

THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF HUMANITIES & SOCIAL STUDIES

Organizational Citizenship Behavior, Happiness and Work Motivation as Correlates of Organizational Commitment of Managers of Public And Private Banks

Nazirul Hasnain

Professor, Department of Psychology, Jamia Millia Islamia, New Delhi, India

Owais Khan

Postgraduate Student, Jamia Millia Islamia, New Delhi, India

Zuby Hasan

Research Scholar, Department of Psychology, Jamia Millia Islamia, New Delhi, India

Abstract:

The purpose of the present study was to find out the difference between the managers of private and public banks on organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behavior, happiness and work motivation. Also study attempts to investigate the contribution of organizational citizenship behavior, happiness and work motivation in organizational commitment of managers of private and public banks. For this purpose a sample of 100 bank managers was taken from Delhi and NCR region. Among them 50 managers were taken from private banks and 50 were taken from public banks. Organizational Commitment Scale developed by Hyde and Roy, Organizational Citizenship Scale developed by Podsakoff, MacKenze, Mooreman and Fetter, Revised Oxford Happiness Scale developed by Argyle and Hills and Work Motivation Questionnaire developed by Agarwal were used. In order to find out the difference between means managers of private and public banks on all the variables, t-test was applied. Regression analysis was used to find out the contribution of percentage of variance of organizational citizenship behavior, happiness and work motivation in organizational commitment. On all the variables, managers of private sector banks excelled their counterparts of public sector banks. It was found that total 10% of variance was counted by three variables together in commitment of managers as a whole. However, only OCB individually contributed 34% variance to the organizational commitment of managers of private banks. However, three variables emerge as non-significant individual contributors of organizational commitment in public banks.

Key words: Organizational citizenship behavior, happiness, work motivation, organizational commitment, public banks, private banks.

1. Introduction

Organizational commitment is the individual's psychological attachment to the organization. It is defined as "a strong belief in and acceptance of the organization's goals and values; a willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization; and a strong desire to maintain membership in the organization" (Mowday, Steers, & Porter (1979). It is a person's feeling with regard to continuing his or her association with the organization, acceptance of the values and goals of the organization, and willingness to help the organization achieve such goals and values (Pareek, 2004).

Porter et al., (1974) defines the organizational commitment as believing and accepting the goals and values of the organization and possessing and showing a desire to be part of the organization. Committed employees show strong intentions to serve their organizations and are low at intentions to leave (Hunt and Morgan, 1994; Robbins and Coulter, 2003; Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1982). According to Madigan, Norton and Testa (1999), committed employees would work diligently, conscientiously, provide value, promote the organizations services or products and seek continuous improvement. In exchange, they expect a work environment that fosters growth and empowerment, allows for a better balance of personal and work life, provides the necessary resources to satisfy the needs of customers and provides for their education and training as well as that of their co-workers.

Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (OCB) are defined as those extra work-related behaviors which go above and beyond the routine duties prescribed by their job descriptions or measured in formal evaluations (Bateman and Organ, 1983). It refers to anything that employees choose to do, spontaneously and of their own accord, which often lies outside of their specified contractual obligations. In other words, it is discretionary. OCB may not always be directly and formally recognized or rewarded by the company, through salary increments or promotions for example, though of course OCB may be reflected in favorable

supervisor and co-worker ratings, or better performance appraisals. In this way it can facilitate future reward gain indirectly. Finally, and critically, OCB must 'promote the effective functioning of the organization' (Organ, 1988).

The importance of Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) for organizational effective functioning has been well rehearsed in recent years and empirical research suggests that OCB accounts for at least as great an effect as that of in role performance in evaluation rating (Podsakoff, Mackenzie, Paine, Bachrach, 2000).

Managers value OCB that creates a work environment conducive to cooperation. It helps to reduce the amount of time a manager spends on an issue and enables focusing on other opportunities for improving organizational performances (Turnipseed and Rassuli, 2005).

Happiness is considered as mental or emotional state of well-being characterized by positive or pleasant emotions ranging from contentment to intense joy. The pursuit of happiness is an important determinant of human behavior: "How to gain, how to keep, how to recover happiness is in fact for most men at all times is the secret motive for all they do" (James 1902). Boehm and Lyubomirsky (2008) preliminarily define a happy person as someone who frequently experiences positive emotions like joy, satisfaction, contentment, enthusiasm and interest. Then, by drawing on both longitudinal and experimental studies, they show that people of this kind are more likely to be successful in their careers. Amabile et al. (2005) uncovers evidence that happiness provokes greater creativity. It is generally believed that a happy worker is a productive worker. It has been observed that psychological well-being is related to a variety of organizational outcomes, such as enhanced job performance, job satisfaction and work involvement, increased profitability and competitiveness of the organization, and reduced employee turnover (Grawitch Gottschalk & Munz, 2006; Keyes, Hysom, & Lupo, 2000; Russell, 2008; Spector, 1997; Warr, 2005; Wright & Bonnet, 2007).

In addition happiness has been found to foster the development of organizational commitment among employees. Research indicates that a high level of well-being leads to enhanced employee commitment to the organization (Grawitch Trares & Kohler, 2007; Jain, Giga, & Cooper, 2009). The relationship of employee well-being with work performance and various other organizational outcomes has been investigated by many researchers. Some researchers argued that psychological well-being causes higher work performance and organizational commitment (Grawitch Trares & Kohler, 2007; Warr, 2005; Wright & Cropanzano, 2004) whereas others argued that work performance and organizational commitment lead to well-being (Begley & Czajka, 1993; Meyer & Allen, 1997), but in both ways they are interrelated.

Work motivation is a process to energize employee to the work goal through a specific path. Motivation by definition refers to what activates, directs human behavior and how this behavior is sustained to achieve a particular goal. Jones (1955) argues that "Motivation is concerned with how behavior gets started, is energized, is sustained, is directed, is stopped and what kind of subjective reaction is present in the organization while all this is going on. It is a method or technique for developing an inner urge to put effort on successful performance into the person who is employed to exchange his cognitive, affective and conative domains for the achievement of organizational goal for a salary which lead him towards the achievement of the specific measures, well defined and achievable goal. According to Antomioni (1999) "the amount of effort people is willing to put in their work depends on the degree to which they feel their motivational needs will be satisfied. On the other hand, individuals become demotivated if they feel something in the organization prevents them from attaining good outcomes.

Deci, Koestner, & Ryan, (1999) observed, "Intrinsic motivation energizes and sustains activities through the spontaneous satisfactions inherent in effective volitional action. Researchers often contrast intrinsic motivation with extrinsic motivation, which is motivation governed by reinforcement contingencies. Traditionally, educators consider intrinsic motivation to be more desirable and to result in better learning outcomes than extrinsic motivation (Deci, Koestner, & Ryan, 1999).

In organizational psychology, the commitment and motivation literatures have usually evolved independently to a certain extent (Meyer et al., 2004). On the contrary, they Meyer et al. (2004) remarked that commitment is one component of motivation and, is important that they gain a better understanding of two processes themselves and of workplace behavior by integrating theories of commitment and motivation. Commitment scholars have also begun to become more concerned with motivation based variables since they report that commitment is a motivational phenomenon (Johnson et al, 2010). In addition, researchers suppose that committed workers make a contribution to the organization in terms of motivation (Eby et al., 1999; De Silva and Yamao, 2006; Pool and Pool, 2007; Johnson et al., 2010). Also companies that paid attention high commitment to improve the employees 'job satisfaction, motivation and morale may recognize the long term benefits of corporate success, loyalty, productivity, and employee retention (Kim et al., 2005). In other word retention, attendance, motivation and job productivity are the consequences of organizational commitment (Mowday et al., 1979; Kim et al., 2005; Eby et al., 1999; De Silva and Yamao, 2006; Meyer et al., 2004; McCabe and Garavan, 2008). Likewise, some researchers emphasize that commitment levels (High or low organizational commitment) are in relation to such many criteria as performance (Shaw et al., 2003; Chong and Eggleton, 2007; Wong and Law, 2002) satisfaction (Mathieu andZajac, 1990; Pool andPool,2007; Yang and Chang, 2008),and work motivation (Meyer et al., 2004; Johnson et al., 2010; Curtis et al.,2009; Eby et al., 1999).For instance, according to Wong and Law (2002), what determines and changes the employees' performance of emotional work is their organizational commitment. It is also stated by De Silva and Yamao (2006) that organizational commitment improves the motivation, creativity of the employees. Meyer et al. (2004) are of the opinion that commitment is considered as one of several energizing forces for motivated behavior. Higher and higher work motivation that is beneficial to the organization (Chang et al., 2007). So employees' productivity is largely related to their motivation levels and a higher level of organizational commitment. Therefore, it is important for an organization to examine the relationships between these two variables. The above discussion reveals that organizational commitment, OCB, happiness and work motivation as positive sides of the work may differ in the manager of public and private banks as they provide different work culture and environment with different provisions of facilities extended to their employees and such differences will lead to differential contributions of OCB, happiness and work motivation in the organizational commitment of managers of two types of banks. The present study is an attempt to find out empirical evidences in this direction.

2.Method

2.1.Participants

The participants of the present study consisted of 100 managers from the banks of delhi, out of which 50 belonged to a public sector banks and 50 belonged to private sector banks. The private bank chosen was Axis Bank and public bank was State Bank of India. These managers were taken on accidental basis. All of them were branch managers.

2.2.Measures

Organizational Commitment Scale: The Organizational Commitment Scale was developed by Hyde and Roy (2006). This scale consists of 30 items and was used to measure the organizational commitment of managers. The scale has a five point response mode which ranges from 'strongly agree' to 'strongly disagree'. The split half reliability was found to be 0.89. The scale has high content validity. In order to find out the validity from the coefficient of reliability, the reliability index was calculated, which indicates high validity on the account of being 0.94

Organizational Citizenship Behavior Scale: The organizational citizenship behavior scale developed by Podsakoff, MacKenze, Mooreman and Fetter (1990) based on conceptual work of Organ (1988) was used. This scale consist 24 items. Responses are given on 7 point scale ranging from 'strongly disagree' to 'strongly agree'. There are five reversed scored items and these item numbers are: 11, 12,13,14 and 15. The rest are positively scored. The internal consistency was obtained average .85 (Altruism = .85, Courtesy = .85, Conscientiousness = .85, Civic virtue = .85, Sportsmanship = .85). The content validity of the scale is pretty good.

Work Motivation Scale: This scale was developed by Agarwal (1988) and is used to measure the work motivation in different work settings. This scale consist 26 items having the response format on a five point scale. All the items are Likert types which were rated on five point scale. Since the items were Likert type, summated scoring is done by assigning 5 to the most positive response and 1 to the extreme negative response. So in this way scores 5, 4, 3, 2, 1 were given to each item. Internal consistency of the instrument was found by split half method. The reliability co- efficient by spearman brown formula was very high .99. This tool holds good face, content and item validity.

Revised Oxford Happiness Scale : Revised Oxford happiness questionnaire consist 15 items was used and each item has six point response criteria. Among the 15 items six items are reversed scored which are 1, 5, 6,10,13,14 and the remaining are positively scored items. The reliability of the Oxford happiness scale is .91. Happiness scale has good validity.

2.3.Procedure

Mean and S.D of scores on different scales were calculated. T-test was used to find out the difference between managers of private and public banks on different variables. Regression analysis was used to ascertain the contribution of variance of predictor variables in the criterion variable.

3.Results

Variables	Types of Banks	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	T	Level of significance
OC	Private banks	50	132.888	7.04400	17.53	< .01
	Public banks	50	103.122	9.71353		
OCB	Private banks	50	146.988	7.72615	20.97	< .01
	Public banks	50	114.844	7.59796		
WM	Private banks	50	107.566	7.86405	22.51	< .01
	Public banks	50	74.3800	6.83595		
HAPPINESS	Private banks	50	77.1600	4.11746	31.46	< .01
	Public banks	50	47.0000	5.38327		

Table 1: Mean, S.D, T Values And Level Of Significance Of Comparisons Of Private And Public Banks On Different Variables:

A look at the above table reveals that mean organizational commitment scores of managers of private and public banks were 132.88 and 103.12 respectively and their S.Ds were 7.04 and 9.71 respectively. The t-value obtained between the two means was 17.53 which was significant at .01 levels. The same table shows that mean organizational citizenship behavior scores of managers of private and public banks were 146.98 and 114.84 respectively and their S.Ds were 7.72 and 7.56 respectively. The t-value obtained between the two means was 20.97, which was significant at .01 levels. The table also reveals that mean work motivation

of managers of private and public banks was 107.56 and 74.38 respectively and their S.Ds were 7.86 and 6.83. The value of t between the two means was 22.51 which was significant at .01 levels. The same table shows that mean happiness scores of managers of private and public banks were 77.16 and 47.00 respectively. The t-ratio between the two means was 31.46 which was significant at .01 level. On all the variables managers of private banks excelled their counterpart of public banks.

Model	Unstandardized coefficients	Std. Error	Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
	B		Beta		
Constant	121.795	25.731		4.733	.000
OCB	.314	.126	.344	2.480	<.01
WM	-.004	.122	-.005	-.036	>.05
HAPPINESS	-.447	.238	-.261	-1.878	>.05

Table 2: Results Of Multiple Regression For Managers Of Private Banks
 $R^2 = .096$, $Df = (1,48)$, $P = 0.05$, $N = 50$

The above tables showed organizational commitment as the criterion variable while happiness, work motivation and organizational citizenship behavior as the predictors in the managers of private banks. The value of R was .389 indicating a strong relationship between predictor and criterion variables. Adjusted R^2 was .096 indicating that almost 10 % of the variance in organizational commitment is explained by happiness, work motivation and organizational citizenship behavior together. F was 2.73 which was significant at .05 level. It means that 10 % variance in organizational commitment was explained by work motivation. Beta table showed only OCB emerged as the significant predictor of organizational commitment in the managers of private banks. The other two predictors i.e. work motivation and happiness were influencing the organizational commitment in the negative direction but Beta values for them were not significant.

Model	R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	Std. Error of the Estimate	F	Level of significance
1	.220	.048	.014	9.78033	.778	>.05

Table 3: Multiple Regression Table For Managers Of Public Sector Banks

- Predictors: (Constant), organizational citizenship behavior, work motivation and Happiness
- Criterion : organizational commitment

The above table shows that values of R^2 and adjusted R^2 were .048 and .014 respectively. The F ratio was .778 which was not significant at .05 level. It means that happiness, organizational citizenship behavior and work motivation did not emerge as significant predictors of organizational commitment.

4. Discussion

The results of the study showed that private sector managers were better than public sector managers on all the variables. Other studies have also found similar results. Laurel and Margaret, (2009) after administration of the organizational commitment questionnaire on 375 employees concluded that Organizational commitment was the highest among private sector employees, followed by those with public sector. Public sector workers were observed to have the lowest average organizational commitment scores. Studies conducted in the field reveal that work motivation among public sector employees and managers is very different from that of their private sector counterparts (Ambrose and Kulik 1999; Rainey and Bozeman 2000; Wittmer 1991; Wright 2001). In comparing public sector and private sector employee motivation, strong interaction effects have been found between work motivation and management level (Baldwin 1987; Jurkiewicz and Massey 1997; Karl and Sutton 1998; Moon 2000; Rainey and Bozeman 2000).

There is evidence that public servants are less motivated by financial rewards than private sector employees (Khojasteh, 1993). It is presumed that people who give high importance to pay will seek employment in the private sector, which is generally perceived to pay more than the public or para-public sectors for comparable jobs (Lewis & Frank 2002).

It was found that the total variance counted by all the predictors was significant and it was 10%. However, when the stepwise regression analysis was performed beta value of only organizational citizenship behavior emerged as significant predictor of organizational commitment in managers of private sector bank where it contribute 34% significant variance in the commitment while another two predictors i.e. work motivation and happiness emerged as non-significant negative predictors of managers of private banks.

There are many studies which revealed a positive relationship between organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior (Chen & Francesco 2003; Chughtai 2008; Cohen 2006; Kuehn & Al-Busaidi 2002; Kwantes 2003; Van Dyne & Ang 1998). Chen and Francesco (2003) found a significant positive effect of affective organizational commitment on altruism and general compliance, using a sample of Chinese employees. Chughtai (2008) also confirmed the positive relationship between affective organizational commitment and the composite measure of OCB, using data collected from Pakistani faculty members. Van Dyne and Ang (1998) demonstrated the positive effect of affective organizational commitment on the helping measure, using a Singaporean sample. A similar positive relationship between affective organizational commitment and OCB was found by Cohen(2006), who used samples from the following western Asian countries: Israel (Cohen 2006), Oman (Kuehn and Al-Busaidi 2002), and India (Kwantes 2003). Although it was not limited to Asian research, the meta-analysis by Organ and Ryan (1995) on the effects of the two organizational commitments revealed that affective organizational commitment had a positive effect on altruism and general compliance.

Citizenship behavior as helping, accommodating and caring for others seem to have a positive relationship with organizational commitment, which is a strong desire, willingness and positive attitude towards the organization and the goals of organizations. There are studies which show results in conjunction with the present findings. Bonaparte (2008) investigated how organizational citizenship behavior can be affected by an organizational commitment within the service industry. Organizational commitment has been found to be significantly associated with the organizational citizenship behavior (Gautam, Dick, Wagner, Upadhayay & Devis, 2004). It has also been found subordinate with high level of OCB are more likely to be committed to the organization (William & Anderson, 1991; Smith, Organ & Near, 1983)

Drucker (2009) found that organizational commitment is highly valuable. Studies have highlighted that commitment has the greatest impact on the successful performance of an organization. This is because a highly committed employee identifies with the goals and values of the organization, has a stronger desire to belong to the organization and is willing to display greater organizational citizenship behavior, i.e. willingness to go over and beyond their required job duties. And if commitment is taken as a human resource, then it can be said that it is an organization's greatest asset and committed managers would be regarded as an organization's competitive advantage.

Private sector Banks seem to have satisfied its customers with best services and they have been successful in retaining their customers by providing better facilities than Public sector Banks. But, still Private Banks need to go a long way to become the customers' first preference. In an economy of innovative technologies and changing markets, each and every service quality variable has become important. New financial products and services have to be continuously introduced in order to stay competent and Private Banks need to concentrate more on their credit facilities and insurance services since customers do not have a very good opinion about these facilities being offered by Private Banks also Public sector banks enjoy the trust of the customers, which they have been leveraging to stay in the race however they need to improve their service quality by improving their physical facility, infrastructure and giving proper soft skill trainings to their employees(Puja et, al).

Results of regression analysis given in the table 3 it becomes clear that organizational citizenship behavior, work motivation and happiness emerged as non-significant predictors of organizational commitment of managers of public sector banks. Thus, third hypothesis of the study was rejected by the findings of the study.

It is strange to note that happiness, organizational citizenship behavior and work motivation together emerged as significant predictors of organizational commitment in managers of private sector banks but they together emerged as non-significant predictors of commitment in managers of public sector banks. It seems tight hierarchical position, lack of freedom to take decisions and above all organizational culture of public banks perhaps work as de-motivators and do not appreciate behaviors which are not covered in the rules. If this is the condition, it needs a serious attention to initiate proper intervention programs. It has become a need of the hour as public banks can sustain progress and compete with private banks only if proper organizational culture and freedom to take decision are given and steps for enhancing the motivation are taken.

Researchers, management practitioners, psychologists and social scientist must understand the very credentials of an individual, his background, social framework, educational update, impact of social group and other situational factors on behavior. Managers under whom many individual work should have knowledge, skill and experience of handling large group of people in diverse situations in order to utilize the resources of work force to the maximum. Organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behavior, work motivation and happiness are important factors related to the achievement of organizational goals. For this an appropriate organizational culture, organizational values fostering a team spirit, motivation and intense feeling of welfare of individual working under him are necessary.

5. References

- 1) Amabile, T.M., Barsade, S.G., Mueller, J.S., Staw, B.M. 2005. Affect And Creativity at work. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 50, 367-403.
- 2) Ambrose, Maureen L., and Carol T. Kulik. (1999). Old Friends, New Faces: Motivation Research in the 1990s. *Journal of Management*, 25, 231 – 92.
- 3) Antomioni, D. (1999), “What motivates middle managers”? *Industrial Management*, Nov,- Dec, Vol. 41, No 6, pp. 27-30.
- 4) Baldwin, Norman J. (1987). Public versus Private: Not “at Die rent, not “at Consequential. *Public Personnel Management* 16, 181 - 93.
- 5) Bateman, T.S. and D.W. Organ, (1983). Job satisfaction and the good soldier: The relationship between affect and employee citizenship. *Academy of Management Journal*, 26, 587-5
- 6) Begley, T.A., & Czajka, J.M. (1993). Panel analysis of the moderating effects of commitment on job satisfaction, intention to quit, and health following organizational change. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78, 552-556.
- 7) Boehm, J.K., Lyubomirsky, S. 2008. Does happiness promote career success? *Journal of Career Assessment* 16, 101-116.
- 8) Bonaparte, W. (2008). The impact of organizational citizenship behavior and organizational commitment on organizational performance. D.B.A., Nova South Eastern University.
- 9) Cabe TJ, Garavan TN (2008). A Study of the drivers of commitment amongst nurses: The salience of training, development and career issues. *J. Eur. Ind. Train.*, 32: 528-568.
- 10) Chen, Z.X., & Francesco, A.M. (2003). The relationship between the three components of commitment and employee performance in China”, *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 62, 90-510.
- 11) Chughtai, A.A. (2008). Impact of job involvement on in-role job performance and organizational citizenship behavior”, *Behavioral and Applied Management*, 9, 169-182.
- 12) Deci, E. L., Koestner, R., & Ryan, R. M. (1999). A meta-analytic review of experiments examining the effects of extrinsic rewards on intrinsic motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 125, 627–668.
- 13) DeSilva, D.A.M., Yamao, M. (2006). The involvement of female labor in seafood processing in Sri Lanka: Impact of organizational fairness, organizational commitment and supervisor evaluation on employee commitment. In: Choo PS, Hall SJ, Williams MJ (eds.) *Global Symposium on Gender and Fisheries. Seventh Asian Fisheries Forum*, 1-2 December, 2004, Penang, Malaysia, 103-114.
- 14) Drucker, P. (2009). What is organizational commitment, why should managers want it in their workforce and is there any cost effective way to secure it? *SMC working paper*, 5.
- 15) Eby L.T., Freeman D.M., Rush M.C., Lance C.E. (1999). Motivational bases of affective organizational commitment: A partial test of an integrative theoretical model. *J. Occupational Organizational Psychology*. 72,463–48
- 16) Gautam, T., Dick, R.V., Wagner, U., Upadhyay, N. & Davis, A.J. (2004). Organizational citizenship behavior and organizational commitment in Nepal. Sciencelinks.jp/j-east/article/.
- 17) Grawitch, M.J., Gottschalk, M., & Munz, D.C. (2006). The path to a healthy workplace: A critical review linking healthy workplace practices, employee well-being, and organizational improvements. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 58, 129-147.
- 18) Grawitch, M.J., Trares, S., & Kohler, J.M. (2007). Healthy workplace practices and employee outcomes. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 14, 275-293.
- 19) Johnson, R.E., Chang, C.H., Yang, L.Q. (2010). Commitment and motivation at work: The relevance of employee identity and regulatory focus. *Acad.Manag.Rev*, 35,226-245.
- 20) Jones, M.R., 1955. Nebraska symposium on motivation, vol. 3. University of Nebraska. Press, Lincoln, Nebraska.
- 21) Jurkiewicz, Carole L., and Tom K. Massey, Jr. (1997). What Motivates Municipal Employees: A Comparison Study of Supervisory vs. Non-Supervisory Personnel? *Public Personnel Management*, 26, 367 -76.
- 22) Kanter, (1968) “Commitment and Social Organization: A Study of commitment, absent-teeism, and turnover. Orlando”: Academic Press.
- 23) Karl, K. A., & Sutton, C. L. (1998). Job Values in Today’s Workforce: A Comparison of Public and Private Sector Employees. *Public Personnel Management*, 27, 515-27.
- 24) Keyes, C.L.M., Hysom, S.J., & Lupo, K.L. (2000). The positive organization: Leadership legitimacy, employee well-being, and the bottom line. *The Psychologist Manager Journal*, 4, 143-153.
- 25) Khojasteh, M. (1993). Motivating the Private vs. Public Sector Managers. *Public Personnel Management*, 22, 391-401.
- 26) Kimn, W.G., Leong, J.K., Lee, Y.K. (2005). Effect of service orientation on job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and intention of leaving in a casual dining chain restaurant. *Hosp.Manage*, 24,171-193.
- 27) Kuehn, K.W., & Al-Busaidi, Y. (2002). Citizenship behavior in a non-Western context: an examination of the role of satisfaction, commitment and job characteristics on self reported OCB, *International Journal of Commerce & Management*, 12, 107-125
- 28) Kwantes, C.T. (2003). Organizational citizenship and withdrawal behaviors in the USA and India: does commitment make a difference? *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, 3, 5-26
- 29) Laurel, R.G., & Margaret, L.F. (2009). Retrieved from Non Profit People: <http://nonprofitpeople.monster.com/news/articles/9-organizational-commitment-across-three-sectors-public-non-profit-and-for-profit?page=1>

- 30) Lewis, G. B., & Frank, S. A. (2002). Who wants to work for the government? *Public Administration Review*, 62, 395-404.
- 31) Madigan, M., Norton, J. & Testa, I. (1999). *The Quest for Work . Life Balance*.
- 32) Mathieu, J.E. & Zajac, D.M. 1990. A review and meta-analysis of the antecedents, correlates, and consequences of organizational commitment. *Psychological Bulletin*, 108, 171-194.
- 33) Meyer, J. P., Becker, T. E., & Vandenberghe, C. 2004. Employee commitment and motivation: A conceptual analysis and integrative model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89: 991–1007.
- 34) Meyer, J., & Allen, N. (1997). *Commitment in the workplace*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- 35) Meyer, J.P and Allen, N.J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Hum. Resour.Manage. Rev.*, 1, 61-89.
- 36) Moon, M. J. (2000). Organizational Commitment Revisited in New Public Management: Motivation, Organizational Culture, and Managerial Level . *Public Performance and Management Review*, 24,177 -94.
- 37) Mowday, R. T., Steers, R. M. & Porter, L. M. (1979): The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 14,224–47.
- 38) Mowday, R., Porter, L., & Steers, R. (1982). Employee--organization linkages. In P. Warr (Ed.), *Organizational and occupational psychology*. (pp. 219-229). New York: Academic Press.
- 39) Organ, D. W., & Ryan, K. (1995). A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology*, 48, 775–802.
- 40) Organ, D.W. (1988). *Organizational Citizenship Behavior. The Good Soldier Syndrome*. 1st Ed., Lexington, Massachusetts/Toronto: D.C. Heath and Co.
- 41) Pareek, U. (2004). *Understanding Organizational Behaviour*. London: Oxford.
- 42) Podsakoff, P. M., Mackenzie, S. B., Moorman, R. H., & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Leadership Quarterly*, 1, 107–142.
- 43) Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Paine, J. B., & Bachrach, D. G. (2000). Organizational citizenship behaviors: a critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research. *Journal of Management*, 26 (3), 513-563.
- 44) Pool S, Pool B (2007). A management development model: measuring organizational commitment and its impact on job satisfaction among executives in a learning organization. *J. Manag. Dev.*, 26: 353-369.
- 45) 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, 603–609.
- 46) Puja Khatri &Yukti Ahuja (2010).Comparative Study of Customer Satisfaction in Indian Public Sector and Private Sector Banks. *International Journal of Engineering and Management Sciences Vol. 1: 42-51*.
- 47) Rainey, Hal G., and Barry Bozeman. (2000). Comparing Public and Private Organizations: Empirical Research and the Power of the A Priori. *Journal of Public Administration Research and theory*, 10, 447- 69.
- 48) Robbins and Coulter, (2003), "Management", 7th ed., Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
- 49) Shaw, J. D., Delery, J.E. and Abdulla, M. H. 2003. Organisational commitment and performance among guest workers and citizens of an Arab country. *Journal of Business Research*, 56 no12: 1021-1030.
- 50) Smith, C.A., Organ, D.W. & Near, J.P. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior. Its nature and antecedents. *Journal of applied psychology*, 68,653-663
- 51) Spector, P. E. (1997). *Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, cause, and consequences*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- 52) Turnipseed, D.L., Rassuli, A., 2005. Performance perceptions of organizational citizenship behaviors at work: a bi-level study among managers and employees. *British Journal of Management*, 16, 231-244.
- 53) Van Dyne, L., & Ang, S. (1998). Organizational citizenship behavior of contingent workers in Singapore, *Academy of Management Journal*, 41, 692-703.
- 54) Warr, P.B. (2005). Work, well-being, and mental health. In J. Barling, E.K. Kelloway, & M.R. Frome (Eds.), *Handbook of work stress*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, 547-573.
- 55) William, L.J & Anderson, S.E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictor of organizational citizenship behavior and in-role behavior, *Journal of Management*, 17, 601-617
- 56) Wittmer, D. (1991). Serving the People or Serving for Pay: Reward Preferences among Government, Hybrid Sector, and Business Managers. *Public Productivity and Management Review*, 14, 369 – 383
- 57) Wong, C.S, Law, K.S. (2002). The effects of leader and follower emotional intelligence on performance and attitude: An exploratory study. *Leadersh. Q.*, 13,243-274.
- 58) Wright, T.A., & Bonett, D.G. (2007). Job satisfaction and psychological well-being as non additive predictors of workplace turnover. *Journal of Management*, 33,141-160.
- 59) Wright, T.A., & Cropanzano, R. (2004). The role of psychological well-being in job performance: A fresh look at an age-old quest. *Organizational Dynamics*, 33, 338-351.