

Impact of Relationship between Job Satisfaction and Affective Commitment

D.Babin Dhas¹, Dr. S.C Vetrivel²

¹Assistant Professor, Department of Management Studies, Loyola Institute of Technology, Chennai.

babindhasmba@gmail.com.

²Associate Professor, School of Management Studies, Kongu Engineering College, Perundurai, Erode.

scvetrivel@gmail.com

Received: 16 March 2020 Revised and Accepted: 16 June 2020

Abstract

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

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

1. INTRODUCTION

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

Organisations always strive to maximise the loyalty of the employees (Hausknecht et al., 2009; Reiche, 2008). If employee feels that his contribution has not be recognised or he is not satisfied with the different job facets, it is very tough for the organisations to obtain loyalty from employee and if things are vice-versa, employee is expected to demonstrate a display a great amount of loyalty (DeConinck, & Stilwell, 2004) and would like to halt with the organisation for a long time. Mowday et al. (1982) have also claimed satisfaction with job and its facets as the main determinants for employee's commitment. An ample amount of exiting studies also supported the same notion (Brown & Peterson, 1993; Johnston et al., 1990; Martin & Bennett, 1996; Schwegker, 2001).

Job Satisfaction has been recognised as the main job attitude and it has been also branded as a essential element to organisational productivity and performance (Mathieu, 1991). Job satisfaction also verified by the various social science researchers that fulfillment with the aspects of the job significantly influences performance, loyalty, intent to leave, and absenteeism ((Baron, 1986; Maghradi, 1999). This is an interesting theme where the relationship between perception, attitude, and behaviour has been explored (Rifai; 2005). Considering the

concept the theme of the paper has been decided where we have intended to analyse the influence of various factors of job satisfaction for affective commitment.

Organisational commitment has been the focal point of social scientists from last for the last four decades (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990) discussed construct has shown an ability to predict many non-work and work behaviour (Hackett et al; 1994; Meyer et al, 1989; Randall, et al, 1990). Though some raised concern over its applicability (Mowday, 1998), it accepted that truth organisational commitment still an important notion to study (Rousseau, 1998). The definition of organisational commitment has been refined over the years. Based on the early conceptualisation of organisational commitment (Becker, 1960; Porter et. al, 1974) a duo Meyer and Allen (1984) offered a three factor model for organisational commitment and the components were, “continuance commitment (CC), affective commitment (AC) and normative commitment (NC)”. AC explained the psychological affection of the employee for the organisation (Allen & Meyer, 1990), CC refer commitment which is founded on cost with leaving the organisation (Allen & Meyer, 1990) and CC represents commitment created through norms and obligation or family pressure to stayback with organisation (Allen & Meyer; 1996). Despite the multi functionality of the construct, there are only a few studies that have studies all three (Randall et al., 1990) and claimed AC is the main dimension that leads to the organisational commitment in a wider sense (Somers, 1995).

2. Hypotheses Development

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

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

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

- Hypotheses: H₁: Job Satisfaction will have significant influence on AC
 - H_{1a}: Pay Satisfaction will have significant influence on AC.
 - H_{1b}: Promotional opportunities in the organisation will have significant influence on AC
 - H_{1c}: Supervision Satisfaction will have significant influence on AC
 - H_{1d}: Benefits Satisfaction will have significant influence on AC
 - H_{1e}: Reward Satisfaction will have significant influence on AC
 - H_{1f}: Operating Procedure will have significant influence on AC.
 - H_{1g}: Co-worker Satisfaction will have significant influence on AC.
 - H_{1h}: Work-itself Satisfaction will have significant influence on AC
 - H_{1i}: Communication Satisfaction will have significant influence on AC

3. Research Methodology

- Objective: The main objective of the study is to explore the relationship between job satisfaction and its facets with AC.
- Hypotheses: H₁: Job Satisfaction will have significant influence on AC
 - H_{1a}: Pay Satisfaction will have significant influence on AC.

- H_{1b}: Promotional opputunities in the organisation will have significant influence on AC
 - H_{1c}: Supervision Satisfaction will have significant influence on AC
 - H_{1d}: Benefits Satisfaction will have significant influence on AC
 - H_{1e}: Reward Satisfaction will have significant influence on AC
 - H_{1f}: Operating Procedure will have significant influence on AC.
 - H_{1g}: Co-worker Satisfaction will have significant influence on AC.
 - H_{1h}: Work-itself Satisfaction will have significant influence on AC
 - H_{1i}: Communication Satisfaction will have significant influence on AC
- Research Design and sample characteristics: The present study is more descriptive. The response obtained from the respondents is cross-sectional.
 - Sampling: Covenient sampling was used to obtain responses from the target audience. Few online responses also added to the response sheet. Initially, A total of 700 questionnaires were circulated, out of which 350 were received back. Further, due to the incompleteness of the questionnaires more 44 questionnaires were eliminated and finally, 306 complete responses of the responses were used for final analysis.
 - Target Population: Senior and Middle-level executives from the corporates with 100 crores per annum turnover.
 - Instruments: Job satisfaction was measure through Job Satisfaction Survey developed by Spector (2015). Satisfaction level of employees on 9 different facets namely Coworkers, Pay, Work itself, Promotion Communication, Benefits Supervision, Reward, and Operating Procedures.
 - Meyer and Allen (1997) Organisational Commitment’s AC 6 items was used to measure AC.
 - Data Analysis: Multiple Regression(Backward, Elimination), correlation, descriptive statistics

4. Analysis and Interpretation

Table No.1: Demographic Details of the Respondents

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

Source: Primary Data

Table No. 1 represents the respondent's demographic details, in which <30 years of age respondents are in the majority with 40.5% representation in the responses, followed by age brackets 30-40(88, 28.8%) and 40> (94, 30.7%) respectively. The study is subjugated by males 255 (83.3%) in comparison with females 51(16.7%). Most of the respondents are married which is 73.2% of the sample population. The sample population is also having an educational background of UG 158 (51.6%) and PG 148 (48.4%). The sample population is also dominated by the experience categories who are having experience <8 years that is 45.4%. Table No.2 represents the descriptive analysis i.e. standard deviation and mean of collected variables.

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

Source: Primary Data

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

** . Correlation Coefficient significance at the 0.01% (2-tailed).
 * . Correlation Coefficient significance at the 0.05 % (2-tailed).

Source: Primary Data

Table No.3 represents all variables association are highly related with each other on 0.01 level and 0.05 level except two associations, which are representing a negative association between AC and operating procedure (-.014) and communication and operating procedure(-.034).

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

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

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

Source: Primary Data

Table No. 5: Coefficients^a

Model		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
		Beta			Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)		3.024	.003		
	Pay	.161	2.872	.004	.729	1.371
	Promotion	.065	1.138	.256	.706	1.416
	Supervision	.131	2.191	.029	.640	1.562
	Benefits	.040	.727	.468	.746	1.341
	Reward	.177	3.097	.002	.697	1.435
	Operating	-.125	-2.229	.027	.727	1.375
	Co-worker	.079	1.445	.150	.766	1.306
	Work-itself	.178	2.833	.005	.582	1.718
	Communication	.055	.992	.322	.737	1.358
2	(Constant)		3.023	.003		
	Pay	.169	3.078	.002	.759	1.318
	Promotion	.065	1.144	.254	.706	1.416
	Supervision	.136	2.287	.023	.648	1.543
	Reward	.182	3.189	.002	.704	1.421
	Operating	-.115	-2.118	.035	.771	1.296
	Co-worker	.081	1.482	.139	.767	1.303
	Work-itself	.180	2.868	.004	.583	1.715
	Communication	.059	1.055	.292	.741	1.349
	3	(Constant)		3.193	.002	
Pay		.170	3.103	.002	.759	1.318
Promotion		.062	1.086	.278	.709	1.411
Supervision		.145	2.473	.014	.663	1.508
Reward		.185	3.260	.001	.707	1.415
Operating		-.118	-2.167	.031	.773	1.294
Co-worker		.087	1.609	.109	.777	1.287
Work-itself		.200	3.344	.001	.642	1.558
4	(Constant)		3.260	.001		
	Pay	.185	3.468	.001	.806	1.240
	Supervision	.156	2.704	.007	.684	1.462
	Reward	.192	3.393	.001	.715	1.399
	Operating	-.109	-2.032	.043	.789	1.267
	Co-worker	.089	1.645	.101	.778	1.286
	Work-itself	.210	3.554	.000	.658	1.520
5	(Constant)		3.626	.000		

	Pay	.184	3.443	.001	.806	1.240
	Supervision	.178	3.141	.002	.720	1.390
	Reward	.195	3.430	.001	.715	1.398
	Operating	-.090	-1.713	.038	.828	1.208
	Work-itself	.232	4.030	.000	.695	1.440
Dependent Variable: AC						

Source: Primary Data

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

Model	beta	t-value	P value	Collinearity Statistics	
				Tolerance	VIF
2 Benefits	.040 ^b	.727	.468	.746	1.341
3 Benefits	.045 ^c	.810	.419	.751	1.332
Communication	.059 ^c	1.055	.292	.741	1.349
4 Benefits	.045 ^d	.812	.418	.751	1.332
Communication	.055 ^d	.992	.322	.744	1.345
Promotion	.062 ^d	1.086	.278	.709	1.411
5 Benefits	.050 ^e	.901	.368	.753	1.328
Communication	.064 ^e	1.163	.246	.753	1.329
Promotion	.065 ^e	1.137	.257	.709	1.410
Co-worker	.089 ^e	1.645	.101	.778	1.286

Source: Primary Data

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

Table No.7		
Hypothesis No.	Hypothesis	Accept/Reject
1	H₁	Accepted
2	H_{1a}	Accepted
3	H_{1b}	Rejected
4	H_{1c}	Accepted

5	H _{1d} :	Rejected
6	H _{1e} :	Accepted
7	H _{1f} :	Accepted
8	H _{1g} :	Rejected
9	H _{1h} :	Accepted
10	H _{1i} :	Rejected

5. Discussion and Conclusion

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

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

6. References

- Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1996). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: An examination of construct validity. *Journal of vocational behavior, 49*(3), 252-276.
- Alniaçık, Ü., Alniaçık, E., Akçin, K., & Erat, S. (2012). Relationships between career motivation, AC and job satisfaction. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 58*, 355-362.
- Alvi, S. A., & Ahmed, S. W. (1987). Assessing organizational commitment in a developing country: Pakistan, a case study. *Human Relations, 40*(5), 267-280.
- Baron, R. (1986). *Behaviour in organisations*. Newton, MA: Allyn and Bacon
- Babin Dhas, D., & Vetrivel, S. C. (2020). Work Life Balance among Medium Size Industrialized Employees. *Test Engineering and Management, 82*(2), 9753–9757.
- Babin Dhas, D., & Vetrivel, S. C. (2020). Innovator Find Producer to Merge Expertise and Finance New Projects. *Test Engineering and Management, 83*(4), 17760–17768.
- Babin Dhas, D., & Vetrivel, S. C. (2020). Substantiate the Intervention Effect of Work-Life Balance in SME's With Special Reference in Chennai. *Test Engineering and Management, 83*(4), 17769-17781.
- Babin Dhas, D., & Karthikeyan, P. (2015). Work-Life Balance Challenges and Solutions: Overview. *International Journal of Research in Humanities and Social Studies, 2*(12), 10-19.
- Becker, T. E., & Billings, R. S. (1993). Profiles of commitment: An empirical test. *Journal of organizational behavior, 14*(2), 177-190.
- Becker, H. S. (1960). Notes on the concept of commitment. *American journal of Sociology, 66*(1), 32-40.

11. Becker, T. E., & Kernan, M. C. (2003). Matching commitment to supervisors and organizations to in-role and extra-role performance. *Human performance*, 16(4), 327-348.
12. Brown, S. P., & Peterson, R. A. (1993). Antecedents and consequences of salesperson job satisfaction: Meta-analysis and assessment of causal effects. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 30, 64-77.
13. Clugston, M., Howell, J. P., & Dorfman, P. W. (2000). Does cultural socialization predict multiple bases and foci of commitment?. *Journal of management*, 26(1), 5-30.
14. DeConinck, J. B., & Stilwell, C. D. (2004). Incorporating organizational justice, role states, pay satisfaction and supervisor satisfaction in a model of turnover intentions. *Journal of Business Research*, 57(3), 225-231.
15. D.Babin Dhas., & S.C Vetrivel. (2020). Precursors of Job Satisfaction With Reference To MSME Sector in Chennai. *Sylwan*, 164(3), 410-440.
16. D.Babin Dhas., & S.C Vetrivel. (2020). Challenges and Circumstances of Medium Size Enterprises Employees Work Life Balance. *International Journal of Psychosocial Rehabilitation*, 24(10), 1604-1609.
17. D.Babin Dhas., & S.C Vetrivel. (2020). Information Technology Helped Entrepreneurs to Flourish. *International Journal of Psychosocial Rehabilitation*, 24(10), 1596-1603.
18. D.Babin Dhas. (2015), A Report on the Importance of Work-Life Balance. *International Journal of Applied Engineering Research*, 10(9), 21659-21665.
19. D.Babin Dhas., & S.C Vetrivel. (2020). Cyberspace Has Greatly Helped Entrepreneurs to Flourish. *Journal of Critical Reviews*, 7(2), 149-152.
20. D.Babin Dhas., & P. Karthikeyan.(2015). Work-Life Balance as Source of Job Dissatisfaction and Irresponsible Attitudes an Exploratory Study on the Views of Male Workers. *Global Journal for Research Analysis*, 4(5), 122-125.
21. D.Babin Dhas, S.C Vetrivel. (2020). Scholastic Stress and Perceived Control for Under Graduate Students. *International Journal of Advanced Science and Technology*, 29(9s), 6490 - 6493.
22. D.Babin Dhas, S.C Vetrivel. (2020). Dissect Factors Induce Stress: Engineering College Educators. *International Journal of Advanced Science and Technology*, 29(9s), 6494 - 6500.
23. Hausknecht, J. P., Rodda, J., & Howard, M. J. (2009). Targeted employee retention: Performance-based and job-related differences in reported reasons for staying. *Human Resource Management*, 48(2), 269-288.
24. Horwitz, F. M., Heng, C. T., & Quazi, H. A. (2003). Finders, keepers? Attracting, motivating and retaining knowledge workers. *Human resource management journal*, 13(4), 23-44.
25. Johnston, M. W., Parasuraman, A., Futrell, C. M., & Black, W. C. (1990). A longitudinal assessment of the impact of selected organizational influences on salespeople's organizational commitment during early employment. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 333-344.
26. Kubo, I., & Saka, A. (2002). An inquiry into the motivations of knowledge workers in the Japanese financial industry. *Journal of Knowledge Management*.
27. Lam, T., & Zhang, H. Q. (2003). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment in the Hong Kong fast-food industry. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*.
28. Liu, X. P., & Wang, Z. M. (2001). The study of organizational commitment and its development mechanism. *Nankai Business Review*, 4(6), 58-62.
29. Long, L., Fang, L., & Ling, W. (2002). Organizational career management: measurement and its effects on employees' behavior and feeling in china. *Acta Psychologica Sinica*, 34(01), 98-106.
30. Maghrabi, A. S. (1999). Assessing the effect of job satisfaction on managers. *International Journal of Value-Based Management*, 12(1), 1-12.
31. Martin, C.L., Bennett, N. (1996). The role of justice judgments in explaining the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment. *Group and Organization Management* 21 (1), 84-104
32. Mathieu, J. E. (1991). A cross-level nonrecursive model of the antecedents of organizational commitment and satisfaction. *Journal of applied psychology*, 76(5), 607.
33. Mathieu, J. E., & Zajac, D. M. (1990). A review and meta-analysis of the antecedents, correlates, and consequences of organizational commitment. *Psychological bulletin*, 108(2), 171.
34. May, T. Y. M., Korczynski, M., & Frenkel, S. J. (2002). Organizational and occupational commitment: Knowledge workers in large corporations. *Journal of Management Studies*, 39(6), 775-801.
35. Reiche, B. S. (2008). The configuration of employee retention practices in multinational corporations' foreign subsidiaries. *International Business Review*, 17(6), 676-687.
36. Rifai, H. A. (2005). A Test of the Relationships among Perceptions of Justice, Job satisfaction, AC and Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *Gadjah Mada International Journal of Business*, 7(2).
37. Schwepker Jr, C.H. (2001). Ethical climate's relationship to job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intention in the sales force. *Journal of Business Research*, 54, 39-52

38. S.C.Vetrivel., V.Krishnamoorthy., Babin Dhas. D., & P. Dinesh. (2020) Anxiety Management in Retail Stores Employees. *International Journal of Psychosocial Rehabilitation*, 24(10), 1648-1658.
39. S.C.Vetrivel., V.Krishnamoorthy., & Babin Dhas, D. (2020). Drivers of Employee Engagement to Job Satisfaction in Modern Industries. *International Journal of Psychosocial Rehabilitation*, 24(10), 1637-1647.
40. S.C.Vetrivel., V.Krishnamoorthy., Babin Dhas, D., & Jawahar kumar, P.K. (2020). Patients Satisfaction over In-house Pharmacy at Hospitals in Coimbatore- Tamil Nadu. *International Journal of Psychosocial Rehabilitation*, 24(10), 1628-1636.
41. Smith, P. C. (1969). The measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement: A strategy for the study of attitudes.
42. Spector, P. E. (1997). *Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, causes, and consequences* (Vol. 3). Sage publications
43. Testa, M. R. (2001). Organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and effort in the service environment. *The Journal of Psychology*, 135(2), 226-236.
44. Vandenberghe, C., Bentein, K., & Stinglhamber, F. (2004). AC to the organization, supervisor, and work group: Antecedents and outcomes. *Journal of vocational behavior*, 64(1), 47-71.
45. Weng, Q., McElroy, J. C., Morrow, P. C., & Liu, R. (2010). The relationship between career growth and organizational commitment. *Journal of vocational behavior*, 77(3), 391-400.
46. Porter, L. W., Steers, R. M., Mowday, R. T., & Boulian, P. V. (1974). Organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover among psychiatric technicians. *Journal of applied psychology*, 59(5), 603.
47. Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1984). Testing the "side-bet theory" of organizational commitment: Some methodological considerations. *Journal of applied psychology*, 69(3), 372.
48. Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1996). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: An examination of construct validity. *Journal of vocational behavior*, 49(3), 252-276.
49. Somers, M. J. (1995). Organizational commitment, turnover and absenteeism: An examination of direct and interaction effects. *Journal of organizational Behavior*, 16(1), 49-58.
50. Mowday, R. T. (1998). Reflections on the study and relevance of organizational commitment. *Human resource management review*, 8(4), 387-401.
51. Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of occupational psychology*, 63(1), 1-18.
52. McCormack, D., Casimir, G., Djurkovic, N., & Yang, L. (2006). The concurrent effects of workplace bullying, satisfaction with supervisor, and satisfaction with co-workers on AC among schoolteachers in China. *International Journal of Conflict Management*.