

THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF BUSINESS & MANAGEMENT

The Effect of Job Satisfaction on Organizational Commitment: An Application on Bakü Büyük Kışlak Agro Company

Salih Güney

Professor, Department of Management, İstanbul Aydın University İstanbul, Turkey

Fariz Guliyev

Student, Department of Management, Institute of Social Sciences,
İstanbul Aydın University, İstanbul, Turkey

Abstract:

Good organizational structure is not enough by itself for the success of the organization. For the longevity of the organization, the goals of the employees and the goals of the organization must be compatible.

The aim of this study is to determine the effect of job satisfaction on organizational commitment at Büyük Kışlak Agro Company. Our survey was conducted on 119 employees. As a result of our research, it was found that organisational commitment has a positive effect on job satisfaction of the employees at Buyuk Kışlak Agro Company and there is a positive relationship between organizational commitment and job satisfaction. (correlation coefficient was 0.421 and it was found statistically significant at 0.05 significance level). According to research data employees are most satisfied with these situations: Decision making ability of the managers and when the job ensures a guaranteed future. The situations with which they are the least satisfied are when the feeling of success as a result of the job they are doing is very little and when they do not recommend their company to a close friend.

Keywords: Job satisfaction, motivation, commitment, organizational commitment

1. Introduction

For employees to stay in their organizations for a long time, business owners and managers need to accommodate the business environment and opportunities for them. This improves their efficiency and performance. When business owners and managers make everything positive and sufficient for their employees, the business and the business environment become satisfactory for them. It will become easy for those who are satisfied with their work to be sincerely attached to their institutions.

In this study, the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment was examined by extensive literature review and by applying a questionnaire. Suggestions have been made to organizations using the obtained data.

2. Concept of Job Satisfaction, Definition, Importance, Relation to Similar Concepts, and Basic Factors Affecting Job Satisfaction

When we look at research on organizational behaviour, it is possible to see that one of the issues most emphasized is job satisfaction. Because now, the importance of being satisfied with the work one is doing, the most important element of business life, is known both by social scientists and organizations. Whether job satisfaction is low or high is an issue that is closely related to the efficiency of wage earners. Social scientists have defined job satisfaction in different ways, depending on what the information they obtained from their research and analyses. Job satisfaction is the entirety of attitudes, thoughts, and feelings that employees working in organizations have towards the work they do. Job satisfaction is the situation of being happy or unhappy as all the needs of employees in their working life are met (Güney, 2007, Güney, 2017). Job satisfaction is the expression of how happy employees are with the work they are doing (Colman, 2001). Job satisfaction is the positive or negative emotional dimension that employees form through their interpretation of their work and work experience (Saari and Judge, 2004). Job satisfaction is a type of personal attitude about how individual expectations are met in business life (Coomber and Barriball, 2007). In short, job satisfaction is the emotional structure of employees that they form about their work.

The higher the job satisfaction, the higher the productivity, morale, and motivation of employees. Job satisfaction is very important in terms of employees (those who are satisfied with their job behave more positively in their private life and relationships) (Sarker, Crossman, Parkpoom, 2003), managers (managers who are satisfied enough with their work will make more efforts to increase the effectiveness of the organization, these managers do not easily want to leave their organization) (Jones, George, 2003), and organizations (organizations that ensure job satisfaction can more easily reach their aims and goals).

Job satisfaction is related to the concepts of burnout, productivity, performance, motivation, morale, occupational and organizational commitment, work attendance, and organizational conflict.

It has been confirmed by studies that more than one factor is influential in the formation of job satisfaction. It is possible to divide the factors affecting job satisfaction into two groups as personal (age, gender, marital status, individual characteristics, intelligence capacity, work experience, duration of employment, and education) and organizational (wage, promotion, working conditions, work and work characteristics, relationships with colleagues, management style and managers, decision making and participation in decisions, communication style, supervisory style, organizational culture and organizational climate, working hours, rewarding, position and title). Some of these factors affect job satisfaction positively, while others may affect it negatively.

2.1. Motivation Theories on Job Satisfaction

Social scientists have put forward theories according to the results of their research on job satisfaction. Process theories on job satisfaction (Vroom's Expectancy Theory, Lawler-Porter's Expectancy Theory, J. Adams's Equity Theory, Edwin Locke's Goal Setting Theory, Harold Kelley's Attribution Theory, Behaviour Correction and Modification Theory) focus on and explain the variables in action that occur from the emergence to the end of the behaviour that people exhibit. Process theories have also focused on the effects and importance of the job satisfaction of employees on business life. Advocates of process theories have argued that employees have different values and views, but despite all this difference, the process of becoming motivated is the same for all of them (Luthans, 2008; Daft, 2000; Davis and Newstrom, 1999; Koçel, 2007).

While process theories of motivation attempt to explain the factors that are effective from the beginning to the end of behaviour, content theories of motivation (Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs Theory, Herzberg's Two Factors Theory, McClelland's Theory of Needs, Alderfer's ERG Theory) only try to determine the variables motivating employees. Process motivation theories have argued that employees have different personality structures and that these differences affect their motivation and job satisfaction. However, content motivation theories have suggested that even though employees have different values, beliefs, thoughts, and opinions the process of motivation that leads them to exhibit behaviour is the same (Luthans, 2008, Davis and Newstrom, 1999, Koçel, 2007).

2.2. Concept of Organizational Commitment, Definition, Importance, Functions, Dimensions, Types, Indicators, Levels, Affecting Factors and Classifications

Commitment is an expression of power that binds to something (to an object, purpose, task, work, or value). Organizational commitment started to gain importance because of the increasing problems in organizations and the inability to solve them. The importance of organizational commitment still continues today. For this reason, those who work in the fields of organizational sociology, organizational psychology, management, public administration, organizational behaviour, and human resources management are showing more interest in the subject (Singh, Gupta and Venugopal, 2008, Dixit and Bhati, 2012, WeiBo, Kaur and Jun 2010, Ghosh and Swamy, 2014). Organizational commitment is the employees expressing themselves together with the institution, seeing the goals of the organization and their own goals as a whole (Meyer and Allen, 1991). Organizational commitment is the sum of internalized normative pressures of employees to act in line with the determined corporate goals and objectives (Wiener, 1982, Güney, 2018). Organizational commitment is the integration of wage earners with the goals and objectives of the organization and their desire to continue their own existence in the organization (Robbins, 2002). In short, organizational commitment is a psychological state related to feeling belonged to the organization as a result of adopting everything belonging to the organization with peace of mind.

Organizational commitment is an important issue in terms of employees, managers, and organizations. Because the higher the organizational commitment of employees, the lower the costs of organizations. The most important function of organizational commitment for organizations is to ensure the efficiency and productivity of the organization by creating inner peace in the organization and by providing healthy relationships and communication between the managers, employees, and colleagues.

There are three basic dimensions of organizational commitment. These dimensions are as follows. The compliance dimension of organizational commitment: At this dimension, employees are not committed to their organization at heart. In business life, employees may show attitudes and behaviours not because of valid and shared beliefs and values, but solely to earn rewards, wages, and salaries (Güney, 2015, O'Reilly and Chatman, 1986). The identification dimension of organizational commitment: The identification dimension is a more emotionally committed dimension of commitment compared to the compliance dimension. The commitment formed as a result of employees' desires of affiliation and their relationships is called the identification dimension (Güney, 2015). The internalization dimension of organizational commitment: In this dimension, the value system of the organization has an influence on the attitudes and behaviours of the employees (Chatman, 1991).

Types of organizational commitment include: Affective commitment: This commitment is based on the emotions and interactions of employees. (Kanter, 1968). Affective commitment is the process of identifying with the organization through the established bond, taking interest in the organization, and enjoying being a member of the organization (South, 2015). Affective commitment is accepting the corporate goals, objectives, values, and beliefs, being willing to contribute to the process of achieving organizational goals and objectives, and being willing to continue corporate membership (Tufail et al., 2005). Continuance commitment: In this type of commitment, the commitment of the employees does not come from the loyalty to the organization, but from the material and nonmaterial losses that they will suffer when leaving the institution. Normative commitment: This commitment refers to the employees' perception of obligation to stay in the institution (Erdil and Keskin, 2003, Allen, Meyer and John, 1990, Meyer and Allen, 1991).

Some of the basic indicators of organizational commitment can be listed as follows (Somuncu, 2008, Bülbül, 2005, Yılmaz and Eroğlu, 2012, Albayrak, 2007) Accepting the basic goals, objectives, and values of the organization, making self-sacrifices for the institution, willingness to become a member of the institution, integration with the institution and internalization of the institution etc.

The levels of organizational commitment are divided into three as low (the commitment of the employees involved in low organizational commitment is continuance commitment), moderate (moderate commitment is closer to normative commitment with these attributes), and high (high organizational commitment is more closely related to affective commitment). (Dikmen, 2012, Liu et al., 2006, Randall, 1989, Somuncu, 2008, Tufail et al., 2005, Manetje, 2009). The factors affecting organizational commitment are divided into two as individual (it has been verified by research that factors such as age, gender, marital status, education, and duration of employment are effective in forming organizational commitment but not strong enough to maintain continuity) (Tufail et al., 2005, Hrebiniak, and Alutto, 1972, Adanalı, 2007, Peace, 1998, Cohen, Lowenberg, 1990, Kaur and Sandhu, 2010, Culverson, 2002, Güney, 2006, Sürgevil, 2007, Solmuş, 2004, Mammadova, 2013, Chughtai and Zafar, 2006, Çolakoğlu, Ayyıldız ve Cengiz Serhat, 2009, Bülbül, 2005) and organizational (structural properties of the organization, communication style, culture, reward system, promotion opportunities, management style, team work, structure of the work, sense of justice also play an effective role in forming organizational commitment) (Kaşlı, 2007, Perçin 2008, Aksoy, 2007, Mowday, Porter and Steers, 1982, Bingol 1998, Güney, 2015, Akyürek, Toygar, Şener, 2013, O'Reilly and Chatman, 1986, Kuyzu, 2007, Vasokolaei and Raadabadi, 2015, Peace, 1998, Gül, Oktay ve Gökçe, 2008, Chughtai and Zafar, 2006, Mammadova, 2013, Singh, Gupta and Venugopal, 2008, Ertürk, 2006).

Classifications of organizational commitment are: F. Kanter's classification of organizational commitment: Kanter stated that organizational commitment is formed as a necessity of different behaviours that the institution attributes to its employees. He also described organizational commitment as follows. Organizational commitment is employees' accommodation of social relationships and interactions that satisfy their needs and expectations with their own personalities (Kanter, 1968). Allen and Meyer's classification of organizational commitment: Meyer and Allen discussed the affective and continuance dimensions of organizational commitment in their first studies. They then added a third dimension to these two dimensions based on the results of the research they conducted. This third dimension is the normative dimension (Çetin, 2018). Etzioni's classification of organizational commitment: Etzioni stated that the authority and power organizations have on their employees are the basis of organizational commitment. According to him, employees' compliance with the orders and directives of the organization is called organizational commitment (Çakır, 2001). O'Reilly and Chatman's classification of organizational commitment: O'Reilly and Chatman described organizational commitment as the psychological affiliation employees feel towards their organization. This psychological affiliation is closely related to employees' view of their institutions and the extent to which they adapt to and adopt the characteristics of the organization. Buchanan's classification of organizational commitment: As a result of his work on organizational commitment, Buchanan defined organizational commitment as the emotional attachment of employees to the goals, objectives, and values that are useful for their organization (Güney, 2006, Buchanan, 1974, Mammadova, 2013). Mowday, Steers and Porter's classification of organizational commitment: Mowday, Steers, and Porter expressed organizational commitment as employees' identification with their institutions and their interest and affection for their institutions (Güney, 2015). Penley and Gould's classification of organizational commitment: Penley and Gould, based on the concept of participation in the organization in Etzioni's model, argued that the organizational commitment of employees may be instrumental or emotional. According to Penley and Gould, there are three dimensions of organizational commitment: moral, calculative, and alienating (Penley and Gould, 1988). Becker's classification of organizational commitment: Becker defined organizational commitment as the entirety of consistent and positive set of activities done throughout life. (Becker, 1960, Cohen and Lowenberg, 1990). Winer's classification of organizational commitment: According to Wiener, commitment is the sum of integrated normative pressures that force to act in accordance with the interests of the organization (Singh, Gupta and Venugopal, 2008, Demirel and Göç, 2013). Staw and Salancik's classification of organizational commitment: According to Staw and Salancik's classification of organizational commitment, organizational commitment emerges because employees learn their own behaviour. There are three basic features that make employees dependent on their own behaviour. These features include: The visibility of behaviour, the inability to change the behaviour, and the willingness to do the behaviour. Employees show less or more commitment to their behaviours or their meanings according to the dimensions of these features (Salancik, 1977).

3. Relationship between Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment

The research on the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment has generally found a positive relationship. For example, in the studies conducted by Bennet and Durkin, they found a positive and directly proportional relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Organizational commitment has a more active structure than job satisfaction and has a behavioural characteristic (Aktay, 2010, Culverson, Elizabeth, 2002).

4. The Method of the Study, Purpose, Universe, Sampling, Hypotheses, Data Collection Tools and Reliability Analysis Results

In the analysis stage of the study, first the survey data was interpreted using descriptive statistics. Hypotheses were tested using parametric and nonparametric tests for differences in demographic characteristics of the responses. Research hypotheses investigate the relationship between variables, so the correlation coefficients between the variables were calculated. In this study, data were collected via questionnaires.

The aim of this research is to determine the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment in working life. The research was carried out with the employees of Büyük Kışlak Agro in Baku, Azerbaijan. Questionnaires were applied to employees. There are 120 employees in the company. The questionnaires were applied to 119 employees in the company. In line with the aim stated above, job satisfaction and organizational commitment levels of the employees have been examined.

The research hypotheses are as follows:

- H₁: There is a positive relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment.
- H₂: There is a positive relationship between job satisfaction and continuance commitment.
- H₃: There is a positive relationship between job satisfaction and normative commitment.
- H₄: There is a positive relationship between job satisfaction and behavioural commitment.

The data were collected through questionnaire method. In this study, one questionnaire and two scales were used for the purpose of data collection. The survey, which consists of a total of 13 questions, contains personal information of the participants.

4.1. Reliability Analysis Results of the Job Satisfaction Scale

The 20-item scale developed by Hockman and Oldhman, named Minnesota Job Satisfaction Scale, consists of items about job satisfaction levels of participants. The result of the study we have done to measure the reliability of the scale is the following.

Job Satisfaction Scale	Cronbach's Alpha	Number of Questions
Total	0.756	20

Table 1: Reliability Analysis Results for Job Satisfaction

The Cronbach's Alpha quotient of the data obtained from 119 participants regarding the job satisfaction scale is 0.756, so the reliability of the scale is high.

Job Satisfaction Scale	Mean	Std. Deviation
In terms of always keeping me busy	4.00	0.720
In terms of the possibility of working independently	4.36	0.824
In terms of the opportunity of doing different things once in a while	4.00	0.600
In terms of giving me the chance to be a "respectable person" in society	4.53	0.607
In terms of the manager's good management of the persons under their command	4.45	0.500
In terms of the manager's ability to make decisions	4.56	0.626
In terms of giving me a chance to carry a conscientious responsibility	4.33	0.659
In terms of ensuring a guaranteed future for me	4.55	0.660
In terms of feeling I can do something for others	4.20	0.645
In terms of giving me the opportunity to direct people	4.32	0.815
In terms of giving me a change to do something with my own talents	4.21	0.812
In terms of putting the decisions taken about my job into practice	4.26	0.875
In terms of the wage I get paid for the work I do	4.02	0.808
In terms of the opportunities for promotion	4.35	0.855
In terms of giving me the freedom to use my own ideas/opinions	4.23	0.730
In terms of working conditions	4.45	0.668
In terms of colleagues getting along well with each other	4.21	0.780
In terms of being appreciated for the work I do	4.31	0.981
In terms of the sense of accomplishment I feel for the job I have done	3.87	1.030
In terms of giving me the opportunity to use my own methods while practicing my profession	4.33	1.090

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics of the Items on Minnesota Job Satisfaction Scale

Descriptive statistics on responses given to the Minnesota job satisfaction scale by the participants are given in Table 2. According to this, it was observed that the situations participants are most satisfied with are "Manager's ability to make decisions" and "In terms of ensuring a guaranteed future for me." In addition, it was seen that the situation participants are least satisfied with is "the sense of accomplishment I feel for the job I have done."

4.2. Reliability Analysis Results of Organizational Commitment Scale

The Cook and Wall scale, which takes Porter et al. (1960) scale as a basis, is a scale that differentiates between willingness for the job, loyalty or passive commitment, organizational identity unity and organizational commitment types. Cook and Wall Organizational Commitment Scale consists of 12 statements about the level of organizational commitment of the participants. The result of the study we have done to measure the reliability of the scale is the following.

Organizational Commitment Scale	Cronbach's Alpha	Number of Questions
Total	0.648	12

Table 3: Reliability Analysis Results of Organizational Commitment Scale

The Cronbach's Alpha quotient of the data obtained from 119 participants regarding the organizational commitment is 0.648, so the reliability of the scale is sufficient.

Organizational Commitment Scale	Mean	Standard Deviation
I am proud to tell about my workplace to others because it is a reputable and reliable institution.	4.03	0.791
I'd like to leave this workplace if I can find a better job.	2.76	1.235
I do not want to consume myself just for the benefit of my workplace.	3.17	1.161
I am proud to tell about my workplace to others because it supports my personal development and satisfies me.	4.03	0.920
I feel like I am a part of my workplace.	4.01	0.987
When I am at work, I would like to feel that I am not only working for myself but also for my job.	4.23	0.682
I do not want to risk my rights I gained by leaving work.	3.54	1.281
I do not recommend a close friend to work at our company.	2.45	1.226
I would be pleased to know that my work contributes to my workplace.	4.14	0.857
I do not want to lose my status at my workplace, even if another workplace offers me more wages.	3.74	1.093
I am willing to do more than I am expected when my workplace faces difficulties.	3.99	1.169
As long as it satisfies me, I do not want to leave my job.	4.13	0.996

Table 4: Descriptive Statistics on Items of Organizational Commitment

Descriptive statistics related to the responses participants have given to the organizational commitment scale are given in Table 4. According to this, it was observed that the situations participants are most satisfied with are "When I am at work, I would like to feel that I am not only working for myself but also for my job" and "I would be pleased to know that my work contributes to the place I work at." In addition, it was seen that the situations the participants are least satisfied with are "I do not recommend a close friend to work at our company" and "I'd like to leave this workplace if I can find a better job."

5. Findings and Comments

5.1. Comparisons by Demographic Characteristics

5.1.1. Differences in Job Satisfaction by Gender

The differences in job satisfaction by gender is shown in Table 5.

Ranks				
	Gender	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
job satisfaction	Female	79	63.86	5045.00
	Male	40	52.38	2095.00
	Total	119		
Test Statistics ^a				
	job satisfaction			
Mann-Whitney U	1275.000			
Wilcoxon W	2095.000			
Z	-1.719			
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.086			

Table 5: Differences in Job Satisfaction by Gender
a. Grouping Variable: D1

When Table 1.15 is examined, perceptions of participants' job satisfaction are not significantly different by gender. ($p > 0.05$).

5.1.2. Differences in Organizational Commitment by Gender

The differences in organizational commitment by gender is shown in Table 6.

Ranks				
	Gender	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
organizational commitment	Female	79	59.22	4678.00
	Male	40	61.55	2462.00
	Total	119		
Test Statistics ^a				
				organizational commitment
Mann-Whitney U				1518.000
Wilcoxon W				4678.000
Z				-.350
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)				.727

Table 6: Differences in Organizational Commitment by Gender
a. Grouping Variable: D1

When Table 6 is examined, perceptions of participants' organizational commitment do not differ significantly by gender. ($p > 0.05$).

5.1.3. Differences in Job Satisfaction by Age

The differences in job satisfaction by age is shown in Table 7.

Ranks			
	Age Group	N	Mean Rank
job satisfaction	20-30	39	50.03
	31-40	48	64.03
	40+	32	66.11
	Total	119	
Test Statistics ^{a,b}			
			job satisfaction
Chi-Square			4.938
Df			2
Asymp. Sig.			.085

Table 7: Differences in Job Satisfaction by Age
a. Kruskal Wallis Test
b. Grouping Variable: D4

When Table 7 is examined, perceptions of participants' job satisfaction are not significantly different by gender. ($p > 0.05$).

5.1.4. Differences in Organizational Commitment by Age

The differences in organizational commitment by age are shown in Table 8.

Descriptive								
organizational commitment								
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
20-30	39	3.5791	.46905	.07511	3.4270	3.7311	2.42	4.50
31-40	48	3.8385	.40503	.05846	3.7209	3.9562	2.83	4.58
40+	32	3.5794	.52878	.09348	3.3888	3.7701	2.42	4.67
Total	119	3.6838	.47536	.04358	3.5975	3.7701	2.42	4.67
Test of Homogeneity of Variances								
organizational commitment								
Levene Statistic			df1		df2		Sig.	
2.252			2		116		.110	

Table 8: Differences in Organizational Commitment by Age

As Seen in Table 8 ($P > .05$), Thus the Variances Are Homogenous

Anova					
Organizational Commitment					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	1.926	2	.963	4.515	.013
Within Groups	24.739	116	.213		
Total	26.665	118			

Table 9: Distribution of Organizational Commitment Score Averages by Age Groups

As seen in Table 9 ($p < .05$), thus we come to the conclusion that the organizational commitment score averages differ significantly with age groups. Where these differences are among age groups was tested by the multiple comparison test given below. Differences in organizational commitment score averages by age groups are shown in Table 10.

Multiple Comparisons							
Dependent Variable: organizational commitment							
	(I) D4	(J) D4	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Tukey HSD	20-30	31-40	-.25948*	.09956	.028	-.4958	-.0231
		40+	-.00037	.11015	1.000	-.2619	.2611
	31-40	20-30	.25948*	.09956	.028	.0231	.4958
		40+	.25911*	.10539	.041	.0089	.5093
	40+	20-30	.00037	.11015	1.000	-.2611	.2619
		31-40	-.25911*	.10539	.041	-.5093	-.0089
Bonferroni	20-30	31-40	-.25948*	.09956	.031	-.5013	-.0176
		40+	-.00037	.11015	1.000	-.2679	.2672
	31-40	20-30	.25948*	.09956	.031	.0176	.5013
		40+	.25911*	.10539	.046	.0031	.5151
	40+	20-30	.00037	.11015	1.000	-.2672	.2679
		31-40	-.25911*	.10539	.046	-.5151	-.0031

Table 10: Differences in Organizational Commitment Score Averages by Age Groups

*. The Mean Difference Is Significant at the 0.05 Level

According to the table above, the 31-40 age group participants' organizational commitment score averages were found to be statistically significantly higher than those in the 20-30 age group and 40+ age group. We can say that participants in the middle age group are more committed to their workplace than those at the beginning or at the end of their career.

5.1.5. Differences in Job Satisfaction by Work Period

The differences in job satisfaction by work period is shown in Table 11. Because the number of employees who have worked at the institution for more than 15 years is lower than 5, they were not included in the analysis.

Descriptives								
job satisfaction								
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Less than 1 year	46	4.1587	.38443	.05668	4.0445	4.2729	3.28	4.90
1-5 years	50	4.3425	.29988	.04241	4.2573	4.4277	3.45	4.75
6-10 years	17	4.3926	.17761	.04308	4.3013	4.4840	4.10	4.75
11-15 years	5	4.2900	.06519	.02915	4.2091	4.3709	4.20	4.35
Total	118	4.2758	.32901	.03029	4.2159	4.3358	3.28	4.90
Test of Homogeneity of Variances								
job satisfaction								
Levene Statistic		df1	df2	Sig.				
5.876		3	114	.001				

Table 11: Differences in Job Satisfaction by Work Period

As seen in Table 11 ($p < .05$), thus the variances are not homogeneous.

Anova					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	1.086	3	.362	3.565	.016
Within Groups	11.579	114	.102		
Total	12.665	117			

Table 12: Distribution of Job Satisfaction Mean Scores by Work Period Job Satisfaction

As seen in Table 12 ($p < .05$), thus we can come to the conclusion that job satisfaction scores differ significantly according to work period. Where these differences are among groups was tested by the multiple comparison test given below. The differences in job satisfaction mean scores by work period are shown in Table 13.

Multiple Comparisons						
Dependent Variable: job satisfaction						
Tamhane						
(I) D9	(J) D9	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Less than 1 year	1-5 years	-.18380	.07079	.065	-.3745	.0069
	6-10 years	-.23395*	.07119	.010	-.4279	-.0400
	11-15 years	-.13130	.06374	.246	-.3076	.0450
1-5 years	Less than 1 year	.18380	.07079	.065	-.0069	.3745
	6-10 years	-.05015	.06045	.958	-.2161	.1158
	11-15 years	.05250	.05146	.898	-.0930	.1980
6-10 years	Less than 1 year	.23395*	.07119	.010	.0400	.4279
	1-5 years	.05015	.06045	.958	-.1158	.2161
	11-15 years	.10265	.05201	.326	-.0505	.2557
11-15 years	Less than 1 year	.13130	.06374	.246	-.0450	.3076
	1-5 years	-.05250	.05146	.898	-.1980	.0930
	6-10 years	-.10265	.05201	.326	-.2557	.0505

Table 13: Differences in Job Satisfaction Mean Scores by Work Period

*. The Mean Difference Is Significant at the 0.05 Level

According to the above table, the job satisfaction mean scores of those with 6-10 years of work period were found to be statistically significantly higher than those with a work period of less than 1 year.

5.1.6. The Differences in Organizational Commitment by Work Period

The differences in organizational commitment by work period is shown in Table 14.

Organizational Commitment								
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Less than 1 year	46	3.5199	.42015	.06195	3.3952	3.6447	2.42	4.25
1-5 years	50	3.8092	.48883	.06913	3.6702	3.9481	2.67	4.67
6-10 years	17	3.7549	.50815	.12325	3.4936	4.0162	2.42	4.58
11-15 years	5	3.6500	.42246	.18893	3.1254	4.1746	2.92	3.92
Total	118	3.6819	.47690	.04390	3.5949	3.7688	2.42	4.67
Test of Homogeneity of Variances								
organizational commitment								
Levene Statistic		df1		df2		Sig.		
.153		3		114		.928		

Table 14: The Differences in Organizational Commitment by Work Period

As seen in Table 14 ($p>.05$), thus the variances are homogenous.

Anova					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	2.112	3	.704	3.277	.024
Within Groups	24.498	114	.215		
Total	26.610	117			

Table 15: Organizational Commitment Score Averages by Work Period

As seen in Table 15 ($p<.05$), thus we can come to the conclusion that job satisfaction scores differ significantly according to work period. Where these differences are among groups was tested by the multiple comparison test given below.

The differences in organizational commitment score averages by work period are shown in Table 16.

Multiple Comparisons								
Dependent Variable: organizational commitment								
	(I) D9	(J) D9	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval		
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound	
Tukey HSD	Less than 1 year	1-5 years	-.28924*	.09471	.015	-.5362	-.0423	
		6-10 years	-.23497	.13158	.285	-.5780	.1081	
		11-15 years	-.13007	.21829	.933	-.6992	.4391	
	1-5 years	Less than 1 year	.28924*	.09471	.015	.0423	.5362	
		6-10 years	.05426	.13015	.975	-.2851	.3936	
		11-15 years	.15917	.21743	.884	-.4077	.7261	
	6-10 years	Less than 1 year	.23497	.13158	.285	-.1081	.5780	
		1-5 years	-.05426	.13015	.975	-.3936	.2851	
		11-15 years	.10490	.23584	.970	-.5100	.7198	
		11-15 years	Less than 1 year	.13007	.21829	.933	-.4391	.6992
			1-5 years	-.15917	.21743	.884	-.7261	.4077
			6-10 years	-.10490	.23584	.970	-.7198	.5100
Bonferroni	Less than 1 year	1-5 years	-.28924*	.09471	.017	-.5435	-.0349	
		6-10 years	-.23497	.13158	.461	-.5883	.1183	
		11-15 years	-.13007	.21829	1.000	-.7162	.4560	
	1-5 years	Less than 1 year	.28924*	.09471	.017	.0349	.5435	
		6-10 years	.05426	.13015	1.000	-.2952	.4037	
		11-15 years	.15917	.21743	1.000	-.4247	.7430	
	6-10 years	Less than 1 year	.23497	.13158	.461	-.1183	.5883	
		1-5 years	-.05426	.13015	1.000	-.4037	.2952	
		11-15 years	.10490	.23584	1.000	-.5283	.7381	
	11-15 years	Less than 1 year	.13007	.21829	1.000	-.4560	.7162	
		1-5 years	-.15917	.21743	1.000	-.7430	.4247	
		6-10 years	-.10490	.23584	1.000	-.7381	.5283	

Table 16: Differences in Organizational Commitment Score Averages by Work Period

According to the table above, it has been found that the organizational commitment score averages of employees who have been working at the institution for 1-5 years are statistically significantly higher than the employees who have been working for less than 1 year. The reason for the higher organizational commitment score averages of employees who have worked at the institution for 1-5 years than the ones who have worked for less than 1 year may be that these employees have learned the job better and they also know the institution better.

5.1.7. Differences in Job Satisfaction by Income

Since the number of people who have a very good income was only 2, they were included in the good income group for the analysis. The differences in job satisfaction by income is shown in Table 17.

Ranks			
	Income	N	Mean Rank
job satisfaction	Low	4	50.00
	Middle	78	62.23
	Good	37	56.38
	Total	119	
Test Statistics^{a,b}			
job satisfaction			
Chi-Square	1.074		
Df	2		
Asymp. Sig.	.584		

Table 17: Differences in Job Satisfaction by Income
a. Kruskal Wallis Test
b. Grouping Variable: income

When Table 17 is examined, it is seen that the perceptions of participants' job satisfaction do not significantly differ by income status. ($p > 0.05$)

5.1.8. The Differences in Organizational Commitment by Income

The differences in organizational commitment by income are shown in Table 18.

	Income	N	Mean Rank
organizational commitment	Low	4	38.13
	Middle	78	62.47
	Good	37	57.16
	Total	119	
Test Statistics^{a,b}			
organizational commitment			
Chi-Square	2.27		
Df	2		
Asymp. Sig.	0.321		

Table 18: The Differences in Organizational Commitment by Income Ranks
a. Kruskal Wallis Test
b. Grouping Variable: Income

When Table 18 is examined, it is seen that perceptions of participants' organizational commitment do not significantly differ by income. ($p > 0.05$).

5.1.9. Correlation

The Spearman Correlation Test results for the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment of the participating workers are shown in Table 19.

Correlations							
			job satisfaction	organizational commitment	normative commitment	continuance commitment	behavioral commitment
Spearman's rho	İşort	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.421**	.360**	.182*	.333**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000	.000	.048	.000
		N	119	119	119	119	119
	Organizational commitment	Correlation Coefficient	.421**	1.000	.527**	.512**	.858**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.	.000	.000	.000
		N	119	119	119	119	119
normative commitment			Correlation Coefficient	.360**	.527**	1.000	.164
			Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.	.074
			N	119	119	119	119
continuance commitment			Correlation Coefficient	.182*	.512**	.164	1.000
			Sig. (2-tailed)	.048	.000	.074	.
			N	119	119	119	119
behavioral commitment			Correlation Coefficient	.333**	.858**	.248**	.137
			Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.006	.137
			N	119	119	119	119

Table 19: Spearman Correlation Test Results on the Relationship between the Employees' Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment

- H₁: There is a positive relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment. The Spearman Correlation Test results for the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment of the participants are shown in Table 19. According to this, a moderate and positive linear correlation coefficient between job satisfaction and organizational commitment of participants was obtained as 0.421 and found to be statistically significant at 0.05 significance level.
- H₂: There is a positive relationship between job satisfaction and continuance commitment. The Spearman Correlation Test results for the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment of the participants are shown in Table 19. According to this, a weak and positive linear correlation coefficient between job satisfaction and organizational commitment of participants was obtained as 0.182 and found to be statistically significant at 0.05 significance level.
- H₃: There is a positive relationship between job satisfaction and normative commitment. The Spearman Correlation Test results for the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment of the participants are shown in Table 19. According to this, a moderate and positive linear correlation coefficient between job satisfaction and organizational commitment of participants was obtained as 0.360 and found to be statistically significant at 0.05 significance level.
- H₄: There is a positive relationship between job satisfaction and behavioural commitment. The Spearman Correlation Test results for the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment of the participants are shown in Table 19. According to this, a moderate and positive linear correlation coefficient between job satisfaction and organizational commitment of participants was obtained as 0.333 and found to be statistically significant at 0.05 significance level.

6. Conclusion and Suggestions

Within the scope of the research, 119 employees were interviewed through the questionnaire method and their organizational commitment and job satisfaction were tried to be determined. Obtained findings were tested and interpreted by frequency analysis, variance analysis, and correlation analysis. According to the results obtained, the situations the respondents were most satisfied with are "manager's ability to make decisions" and "the job ensures a guaranteed future for them." The situation the respondents were least satisfied with is "feeling of accomplishment as a result of the job they have done." When their responses to the statements in the organizational commitment scale were considered, it was observed that the situations the participants are most satisfied with are "When I am at work, I would like to feel that I am not only working for myself but also for my job." and "I would be pleased to know that my work contributes to my workplace." In addition, it was seen that the situation the participants are least satisfied with is, "I do not recommend a close friend to work in our company." It was found that the organizational commitment of participants in different age groups is at similar levels. It was found that the job satisfaction of participants in different age groups is at different levels. It was seen that the job satisfaction of participants in different work period groups is at different levels. It was seen that the organizational commitment of participants in different work period groups is at different levels. It was

seen that the job satisfaction of participants in different income groups is at similar levels. It was found that the organizational commitment of participants in different income groups is at similar levels.

High salary, even though it is not enough by itself, is an important factor in high job satisfaction. Because employees who receive a high wage are more motivated and enjoy their jobs more than the ones who receive low wages. As a result, their job satisfaction levels become higher.

There are also differences in the organizational commitment of employees in different income groups. The commitment to institutions who financially satisfy employees is higher and the employees do not easily want to change their institutions. In our research, the level of commitment of employees in different income groups was similar. The reason for this may be that the managers were with the employees when they filled out the questionnaires. In order to be good in the eyes of the managers, they stated that they are satisfied with their job despite the low salary they receive.

The ones who are satisfied with the work they do are more committed to their companies. Companies that please the employees are preferred more. According to the research data we obtained, there is a positive relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Research on job satisfaction has shown that continuance commitment occurs in the following ways. The investment the employees make in themselves during the time they work in the institution and inadequate options for alternative jobs. If the employee works at an institution for a long period of time, it is difficult to leave this institution and move to another institution. If opportunities for finding a job again are insufficient, the person continues to work in the same institution. An employee may like their job. However, due to family problems and entering the health and retirement period, they may continue to work in their institution. According to this statement, continuance commitment is a commitment based on external factors. In short, the employee did not integrate with their institution. Behavioural commitment is a commitment that occurs when the employee continues to work because of the behaviours they exhibited in the past. When the employees want to stay committed to their institution, think about staying at the institution, and not want to leave their institution, this may prevent absenteeism. In short, behavioural commitment is a form of commitment that is related to the problem of staying at the institution for a long period and how they cope with this problem. Employees who are in the process of behavioural commitment are committed to their institutions because of an activity they do in their institution. In short, employees get job satisfaction due to effort and time they spent on their work. If the employee feels compelled to work in the institution, the resultant commitment is called normative commitment. This obligation may be due to the moral nature of the employee and the values they have. Shortly, normative commitment is a type of commitment based on the understanding an employee has that their institution needs their commitment. In normative commitment, employees are devoted to their institutions. They are integrated with the aims, goals, beliefs, and values of the institution. Due to this integration, their productivity and performance are high. In the form of normative commitment, the employee sees themselves as important and valuable to the organization and is therefore satisfied.

In conclusion, we can say that the fact that there is a very strong positive relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment was confirmed as a result of our research.

As a result of our research, we can make the following suggestions:

The purpose of this study is to determine the points that employees are most and least satisfied with. It was seen that the situation participants were least satisfied with is "I do not recommend a close friend to work in our company. For this reason, company managers need to focus on this issue. Because the situation they are least satisfied with was "the feeling of accomplishment as a result of the work done," managers need to make employees feel proud of their accomplishments. The managers also need to focus on the statement of employees "I want to leave this workplace if I find a better job". Another situation that employees are not satisfied with is the lack of opportunities for promotion and wage increases within the institution. Our advice to the managers is to offer a career plan to the employees and to make a promotion plan that will encourage them to succeed. It will also please employees to offer them increases in their salary or awards for their successes.

7. References

- i. Adanalı, E. C. (2007). "Kuruma Bağlılık Olgusuna Genel Bir Bakış", *Endüstriyel Klinik Psikoloji ve İnsan Kaynakları Yönetimi: Kuramdan Uygulamaya İş Yaşamında Psikoloji*, Tarık Solmuş (ed.), Beta Yayınları, İstanbul, ss.1-15.
- ii. Aksoy, H. (2007). "Örgüt İklimi ve Motivasyon", Tarık Solmuş (ed.), *Endüstriyel Klinik Psikoloji ve İnsan Kaynakları Yönetimi: Kuramdan Uygulamaya İş Yaşamında Psikoloji*, Beta Yayınları, İstanbul, ss:16-58.
- iii. Aktay D. D., (2010), "İş Tatmini ve Örgütsel Bağlılık Arasındaki İlişki ve Askeri Hastanede Bir Uygulama", (Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi) İstanbul Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Hastane ve Sağlık Kuruluşlarında Yönetim Anabilim Dalı, İstanbul, ss.30-35.
- iv. Akyürek, Ç. E., Toygar, Ş.A., Şener, T., (2013), "Örgütsel Kültür ve Alt Kültürün Örgütsel Bağlılığa Etkisi: Sağlık Çalışanları Üzerine Bir Araştırma", *Ankara Sağlık Hizmetleri Dergisi*, Cilt 12, Sayı 2, ss.55-62,
- v. Albayrak Emine Gözde, (2007), "Kariyer Yönetimi ve Örgütsel Bağlılık Üzerine Etkisi", (Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi), Maltepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü İşletme Ana Bilim Dalı, İstanbul, s.58.
- vi. Allen, Natalie J. and Meyer, John P. (1990). "The Measurement and Antecedents Of Affective, Continuance and Normative Commitment To The Organization", *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, No:63.1, pp. 1-18.
- vii. Becker, H. S., (1960), "Notes On The Concept of Commitment", *American Journal of Sociology*, pp.32-40.
- viii. Buchanan, Bruce (1974), "Building Organizational Commitment: The Socialization of Managers in Work Organizations", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 19 No.4, p.533.

- ix. Bülbül Muharrem, (2005), "Örgütsel Bağlılık ve Kamu Kuruluşlarına Yönelik Araştırma", (Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi), Kahramanmaraş Sütçü İmam Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü İşletme Ana Bilim Dalı, Kahramanmaraş, s.5.
- x. Chatman, J. A. (1991), "Matching People and Organizations: Selections and Socialization in Public Accounting Firms", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 36(1):459-484.
- xi. Chughtai, A. A., Zafar, S., (2006), "Antecedents and Consequences of Organizational Commitment Among Pakistani University Teachers", *Applied H.R.M. Research*, Vol 11, No 1, p.43.
- xii. Cohen, A., Lowenberg, G., (1990), "A Re-Examination of The Side-Bet Theory as Applied to Organizational Commitment: A Meta Analysis", *Human Resources*, Vol 43, No 10, pp. 1015-1050.
- xiii. Colman, A. M. (2001). *A Dictionary Of Psychology*, Oxford University Press Inc., New York.
- xiv. Coomber, B. and Barriball, K. L. (2007). "Impact of Job Satisfaction Components on Intent to Leave and Turnover for Hospital-Based Nurses: A Review of the Research Literature", *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, 44 (2), pp:297-314.
- xv. Culverson, D., (2002). "Exploring Organizational Commitment Following Radical Change: A Case Study Within the Parks Canada Agency", (Unpublished Master Thesis), University of Waterloo, Ontario, pp.27-30.
- xvi. Çakır, Ö. (2001), *İşe Bağlılık Olgusu ve Etkileyen Faktörler*, Seçkin Yayıncılık, Ankara.
- xvii. Çetin Serhat Süreyya, (2018), "İşletmelerde Güven, Bağlılık ve Vatandaşlık Arasındaki İlişkide Kültürün Rolü: Sigorta Sektöründe Bir Uygulama", (Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi), İstanbul Aydın Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul, s.125,
- xviii. Çolakoğlu Ülker, Ayyıldız Tuğrul ve Cengiz Serhat, (2009), "Çalışanların Demografik Özelliklerine Göre Örgütsel Bağlılık Boyutlarında Algılama Farklılıkları: Kuşadası'ndaki Beş Yıldızlı Konaklama İşletmeleri Örneği", *Anatolia: Turizm Araştırmaları Dergisi*, Cilt 20, Sayı 1, s.80.
- xix. Daft, R.L. (2000), *Management*, 5th Edition, The Dryden Press, U.S.A.
- xx. Davis, K. ve Newstrom, J.W. (1999). *Human Behaviour at Work*, 8.Baskı, McGraw-Hill, A.B.D.
- xxi. Demirel, Y., Göç, K., (2013), "The Impact of Organizational Commitment on Knowledge Sharing", 1st Annual International Interdisciplinary Conference, AIIC, Azores, Portugal, pp. 954-963.
- xxii. Dikmen Bahar, (2012), "Liderlik Kuramları ve Dönüştürücü Liderlik Kuramının Çalışanların Örgütsel Bağlılıkları Üzerindeki Algılanan Etkisine Yönelik Uygulamalı Bir araştırma", (Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi), İstanbul Aydın Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü İşletme Ana Bilim Dalı, İstanbul, s.160.
- xxiii. Dixit, V., Bhati, M.; 2012, "A Study about Employee Commitment and Its Impact on Sustained Productivity in Indian Auto-Component Industry", *European Journal of Business and Social Sciences*, Vol 1, No 6, pp.34-51.
- xxiv. Erdil O., H. Keskin, (2003), "Güçlendirmeye İş Tatmini, İş Stresi ve Örgütsel Bağlılık Arasındaki İlişkiler: Bir Alan Çalışması", *İ.Ü. İşletme Fakültesi Dergisi*, 32 (1),7-24.
- xxv. Ertürk, Y. D., (2006), "Etkin Örgütsel İletişim İçin Örgütsel Davranışın Analizi", *Halkla İlişkiler Alanına Örgütsel Davranış Yansımaları*, Yıldız Dilek Ertürk (ed.), Nobel Yayın Dağıtım, Ankara.
- xxvi. Ghosh, S., Swamy, D.R., (2014), "A Literature Review on Organizational Commitment - A Comprehensive Summary", *Int. Journal of Engineering Research and Applications*, Vol 4, No 12, pp. 4-14.
- xxvii. Gül, H., Oktay, E. ve Gökçe, H., (2008), "İş Tatmini, Stres, Örgütsel Bağlılık, İşten Ayrılma Niyeti ve Performans Arasındaki İlişkiler: Sağlık Sektöründe Bir Uygulama", *Akademik Bakış, Uluslararası Hakemli Sosyal Bilimler E-Dergisi*, 20, ss.1-11.
- xxviii. Güney Çetin Gürkan, (2006), "Örgütsel Bağlılık: Örgütsel İklimin Örgütsel Bağlılık Üzerindeki Etkisi ve Trakya Üniversitesinde Örgüt İklimi ile Örgütsel Bağlılık İlişkisinin Araştırılması", (Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi), Trakya Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü İşletme Ana Bilim Dalı, Temmuz, s.36.
- xxix. Güney, S. (2007). "Yönetim ve Organizasyonun Bazı Temel Kavramları", Salih Güney (ed.), *Yönetim ve Organizasyon*, Nobel Yayın Dağıtım, Ankara.
- xxx. Güney, S. (2015-2017). *Liderlik*, Nobel Yayın Dağıtım, Ankara.
- xxxi. Güney, S. (2015-2017). *Örgütsel Davranış*, Nobel Yayın Dağıtım, Ankara.
- xxxii. Güney, S. (2015-2017-2018). *Davranış Bilimleri*, Nobel Yayın Dağıtım, Ankara.
- xxxiii. Güney, S. (2018). *Yönetim Organizasyon El Kitabı*, Nobel Yayın Dağıtım, Ankara
- xxxiv. Hrebiniak, L. G. ve Alutto, J. A. (1972). "Personal and Role-Related Factors in the Development of Organizational Commitment", *Administrative Science Quarterly*,
- xxxv. Jones, G R. & George, J. M. (2003), *Contemporary Management*, Third Edition, The McGraw-Hill: USA.
- xxxvi. Kanter, R.M., (1968), "Commitment and Social Organization: A Study of Commitment Mechanisms in Utopian Communities", *American Sociological Review*, Vol 33, No 4, pp.499-517.
- xxxvii. Kaşlı Mehmet, (2007), "İş Özellikleri Modelinin Otel İşletmelerinde Uygulanabilirliğine Yönelik Bir Araştırma", *Doğuş Üniversitesi Dergisi*, Cilt 8, Sayı 2, s.161.
- xxxviii. Kaur, K., Sandhu, H.S., (2010), "Career Stage Effect on Organizational Commitment: Empirical Evidence from Indian Banking Industry", *International Journal of Business and Management*, Vol 5, No 12, pp. 141-152,
- xxxix. Koçel, T. (2007-2014). *İşletme Yöneticiliği*, Beta Yayın Dağıtım, İstanbul.
- xl. Kuyzu Şule Dilşad, (2007), "Küçük ve Orta Ölçekli İşletmelerde Ücret ve Ödüllendirme Yöntemleri Konusundaki İşgören Algılamaları: Kahramanmaraş Tekstil İşletmelerinde Bir Alan Çalışması", (Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi), Kahramanmaraş Sütçü İmam Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü İşletme Ana Bilim Dalı, Kahramanmaraş, s.58.

- xli. Liu, A.M.M., Fellows, R., Chiu, W.M., (2006), "Work Empowerment as an Antecedent to Organisational Commitment in the Hong Kong Quantity Surveying Profession", *Surveying and Built Environment*, Vol 17, No 2, pp. 63-72.
- xlvi. Luthans, F. (1973-1985-2008). *Organizational Behaviour*, 60th. Edition, McGraw-Hill, NewYork.
- xlvi. Mammadova İlahı, (2013), "İş Tatmini İle Örgütsel Bağlılık Arasındaki İlişki ve Bir Uygulama", (Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi), İstanbul Aydın Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul, s.79.
- xliv. Manetje, O.M., (2009), "The Impact of Organizational Culture on Organizational Commitment", (Unpublished Master's Thesis), University of South Africa, Industrial and Organizational Psychology, South Africa.
- xlv. Meyer, J. P. ve Allen, N. J. (1991). "A Three-Component Conceptualization Of Organizational Commitment", *Human Resource Management Review*, Volume 1, Issue 1, pp.61-89.
- xlvi. Mowday, R.T., Porter, L.W., Steers, R.M., (1982), *Employee-Organization Linkages: The Psychology of Commitment, Absenteeism, and Turnover*, Academic Press, New York, pp.20-43.
- xlvii. O'Reilly, C. A. ve Chatman, J. (1986). "Organizational Commitment and Psychological Attachment: The Effects Of Compliance, Identification, and Internalization On Prosocial Behaviour", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71 (3).
- xlviii. Peace, H., (1998), "Organizational Commitment of Female Lecturers in Higher Institutions of Learning in Uganda: Its Nature and Determinant Factors, 1975-1993", *Gender Issues Research Report Series*, no 5, Addis Ababa, Ossa, pp. 1-35.
- xliv. Penley, L.E., Gould, S., (1988), "Etzioni's Model of Organizational Involvement: A Perspective for Understanding Commitment to Organizations", *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, Vol 9, No 1, pp. 46-47.
- i. Perçin Mehmet, (2008), "İşletmenin Örgüt Yapısının İşgörenlerin Örgüt Bağlılığına Etkisine İlişkin Bir Araştırma", (Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi), Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü İşletme Ana Bilim Dalı, Isparta.
- li. Porter L.W., Steers R. M., Mowday and Boulian P.Y., (1974), "Organizational Commitment, Job Satisfaction and Turnover Among Psychiatric Technicians", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol.59, No.5, p.604.
- lii. Randall, D.M., (1989), "Commitment and The Organization: The Organization Man Revisited", *Academy of Management Review*, vol 12, no 3, pp. 460-471.
- liii. Robbins Stephen, (1998-2002), *Organizational Behaviour*, (Eight,- Ten Edition), New Jersey, Prentice Hall International Inc.
- liv. Saari, L. M. and Judge, T. A. (2004), "Employee Attitudes And Job Satisfaction", *Human Resource Management*, 43 (4), pp:395-407.
- lv. Salancik, G. R., (1977), "Commitment and The Control of Organizational Behaviour and Belief", InB. M. Staw & GR Salancik (Eds.), *New Directions in Organizational Behaviour*, Chicago: St., pp.1-54.
- lvi. Salancik, Gerald R., (1977), "Commitment is too Easy", *Organizational Dynamics*, Vol: 6, p.64.
- lvii. Sarker, S J, Crossman, A, Parkpoom, P. (2003), "The Relationships of age and Length of Service With Job Satisfaction: An Examination of Hotel Employees in Thailand", *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 18 (7).
- lviii. Singh, B., Gupta, P.K., Venugopal, S., (2008), "Organisational Commitment: Revisited", *Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology*, Vol 34, No 1, pp.57-68.
- lix. Solmuş, T. (2004). *İş Yaşamında Duygular ve Kişilerarası İlişkiler*, Beta Basım Yayım Dağıtım, İstanbul.
- lx. Somuncu Funda, (2008), "Örgütsel Bağlılık ve Örgütsel Bağlılığı Geliştirme Araçları: Özlem Bir Hizmet İşletmesinde Araştırma", (Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi), Eskişehir Anadolu Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü İşletme Anabilim Dalı, Şubat, s.31.
- lxi. Sürgevil, O., (2007), "Çalışma Yaşamında Örgütsel Bağlılık", (Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi), Ege Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Psikoloji Anabilim Dalı, İzmir, s.34.
- lxii. Tufail, M., Yorıd, A.Z., Shahzad, K., Irfan, M., (2005), "A Glance at Organizational Commitment, Antecedents and Consequences (1960-2005)", *Journal of Managerial Sciences*, Vol 6, No 1, pp. 73-91.
- lxiii. Vasokolaei, G.R., Raadabadi, M., (2015), "Organizational Culture and the Organizational Commitment; Correlational Study in Hospital Staffs", *Asian Social Science*, Vol 11, no 5, pp.143-149.
- lxiv. Weibo, Z., Kaur, S., Jun, W.; 2010, "New Development of Organizational Commitment: A Critical Review (1960-2009)", *African Journal of Business Management*, Vol 4, No 1, pp.12-20.
- lxv. Wiener Yoash, (1982), "Commitment in Organizations: A Normative View", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol: 7, No: 3, p.42.
- lxvi. Yılmaz Aydin ve Cemal Eroğlu, (2012), *Davranış Bilimleri ve Örgütsel Davranış*, Detay Yayıncılık, Ankara, ss.113-114.