2(13). Retrieved from: http://www.ijhssnet.com/journals/Vol_2_No_13_Jul_y_2012/22.pdf
- [2] Kipkebut, D. J. (2010). Organisational commitment and job satisfaction in higher educational institutions: the Kenyan case. Retrieved from <http://eprints.mdx.ac.uk/6509/>
- [3] Govindasamy, M. (2009). *A Study on Factors Affective Organizational Commitment among Knowledge Workers in Malaysia*. Graduate School of Business Faculty of Business and Accountancy University of Malaya.
- [4] Porter, LW, Crampo, WJ. & Smith, FJ (1972) "Organizational Commitment and Managerial Turnover: A longitudinal Study" California University, CA, NTIS
- [5] Mowday, R., Steers, R. and Porter, L. (1979) "The Measurement of Organizational Commitment", *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, Vol.14 No.2.
- [6] Gall & Borg (2007). *Elinor Ostrom's contributions to the experimental study of social dilemmas*. *Public Choice*, 143.
- [7] Driscoll, D. L. (2011). *Introduction to Primary Research: Observations, Surveys, and Interviews*. ISBN 978-1-60235-184-4 <http://www.parlorpress.com/pdf/driscoll--introduction-to-primary-research.pdf>
- [8] Burns N, Grove SK (2005). *The Practice of Nursing Research: Conduct, Critique, and Utilization* (5th Ed.). St. Louis, Elsevier Saunders
- [9] Saunders, et al., 2007. *Applied linear regression application* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Duxbury Press.
- [10] Meyer, J. P., & Parfyonova, N. M. (2010). *Normative commitment in the workplace: A theoretical analysis and re-conceptualization*. *Human Resource Management Review*, 20, doi:10.1234/12345678
- [11] Oppenheim, A. N. (2006), "Questionnaire design and attitude measurement", Great Britain, Gower Publishing Porter, Steers.
- [12] Kimura, T. (2013). *The moderating effects of political skill and leader-member exchange on the relationship between organizational politics and affective commitment*. *Journal of Business Ethics*, doi:10.1007/s10551-012-1497-x
- [13] Leroy, H., Palanski, M., & Simons, T. (2012). *Authentic leadership and behavioral integrity as drivers of follower commitment and performance*. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 107, doi:10.1007/s10551-011-1036-1.
- [14] Balassiano, M., & Salles, D. (2012). *Perceptions of equity and justice and their implications on affective organizational commitment: A confirmatory study in a teaching and research institute*. *Brazilian Administration Review*. Retrieved from http://anpad.org.br/periodicos/content/frame_base.php?revista=2
- [15] Boles, J., Madupalli, R., Rutherford, B. and Wood, J. A. (2007), "The relationship of facets of salesperson job satisfaction with affective organizational commitment", *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, Vol. 22 No. 5.
- [16] Jussila, I., Byrne, N., & Tuominen, H. (2012). *Affective commitment in co-operative organizations: What makes members want to stay?* *International Business Research*, 5(10), doi:10.5539/ibr.v5n10p1
- [17] Darolia, C. R., Kumari, P., & Darolia, S. (2010). *Perceived organizational support, work motivation, and organizational commitment as determinants of job performance*. *Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology*, 36(1).
- [18] Van Knippenberg, D. & Sleebos, E. (2012). *Organizational identification versus organizational commitment: Self-definition, social exchange, and job attitudes*. *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 27 (5),
- [19] Vandenberghe, C., Panaccio, A., & Ayed, A. K. B. (2011). *Continuance commitment and turnover: Examining the moderating role of negative affectivity and risk aversion*. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, doi: 10.1348/096317910X491848
- [20] Taing, M., Granger, B., Groff, K., Jackson, E., & Johnson, R. (2011). *The multidimensional nature of continuance commitment: Commitment owing to economic exchanges versus lack of employment alternatives*. *Journal of Business & Psychology*, 26, doi:10.1007/s10869-010-9188-
- [21] Markovits, Y., Boer, D. & van Dick, R. (2013). *Economic crisis and the employee: The effects of economic crisis on*

- employee job satisfaction, commitment, and self-regulation.* European Management Journal. In Press.
- [22] Colquitt, J. A., LePine, J. A., & Wesson, M. J. (2010). *Organizational behavior: Essentials for improving performance and commitment.* New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Irwin.
- [23] Nauret (2012). Nauert, R. (2012). *Co-Worker support reduces workplace stress, ups productivity.* Retrieved from <http://psychcentral.com/news/2012/02/07/co-worker-support-reduces-workplace-stress-ups-productivity/34537.html>
- [24] George, J.M. and Jones, G.R. (2006), "The experience of work and turnover intentions: interactive effects of value attainment, job satisfaction, and positive mood", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 81 No. 3.
- [25] Veled-Hecht, A., & Cohen, A. (2010). *The relationship between organizational socialization and commitment in the workplace among employees in the long-term nursing care facilities.* *Personnel Review*, 39 (5).
- [26] Umbach, P. D. (2008). *The effects of part-time faculty appointments on instructional techniques and commitment to teaching.* Paper Presented at the 33rd Annual Conference of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Jacksonville, FL, and November 5-8, 2008
- [27] Joiner, T.A. and Bakalis, S. (2006), "The antecedents of organizational commitment: the case of Australian casual academics", *International Journal of Educational Management*, Vol. 20 No. 6.
- [28] Massingham, P. and Diment, K., (2009), "Organizational commitment, knowledge management interventions, and learning organization capacity", *The Learning Organization*, Vol. 16 No. 2.
- [29] Bakker & Leiter (2010). *The relationship between affective and normative commitment: review and research agenda.* *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 27 (5),
- [30] Smith, M. (2008) *Employee Empowerment: Definition, Construct Validation and Measurement.* Doctoral Thesis, McGill University.
- [31] Mckenna, S. (2012). *Organizational commitment in the small entrepreneurial business in Singapore.* *Cross Cultural Management*, Vol.12, No.2
- [32] Schaufeli, W. B. & Salanova, M. (2007). *Work engagement: An emerging psychological concept and its implications for organizations.* In S. W. Gilliland, D. D. Steiner, D. P. Skarlicki (Eds.) *Managing social and ethical issues in organizations.* Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing
- [33] Muindi, F.K. (2011). *The relationship between participation in decision making and job satisfaction among academic staff in the school of business, university of Nairobi.* *Journal of Human Resources Management Research*, 2011(2011). doi:10.5171/2011.246460
- [34] Siegel, P.A., Post, C., Brockner, J., Fishman, A.Y., & Garden, C. (2015). *The Moderating influence of procedural fairness on the relationship between work-life conflict and organizational commitment.* *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90,
- [35] Workman, M. and Bommer, W. (2004), "Redesigning computer call center work: a longitudinal field experiment", *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, Vol. 25.
- [36] Parry, J. (2010). *The effect of workplace exposure on professions' commitment: a longitudinal study of nursing professionals.* Central Queensland University ecialist; *Journal of Work and Occupations*, Vol. 31, No.2,
- [37] Giffords, E. D. (2013). *An examination of organizational and professional commitment among public; not profit and proprietary social service employees;* *Administration in Social Work*. Vol. 27, No.3
- [38] Chew, J. and Chan, C.C.A. (2007), "Human resource practices, organizational commitment and intention to stay", *International Journal of Manpower*, Vol. 29 No. 6.
- [39] Williamson, I. O., Burnett, M. F., & Bartol, K. M. 2009. *The Interactive Effect Of Collectivism And Organizational Rewards On Affective Organizational Commitment.* *Cross Cultural Management: An International Journal.* Retrieved from <http://tampub.uta.fi/bitstream/handle/10024/96724/GRA-DU-142344150/pdf;sequence>
- [40] Boer & van Dick (2013)
- [41] Ansari, M.A., Hung, D.K.M. and Aafaqi, R. (2010), "Fairness of Human Resource Management Practices, Leader-Member Exchange, and Intention to Quit", *Journal of International Business and Entrepreneurship*, Vol. 8, No.1.
- [42] Johns, R. (2010). *Determinants of organizational commitment among U.S. workers.* Unpublished master's thesis, Duquesne University.
- [43] Enache, M., Sallan, J. M., Simo, P. & Fernandez, V. (2013). *Organizational commitment within a contemporary career context.* *International Journal of Manpower* 34 (8),