

ANTECEDENTS AND CONSEQUENCES OF
ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

F. BETÜL EKREM DUMAN

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

SEPTEMBER 2010

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

Prof. Meliha Altunışık
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

Prof. Nebi Sümer
Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and in our opinion, it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

Assoc. Prof. Reyhan Bilgiç
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Prof. H. Canan Sümer

(METU,PSY)

Assoc. Prof. Reyhan Bilgiç

(METU,PSY)

Dr. Başak Ok

(AU, PSY)

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last name: F. Betül Ekrem Duman

Signature :

ABSTRACT

ANTECEDENTS AND CONSEQUENCES OF ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT

Ekrem Duman, F. Betül

M.S., Department of Psychology

Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Reyhan BİLGİÇ

September 2010, 94 pages

In the present study, organizational commitment's relationship with a number of antecedents and consequences were examined. In more detail, firstly the effects of job characteristics (i.e., job variety, promotional opportunity, organizational fairness, and perceived organizational support) on three dimensions of organizational commitment namely affective, normative, and continuance commitment were examined. Secondly, how these three dimensions of organizational commitment predict two dimensions of performance (i.e., task and contextual performance) and turnover intentions were examined. With these purposes, a pilot study was conducted with the participation of 45 employees and then in the main study questionnaires were administered to a sample of 175 employees working in different public organizations.

According to the results of the study, job characteristics significantly and positively predicted both affective and normative commitment in addition to

overall commitment but they were not significant predictors of continuance commitment. In more detail, affective commitment was predicted by job variety, promotional opportunity and perceived organizational support while normative commitment was predicted by job variety and perceived organizational support. The results of the mediation analysis revealed that perceived organizational support partially mediated the organizational fairness - affective organizational commitment relationship.

Among three dimensions of commitment, affective and normative commitment were found to significantly and negatively predict turnover intentions of employees. On the other hand, none of the three dimensions significantly predicted task performance when self ratings were used but affective and normative commitment significantly influenced self reported contextual performance. However, three dimensions of commitment were not significant predictors of task, contextual or overall performance rated by supervisors. The results of the study, its implications, limitations and directions were future research were discussed in more detail.

Keywords: Organizational Commitment, Job Characteristics, Turnover Intentions, Performance

ÖZ

ÖRGÜTSEL BAĞLILIĞIN ÖNCÜ DEĞİŞKENLERİ VE SONUÇLARI

Ekrem Duman, F. Betül

Yüksek Lisans, Psikoloji Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Doç. Dr. Reyhan BİLGİÇ

Eylül 2010, 94 sayfa

Bu çalışmada örgütsel bağlılığın çeşitli öncül ve sonuç değişkenleriyle ilişkileri incelenmiştir. Bu çerçevede, öncelikle işe ilişkin çeşitli değişkenlerin (iş çeşitliliği, yükselme fırsatı, kurumsal adalet, algılanan örgütsel destek) duygusal, normatif ve devamlılık bağlılığı olmak üzere örgütsel bağlılığın üç boyutu üzerindeki etkileri incelenmiştir. Bunun yanında, örgütsel bağlılığın boyutlarının performansın iki boyutu (görev performansı ve kurumsal performans) ve işten ayrılma niyetini ne şekilde etkilediği araştırılmıştır. Bu amaçlarla, öncelikle 45 kamu kurumu çalışanın katılımıyla bir pilot çalışma gerçekleştirilmiş ve sonrasında ana çalışmada çeşitli kamu kurumlarında çalışan 175 kişilik bir örnekleme anket uygulanmıştır.

Çalışmanın sonuçlarına göre, işe ilişkin değişkenler duygusal ve normatif bağlılığı pozitif ve anlamlı olarak yordamakla beraber söz konusu değişkenlerin devamlılık bağlılığı üzerinde anlamlı etkileri olmamıştır. Bu kapsamda duygusal

bağlılık; iş çeşitliliği, yükselme fırsatı ve algılanan örgütsel destek tarafından anlamlı olarak yordanmış; normatif bağlılık ise iş çeşitliliği ve algılanan örgütsel destek tarafından anlamlı olarak yordanmıştır. Aracı değişken analizinin sonuçlarına göre algılanan örgütsel destek, kurumsal adalet - duygusal bağlılık ilişkisine kısmi olarak aracılık etmektedir.

Bunlara ilaveten, duygusal ve normatif bağlılık işten ayrılma niyetini negatif ve anlamlı olarak yordamakla beraber devamlılık bağlılığının işten ayrılma niyeti üzerinde yordayıcı etkisi bulunmamaktadır. Diğer taraftan, çalışanlara uygulanan anketlerin sonucuna göre örgütsel bağlılığın boyutlarının görev performansı üzerinde anlamlı bir etkisi olmadığı ancak duygusal ve normatif bağlılığın kurumsal performansı pozitif ve anlamlı olarak etkilediği görülmüştür. Buna karşın, örgütsel bağlılığın boyutlarından hiçbiri amirlerin değerlendirdiği performansı anlamlı olarak yordamamıştır. Çalışmanın bulguları, uygulamalar, sınırlılıklar ve ileriye dönük öneriler çerçevesinde daha detaylı olarak tartışılmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Örgütsel Bağlılık, İş Değişkenleri, İşten Ayrılma Niyeti, Performans

To My Parents and to Birol

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First of all, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my thesis advisor Assoc. Prof. Reyhan Bilgiç for her guidance and suggestions throughout the long and difficult process of this study. I appreciate her for being so supportive and patient to me in hard times.

Special thanks go to my examining committee: Prof. H. Canan Sümer and Dr. Başak Ok for their support and constructive comments on the study.

I would also like to thank all the participants of the study for spending time and efforts. Many thanks go to my friends who helped me during the data collection namely Sümeyra Karataş, Harun Kara, Deniz Uygur, Aygün Cilan, my sister Hilal Urgancıoğlu and my dear husband Birol Duman. I wish to especially thank Ülkü Türkmen for relieving me by entering almost all data in addition to her efforts in collecting data for the study.

I would like to express my very special thanks to my husband Birol Duman for being with me in joy and sorrow. Without his continued support and patience, it would be impossible to complete this study.

Lastly, my deepest gratitude is for my family. I extend my warmest and the most special thanks to my mother and father for encouraging me to study and complete my thesis in all my hopeless times. I know that they have always believed and trusted in me, and in everything I do which made me feel more comfortable and stronger. Additionally, I would like to thank to my lovely sister Hilal and my little brother Kürşat for all kinds of help they have provided me so far.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM.....	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
ÖZ.....	vi
DEDICATION.....	viii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	ix
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	x
LIST OF TABLES.....	xiii
CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION	
1.1 The Purpose of the Study.....	1
1.2 Organizational Commitment – Concept and Dimensionality.....	4
1.3 Foci of Commitment.....	8
1.4 Antecedents of Organizational Commitment.....	10
1.4.1 Demographics/Personal Characteristics.....	15
1.4.2 Job Characteristics.....	18
1.4.2.1 Job Variety/Routinization.....	19
1.4.2.2 Promotional Opportunity.....	20
1.4.2.3 Organizational Fairness (Justice).....	21
1.4.2.4 Perceived Organizational Support (POS).....	24
1.4.3 Organizational Fairness - Commitment Mediation by POS.....	26
1.5 Consequences of Organizational Commitment.....	27
1.5.1 Turnover Intentions.....	28
1.5.2 Job Performance.....	32

2. METHOD

2.1 Overview.....	40
2.2 Pilot Study.....	41
2.2.1. Participants.....	41
2.2.2. Procedure.....	42
2.2.3 Measures.....	42
2.3 Main Study.....	46
2.3.1. Participants.....	46
2.3.2. Procedure.....	47
2.3.3. Measures.....	48

3. RESULTS

3.1. Pilot Study.....	50
3.1.1. Intercorrelations Between Variables.....	52
3.2. Main Study.....	53
3.2.1 Overview.....	53
3.2.2 Cleaning the Data.....	53
3.2.3 Factor Analysis and Reliabilities.....	54
3.2.4 Intercorrelations Between Variables.....	57
3.2.5. Regression Analyses.....	61
3.2.5.1. Prediction of Affective, Normative, Continuance and Overall Organizational Commitment from Antecedent Variables.....	61
3.2.5.2. Investigating the possible mediation of organizational fairness – affective organizational commitment relationship	

by perceived organizational support.....	66
3.2.5.3. Prediction of Turnover Intentions from Three Dimensions of Organizational Commitment.....	68
3.2.5.4. Prediction of Job Performance from Three Dimensions of Organizational Commitment.....	70
4. DISCUSSION	
4.1 Summary of the Findings.....	79
4.1.1 Demographic Variables Relationship with Organizational Commitment	79
4.1.2 Job Characteristics Relationship with Organizational Commitment	80
4.1.3 Turnover Intentions Relationship with Organizational Commitment	85
4.1.4 Performance Relationship with Organizational Commitment.	86
4.2 Implications for Human Resource Practices.....	89
4.3 Limitations of the Study	91
4.4 Directions for Future Research.....	92
REFERENCES.....	95
APPENDICES	
A. Questionnaire Filled by the Employees in the Pilot Study.....	105
B. Questionnaire Filled by the Employees in the Main Study.....	112
C. Questionnaire Filled by the Supervisors in the Main Study.....	113
D. Confirmatory Factor Analyses Results of Commitment and Performance Scales.....	116

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 Descriptive Statistics of the Scales in the Pilot Study.....	50
Table 2 Descriptive Statistics of the Scales in the Main Study.....	56
Table 3 Intercorrelations Between Variables.....	59
Table 4 Linear Regression Analysis for Prediction of Affective Organizational Commitment.....	63
Table 5 Linear Regression Analysis for Prediction of Normative Organizational Commitment.....	63
Table 6 Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Prediction of Continuance Organizational Commitment.....	64
Table 7 Linear Regression Analysis for Prediction of Overall Organizational Commitment.....	65
Table 8 Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Prediction of Turnover Intentions.....	69
Table 9 Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Prediction of Self Rated Task Performance.....	72
Table 10 Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Prediction of Self Rated Contextual Performance.....	73
Table 11 Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Prediction of Self Rated Overall Performance.....	74
Table 12 Linear Regression Analysis for Prediction of Supervisory Rated Task Performance.....	74
Table 13 Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Prediction of Supervisory Rated Contextual Performance.....	76

Table 14 Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Prediction of Supervisory Rated
Contextual Overall Performance.....77

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 The Purpose of the Study

In today's working environment, organizations emphasize issues like satisfaction, commitment of the employees for increasing performance and acquiring better service and products, for preventing turnover, absenteeism or decreasing them.

The aim of the present study was to examine some of the antecedents and consequences of organizational commitment. In more detail, the first aim was to examine the effects of job characteristics (i.e., job variety, promotional opportunity, organizational fairness and perceived organizational support) on three dimensions of organizational commitment namely affective, normative, and continuance commitment. Second aim was to examine how these three dimensions of organizational commitment predict two dimensions of performance (i.e., task and contextual performance) and turnover intentions. Moreover, perceived organizational support was proposed to mediate the relationship between organizational fairness and affective organizational commitment.

Organizational commitment is a widely studied topic with its relations to several work outcomes, correlates, and antecedent variables. Understanding the dynamic nature of the relationships between job characteristics and

organizational commitment dimensions as well as between organizational commitment dimensions and critical outcome variables is expected to contribute to the relevant international and national literatures.

This study can be justified on several grounds. First, Allen and Meyer's (1990) three dimensional model of organizational commitment (i.e., affective, normative and continuance commitment) was studied in all dimensions while many of the previous studies (e.g., Becker & Kernan, 2003; Gaither et al., 2008; Lord & Hartley, 1998) used only attitudinal/affective commitment. Working all three dimensions would contribute to our understanding with respect to their similarities and differences in explaining different outcome variables.

Second, performance is one of the most important work outcomes as organizations spend time and money to improve performance of their employees. Many organizations don't produce solid products and thus it is difficult to measure performance due to its subjective nature (Brooks & Wallace, 2006). Accordingly they depend on interpretation by supervisors or employees themselves to measure performance. Supervisory ratings are generally accepted to be more reliable than self reported performance. In this study, performance is measured by collecting both supervisory and self reported performance ratings. Moreover, organizational commitment's effects on two dimensions of performance (i.e., task and contextual performance) were measured.

Third, low levels of commitment was found to lead to both actual turnover and turnover intentions. As turnover intentions was found to be one of the strongest predictors of actual turnover (e.g., Loi, Hang-yue & Foley, 2006; Tett & Meyer, 1993), investigating the effects of all three dimensions of commitment on turnover intentions would help us conceptualize why employees leave their organizations voluntarily.

Fourth, there is a wide range of antecedent variables found to predict dimensions of commitment (e.g., Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Meyer & Allen, 1991). As organizational commitment is an important variable because of its effects on valuable outcomes for organizations, it is also important to investigate which variables predict organizational commitment. In this regard, influence of job variety, promotional opportunity, organizational fairness and perceived organizational support on three dimensions of organizational commitment would contribute to our understanding on antecedent variables – commitment relationship.

Fifth, there is sufficient literature on mediating role of perceived organizational support on the organizational fairness - organizational commitment relationship. Organizations wanting affectively committed employees must demonstrate their own commitment by providing a supportive work environment (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, & Sowa, 1986). One of the the things they can do to show their support is to treat employees fairly (Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch, & Topolnytsky, 2002). In this regard, investigating whether perceived organizational support mediates

organizational fairness - organizational commitment relationship or not, would also contribute to our understanding on antecedent variables – commitment relationship.

Finally, studies in commitment area are limited in the Turkish context (e.g., Wasti, 2002; Wasti & Can, 2008); and also in public organizations (e.g., Poyraz & Kama, 2008). In this respect, we would expect to learn more on generalizability of the findings on organizational commitment in different countries to Turkish context and public organizations.

With these purposes, the proposed hypotheses were tested in a sample of public sector employees working in different public institutions in Ankara.

1.2 Organizational Commitment – Concept and Dimensionality

Commitment in the workplace is one of the most studied concepts and still open to new research in the subjects of concept building, dimensionality, different forms (foci) and relations with other variables. Following Porter, Steers, Mowday, and Boulian (1974), Mathis and Jackson (2008) defined organizational commitment as the degree of employees' belief and acceptance of organizational goals and desire to remain with the organization. Meyer and Allen (1991) conceptualized commitment as a psychological state which characterizes the employee's relationship with the organization and affects the decision of continuing or discontinuing membership in the organization. Organizational commitment was also defined as the psychological and

emotional attachment of employees to their organizations (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Meyer & Allen, 1991).

A variety of studies have been conducted to explore the concept of organizational commitment (OC) (e.g., Becker, 1960), to examine the validity of different measures of organizational commitment (e.g., Allen & Meyer, 1990; Lee, Allen & Meyer, 2001), to test the dimensionality of commitment (e.g., Allen, 2003; Hartmann & Bambacas, 2000), and to investigate the relationships between organizational commitment and its antecedents and outcomes (e.g., Allen, 2003; Cohen, 1991; Fornes, Rocco, & Wollard, 2008; Hartmann & Bambacas, 2000; Lambert & Paoline, 2008; Park & Rainey, 2007; Raghunathan, Raghunathan, & Tu, 1998).

Theoretically, there are two dominant views about the conceptualisation of organizational commitment : behavioural and attitudinal. The behavioural conceptualisation of organizational commitment is based on the work of Becker (1960) who pointed out that commitment as consistent lines of activity that continue over time and lead to the rejection of alternative activities. Organizational commitment is thought to develop through a process as an individual's past behaviour binds the person to an organization. Becker (1960) conceptualized side bet theory and declared that commitment is a result of hidden investments of an employee, "side-bets," they have made by remaining in a given organization. According to Meyer and Allen (1991), this type of commitment is calculative in that the longer an individual stays with

an organization, the greater the sacrifice they would have to make to leave and the fewer alternatives would be available if they did leave.

The attitudinal conceptualisation of organizational commitment develops largely within the affective domain and it can be characterized as an intense and positive orientation towards an organization (Cuskelly & Boag, 2001) or can be described as the employee's emotional attachment and identification with the organization (Meyer & Allen, 1991).

In the literature, there are many studies conducted to find the most accurate composition of the concept of organizational commitment. Brooks and Wallace (2006) summarized eight studies ranging from Porter et al. (1974) with three dimensions namely "belief in goals and values of the organization, willingness to work for the organization, and desire to stay" to Adler and Adler (1998) study with five dimensions "domination, identification, integration, goal alignment, and commitment." They pointed out that although these eight studies seem to have different results in dimensionalities, there are duplications and similarities suggesting considerable congruence and commonality across the frameworks.

The most prominent view and leading approach among the studies on dimensionality of commitment is Meyer and Allen's (1991) three component model of commitment that covers the behavioural and attitudinal concepts of organizational commitment. The three components are: "affective commitment (AC) that refers to the emotional attachment, identification with and involvement within an organization, normative commitment (NC) that is

based on a perceived obligation to continue working in the organization, and continuance commitment (CC) that is based on the perceived costs associated with leaving the organization” (Meyer et al., 2002; p.21). However, there is controversy about the dimensions because of the issues like the overlap between normative and affective commitment and dimensionality of continuance commitment to high personal sacrifice and low perceived alternatives.

For example, Meyer et al. (2002) argued that although affective and normative commitments are literally highly correlated, the correlation between the constructs is not unity. In addition, despite affective and normative commitment show similar patterns of correlations with antecedents, correlates and consequence variables, the magnitude of the correlations often differ. They also found that the two subcomponents of continuance commitment, high perceived sacrifice and low alternatives, are highly correlated and their correlations with both affective and normative commitment are opposite in sign.

Cohen (2007) proposed an alternative way for the dimensionality of commitment. The model was a two dimensional, four component model that one dimension was instrumental, one dimension was affective in nature and before and after one’s entry to the organization was distinguished.

Distinguishing between before and after one’s entry to the organization is meaningful as career stage was found to moderate the relationship between commitment and outcomes (e.g., Cohen, 1991).

For the dimensionality of commitment, in the present study organizational commitment is conceptualized using the Meyer and Allen's (1991) multi dimensional model (affective form of commitment based on feelings of attachment toward the organization, continuance component that assesses perceived costs and alternatives for leaving, and normative component that assesses feelings of obligation to stay in the organization). Meyer and Allen (1991) argue that employees with high affective commitment continue because they desire to, those with high continuance commitment continue because of the necessity, and employees with high normative commitment continue because they think they obliged to.

1.3 Foci of Commitment

Commitment to what has been an important issue in commitment research. In the early studies, the focus was almost always on organization and in a few studies occupation and profession. But in more recent studies it was emphasized that one can be committed to many different work-related domains, or foci, and workplace commitment can be best understood by examining them as a whole (e.g., Cohen, 2000; Vandenberghe, Bentein, & Stinglhamber, 2004). These domains can be within (i.e., unit, team, department) and beyond (i.e., occupation, career) the organization and the generally worked domain, the organization itself. In the literature, work commitment namely organizational commitment, job involvement,

occupational commitment, work involvement, and Protestant work ethic (e.g., Cohen, 1998); commitment to supervisors (e.g., Sutanto, 1999); team commitment (e.g., Bishop, Scott, Goldsby, & Cropanzano, 2005); professional commitment (e.g., Lu, Lin, Wu, Hsieh, & Chang, 2002); occupational/career commitment and individual commitment (team-job-career) with organizational commitment (Fornes et al., 2008) are examples of different foci. But the problem is that when we view psychological commitment as a multidimensional construct, as many researchers do, this extension of the construct leads to more complexity in measuring and also comparing different studies on commitment.

Commitment to different forms were studied in order to investigate the possible discriminating effects of these forms on different work outcomes. Vandenberghe, Bentein, and Stinglhamber (2004) pointed out the usefulness of distinguishing among employees' affective commitments to the organization, the supervisor and the work group. They found that commitment to different forms were factorially distinct and related in a different way to their theorized antecedents. Chang, Chi, and Miao (2007) explored the relationship between three-component organizational/ occupational commitment and organizational/occupational turnover intention and they found that affective occupational commitment is the strongest negative predictor of occupational turnover intention, and normative organizational commitment predicts organizational turnover intentions stronger than affective organizational commitment. Also Becker and Kernan (2003)

concluded that affective commitment to supervisors was related to in-role performance and courtesy while affective commitment to organizations was related to loyal boosterism.

Chen et al. (2002) examined the effects of loyalty to supervisor and organizational commitment on employee performance. Loyalty to supervisor was found to be more strongly associated with both in-role and extra-role performance than organizational commitment. Sutanto (1999) also concluded that creating employee commitment to supervisors would be more valuable than to organizations in order to increase performance in organizations. Lu et al. (2002) investigated the relationships between turnover intentions, professional commitment and job satisfaction among hospital nurses. The results revealed that professional commitment's relation to intention to leave the profession was stronger than intention to leave the organization which were both negative. These results also support the view that commitment to different domains have different outcomes and it is meaningful to study these domains separately.

This study focuses on commitment to an organization as a whole concept, rather than a number of domains within and beyond the organization.

The following parts of the present study summarize the findings in the literature for the related variables of commitment that are hypothesized to be its antecedents and consequences.

1.4 Antecedents of Organizational Commitment

In the literature a large number of variables (e.g., autonomy, peer support, supervisor support, pay, routinization, role ambiguity, role conflict, workload, age, tenure, gender, alternatives, investments) were studied in relation to commitment to explore what explains variance in commitment (e.g., Allen & Meyer, 1990; Lambert, Hogan, & Jiang, 2008; Meyer et al., 2002). While showing our interest in understanding, developing, and managing committed employees, this research also reflects different variables that have been considered to have an impact on commitment (Allen, 2003). The antecedents are grouped like personal characteristics/demographics, job characteristics, organizational characteristics (e.g., Mathieu & Zajac, 1990) work attitudes, environmental conditions (e.g., Iverson & Buttigieg, 1998) in many studies while in some other studies they are grouped as antecedents of affective, normative and continuance commitment (e.g., Cheng & Stockdale, 2003).

Meyer and Allen (1991) categorized the antecedents into three groups according to the three dimensions of commitment: affective, normative and continuance. The antecedents of AC fall generally into three categories: personal characteristics (demographic characteristics such as age, gender, tenure and education, and personal dispositions such as need for achievement, affiliation, and autonomy); organizational structure; and work attitudes/perceptions (labeled as work experiences by Meyer and Allen).

Work attitudes/perceptions have been regarded as the most important category of antecedents of AC by Meyer and Allen. Meyer and Allen (1991) found that work attitudes/perceptions (i.e., organizational dependability, peer cohesion, role clarity, personal importance, job challenge, participation, goal clarity, goal difficulty, management receptiveness, equity, feedback) were the best predictors of AC. Because continuance commitment reflects the recognition of costs associated with leaving the organization, anything that increases perceived costs can be considered as antecedents. So alternatives and side-bets were taken as the antecedents of continuance commitment while for normative commitment, cultural/familial in addition to organizational socialization and organizational investments were proposed as antecedents.

Curry (1999) examined the relationship between the determinants of commitment (i.e., individual characteristics, workplace structure and environmental conditions) and turnover. The results revealed that routinization, peer support, supervisor support, workload and tenure were significant predictors of commitment.

Park and Rainey (2007) focused on transformation-oriented leadership (TOL), public service-oriented motivation (PSOM), empowerment, procedural equity perceptions, job satisfaction, and perceived performance as antecedents of AC, NC and CC. They found that these antecedents have both direct and indirect effects on the three commitment variables. But the effects on the three variables were different; all six antecedent variables most significantly and positively affected affective commitment, whereas

continuance commitment to stay was the least influenced dimension by these antecedent variables.

Cheng and Stockdale (2003) examined the antecedents of affective, normative and continuance commitment based on the proposed antecedents of Meyer and Allen (1991). They studied eleven work attitude/perception variables as antecedents of AC (i.e., job challenge, role clarity, goal clarity, goal difficulty, management receptiveness, peer cohesion, organizational dependability, equity, personal importance, feedback, and participation), four variables as antecedents of CC (i.e., alternatives, pension, skill transferability and costs of leaving) and lastly two variables as antecedents of NC (i.e., receipt of benefits and socialization toward loyalty). Four of the AC antecedents (i.e., perceived equity, peer group cohesion, personal importance, and role clarity (negatively)) significantly predicted AC after controlling for demographic variables.

In addition, normative commitment antecedents, significantly predicted AC while none of the continuance commitment antecedents predicted AC. Three of the four CC antecedents (i.e., alternatives (negatively), pension, and costs of leaving) significantly predicted CC while two AC antecedents (i.e., peer group cohesion (negatively) and role clarity (positively)) also predicted CC. Both NC antecedents were the strongest predictors of NC. Costs of leaving, a CC antecedent, and goal difficulty, an AC antecedent, also significantly predicted NC.

Raghunathan et al. (1998) reported that characteristics of the organizational environment that affect information systems successfully distinguished organizations with high and low levels of commitment while research by Schaubroeck et al. (2007) illustrated that a composite measure of the characteristics of enriched jobs (job scope) was positively related to organizational commitment. Besides those, Bashir and Ramay (2008) found that career opportunities and work life policies in the organization significantly predicted commitment of the employees.

In another study, Gaertner (1999) investigated the relationship of various antecedents (i.e., pay, promotional chances, distributive justice, peer support, supervisory support, workload, role conflict, role ambiguity, autonomy and routinization) with commitment. The results suggested that only three structural determinants (i.e., distributive justice, promotional chances, and supervisory support) were directly related to organizational commitment.

Lambert and Paoline (2008) conducted a study to examine organizational variables' and job characteristics' relation with organizational commitment. They found that all the organizational variables (i.e., instrumental communication, formalization, input into decision making, promotional opportunity) and job characteristics variables (i.e., dangerousness, job variety, and role strain) had significant correlations with organizational commitment. Instrumental communication, formalization, input into decision making, promotional opportunity, and job variety all had

positive correlations while dangerousness, job stress and role strain had negative correlations.

In this study, antecedents of commitment were grouped in two categories: personal characteristics and job characteristics. Personal characteristics were mostly found to be unrelated or weakly related to commitment (e.g., Lambert, Hogan & Jiang, 2008; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990). Additionally, they were included as control variables in the prediction of commitment variables to eliminate their possible effects on commitment. Variables under job characteristics group were among the strongest predictors of commitment (e.g., Lambert & Paoline, 2008; Meyer & Allen, 1991) so they were included in the analyses.

1.4.1 Demographics/Personal Characteristics:

When studying about the antecedents of commitment, research frequently include demographics/personal characteristics. Most of the studies include personal variables as a group (Lambert et al., 2008; Lambert & Paoline, 2008; Salami, 2008) while some others focus on one or two of them (Cohen, 1993). Total explained variance by personal variables (e.g., age, gender, education) in commitment was generally found to be low (e.g., Lambert & Paoline, 2008). When demographics were taken together with organizational and job characteristics as antecedents, Lambert and Paoline (2008) found that only race, position and tenure (other personal variables are

education, age, gender, supervisor) significantly and negatively predicted organizational commitment.

Lambert, Hogan and Jiang (2008) has taken demographics and organizational structure variables to predict affective, moral (normative) and continuance commitment. The results showed that none of the personal characteristics predicted any dimension of commitment. Meyer et al. (2002) stated that age and tenure (i.e., organization and position) correlated positively, but weakly, with all three components of commitment (i.e., AC, CC, NC).

Education is a general measure of worth of employees, so employees with higher education level may have more job options. Having more options may weaken their moral and affective attachment, while increasing job expectations (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Iverson & Buttigieg, 1998; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990). In this regard, education is expected to be negatively related to all three types of commitment (i.e., AC, CC, NC). Accordingly, it exhibited a weak negative correlation with commitment in the meta analyses of Mathieu and Zajac (1990) and Meyer et al. (2002).

Cohen (1993) demonstrated that age and tenure relations with OC vary across employment stages and the OC-age relation was strongest for the earliest employment stage, whereas the OC-tenure relation was strongest for the latest stage. Tenure represents investments in the organization so this can exhibit positive relations with CC (Iverson & Buttigieg, 1998). Meyer et al. (2002) found that age and tenure (i.e., organization and position) correlated

positively, but weakly, with all three components of commitment in their meta analysis. In addition to those, Mathieu and Zajac (1990) stated that years spent in an organization also increases psychological attachment. Lambert and Paoline (2008) declared that increasing tenure led to decreased organizational commitment although the relationship was weak.

Age is also seen as representative of limited alternative opportunities and greater sunk costs in later years like tenure (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990). Age as an OC determinant is exposed to factors external to the organization in addition to the work itself (i.e., having to do with one's life and attitudes beyond those in a very specific work situation such as the organization) (Cohen, 1993). But there are many studies in which the results showed age didn't affect organizational commitment (e.g., Lambert et al., 2008; Lambert & Paoline, 2008). Mathieu and Zajac (1990) found a medium positive correlation between age and commitment in their meta-analysis.

According to various studies on this subject, there doesn't seem to be a difference between men and women in terms of organizational commitment (e.g., Lambert et al., 2008; Lambert & Paoline, 2008). Meyer et al. (2002) concluded that gender - organizational commitment correlations were very small whereas Mathieu and Zajac (1990) indicated that women were more committed than men although the magnitude of this effect was small. In line with these studies, in the present study I expected a very small or insignificant correlation between gender and organizational commitment.

1.4.2 Job Characteristics:

According to the literature, the components of commitment have different relationships with various antecedents. In addition to personal characteristics, job characteristics are other relevant variables. For example, Meyer and Allen (1991) proposed that equity, personal importance, feedback were more related to AC, receipt of benefits was more related to NC and alternatives and pension were more related to CC. They argued that the three components of commitment would develop in different ways and have different implications for job behavior. Reason for different relations was defined as their characterization by different mind-sets (Powell & Meyer, 2004). For instance, conditions that increase cost of leaving like side bets were believed to be determinant in development of continuance commitment whereas affective commitment was expected to be particularly sensitive to work experiences like job scope or organizational support. Social pressure was believed to be determinant in development of normative commitment. Additionally, we may consider affective and normative commitment as the attitudinal aspect of commitment and continuance commitment as the calculative aspect. In relation to this, Fornes et al. (2008) declared that the relations between antecedents (i.e., clarity of purpose, equity and fairness, empowerment, congruency, feedback and recognition, autonomy, and interesting work) and attitudinal measures were stronger than measures of the calculative commitment.

The antecedent job characteristics variables included in my study can be grouped under work attitudes/perceptions category those were stated to be mostly related to affective commitment by Meyer and Allen (1991). The following part gives details about the relationship of each proposed antecedent job characteristics variable with three components of commitment. These antecedents related to job/work characteristics are job variety/routinization, promotional opportunity, organizational fairness, and perceived organizational support.

1.4.2.1 Job Variety/Routinization:

Routinization is the degree to which job tasks are repetitive (Currivan, 1999) and the opposite concept is job variety. Some jobs have highly repetitive tasks whereas other jobs have a variety of tasks (Lambert & Paoline, 2008). Routinization in work place may cause boredom thus may lead to dissatisfaction in the job while increasing job variety may increase perceived ability to improve one's abilities and knowledge in different areas. In addition to those, an organization's failure to offer a wide range of tasks would decrease the perceived contributions of the organization in terms of knowledge and experience. Accordingly, this may inversely affect employees' perceived obligation to stay with the organization and their emotional attachment. But studies investigating routinization-commitment relationship have mixed results: Iverson and Buttigieg (1998) found that when jobs are

more routinized, employees' affective and normative commitment decrease while Gaertner (1999) reported that routinization was not related to organizational commitment. Currivan (1999) also found that routinization of jobs led to decreased organizational commitment. Lambert and Paoline (2008) investigated the relationship between job variety and overall organizational commitment that is conceptualized similar to affective dimension of commitment. The results revealed that increasing job variety resulted in increasing organizational commitment.

In line with the findings in the literature, I expect that as employees perform a number of different tasks in their organizations, they become more affectively and normatively attached to their organizations:

Hypothesis 1a: *Job variety is a positive predictor of affective and normative organizational commitment but not continuance commitment.*

1.4.2.2 Promotional Opportunity:

Promotional opportunity (chances) refers to the degree an employee perceives his or her chances to grow and be promoted within the organization and it deals with the fact that many workers seek more than just a job, but also a career that provides them opportunities to be promoted to new and challenging positions (Lambert et al., 2008). Gaertner (1999) found that promotional opportunity was directly related to organizational commitment over and above its impact on job satisfaction. Lambert and Paoline (2008)

reported it as the positive and strongest predictor of organizational commitment among various demographic, organizational and job characteristics. Lambert et al. (2008) examined promotional opportunity's relationship with different forms of commitment and the results revealed that it had positive predictive power in affective and agency commitment while it negatively affected continuance commitment. In addition to those, Iverson and Buttigieg (1998) found that it increased only affective commitment of employees among three forms of commitment.

In line with the findings in the literature, I expect that as employees believe that they have chance to promote, their affective commitment increases:

Hypothesis 1b: *Promotional opportunity is a positive predictor of affective organizational commitment but not normative and continuance commitment.*

1.4.2.3 Organizational Fairness (Justice):

Organizational fairness is also known in the literature as organizational justice. The vast majority of workers desire to be treated fairly by their employer. The concept was analysed as a single construct in some of the articles while many of them accepted organizational fairness as composed of distinct dimensions even though these dimensions are correlated. The dimensions of organizational fairness consist of distributive and procedural justice (Folger & Cropanzano, 1998) in addition to interactional justice that is

included as a third type of justice (Bies & Boag, 1986). Based on equity theory by Adams (1965), distributive justice was defined as the comparison result of input / output ratios by an individual with those of others that determines the level of fairness (Erdogan, 2002). It deals with the perception that organizational rewards and punishments are based fairly on the work efforts of a person. Procedural justice refers to the fairness of procedures by which performance is evaluated (Erdogan, 2002, p.557). And lastly interactional justice refers to the fairness during the relations between working parties and there is a disagreement about whether the interpersonal side of justice is part of procedural justice or is a distinct dimension of justice (Erdogan, 2002).

When defined as a single construct organizational fairness was described as the conditions of employment that lead individuals to believe they are being treated fairly or unfairly by their organization (Folger & Cropanzano, 1998). Distributive justice was found to be the strongest predictor of organizational commitment after job satisfaction and the relation was positive (Gaertner, 1999). Meyer et al. (2002) found that various forms of organizational justice (i.e., interactional justice, distributive justice and procedural justice) were positively related to affective and normative commitment but relationship with continuance commitment was negative and low.

In another study, Cheng and Stockdale (2003) grouped perceived equity, the same concept with organizational fairness, under affective

commitment antecedents and they found that it was able to predict affective commitment significantly and positively but unrelated to continuance and normative commitment. Parker and Kohlmeyer (2005) reported that unfair practices of the organization negatively predicted organizational commitment. Fairness in this study involved the allocation of organizational rewards like pay and promotions and what was important about this issue was conceptualized as the consistency of decisions taken for individuals.

Chughtai and Zafar (2006) conducted a study among University Teachers in Pakistani and results showed that both distributive justice and procedural justice - two dimensions of organizational justice – were significant predictors of organizational commitment explaining one third of the variance in commitment. As a more general concept, research by Lambert et al. (2008) explained that organizational fairness had significant effects on affective commitment, moral commitment and agency commitment, but insignificant effects on institutional and continuance commitment.

In line with this literature, I expect that if employees feel that they are fairly compensated or rewarded, keeping in view their qualifications and the amount of effort that they put in, and their job performance, they will be more committed to their organization. In light of these studies, the following hypothesis was formed:

Hypothesis 1c: *Organizational fairness is a positive predictor of affective and normative organizational commitment but not continuance commitment.*

1.4.2.4 Perceived Organizational Support (POS):

Perceived organizational support was defined as the extent to which employees perceive that the organization values their contributions and cares about their well being (Eisenberger, Fasolo, & Davis-Lamastro, 1990) and it is assumed to be a global belief that employees form concerning their valuation by the organization (Eisenberger, Aselage, Sucharski, & Jones, 2004).

Eisenberger, Aselage, Sucharski, and Jones (2004) pointed out that in order to meet socio-emotional needs and to assess the benefits of increased work effort, employees form a general perception concerning the extent to which the organization values their contributions and cares about their well-being (p.206). Such a definition holds that POS may foster affective organizational commitment by meeting employees' socio-emotional needs, such as the needs for esteem, approval, and emotional support (Eisenberger et al., 2004).

There are many studies on the effects of POS on organizational commitment (e.g., Eisenberger et al., 1990; Lee & Peccei, 2007; Loi et al., 2006; Meyer et al., 2002; Vandenberghe et al., 2004;). POS's direct relation to commitment (e.g., Rhoades, Eisenberger, & Armeli, 2001; Tansky & Cohen, 2001), mediating role of POS (e.g., Loi et al., 2006; Pazy & Ganzach, 2006) and relation between POS and commitment with possible mediators (e.g., Lee & Peccei, 2007) were investigated in different studies. Almost in all studies, POS was a positive predictor of commitment.

Loi, Hang-yue, and Foley (2006) found a positive relationship between POS and affective organizational commitment. Additionally, Eisenberger et al. (1990) study resulted in a positive relation between POS and affective commitment of employees. In this regard, they argued that employees with high perceived support express stronger feelings of affiliation and loyalty to the organization.

Of the work experience variables included in Meyer et al. (2002) analysis, perceived organizational support had the strongest positive correlation with affective commitment, normative commitment had lower but still high correlation but continuance commitment's relation was low and negative. Pazy and Ganzach (2006) investigated the relationship between POS and commitment with moderating effects of pay (fixed-variable and low-high pay contexts) and the results showed that in all contexts POS had significant effect on commitment. In another study, Mankjee, Hartzel, and Uys (2005) found a positive relationship between various antecedents of perceived organizational support and organizational commitment (mainly affective and normative), indicating that POS positively influenced organizational commitment.

These findings are consistent with Eisenberger et al.'s (1986) argument that organizations wanting affectively committed employees must demonstrate their own commitment by providing a supportive work environment. Among the things they can do to show support are to treat

employees fairly and provide strong leadership (Meyer et al., 2002).

Therefore:

Hypothesis 1d: *Perceived organizational support is a positive predictor of affective and normative organizational commitment but not continuance commitment.*

1.4.3 Organizational Fairness - Commitment Mediation by POS

There is sufficient literature about the positive relationship between dimensions of organizational fairness and organizational commitment and between POS and organizational commitment that presented when setting H1c and H1d. Loi et al. (2006) declared that fair procedures may imply the organization's respect of employees' rights that contribute positively to POS, fair outcome is probably perceived by employees as an organization's discretionary positive treatment to enhance POS and under the norm of reciprocity, employees with high POS would then have a feeling of obligation to repay the organization in terms of organizational commitment. So they proposed that POS would mediate procedural and distributive justice's relationship with affective organizational commitment and the result was supportive.

Rhoades, Eisenberger and Armeli (2001) found that POS mediated positive associations of procedural justice and affective commitment. Also in another study, Yoon and Thye (2002) investigated the mediating effects of job

satisfaction and POS between a set of variables and commitment and organizational support mediated the effects of communication, procedural and distributive justice on organizational commitment.

In light of H1c and H1d and the mentioned literature above, it could be expected that POS may mediate the relation between a more general concept that is organizational justice and organizational commitment. As it is the case that studies on POS - organizational commitment relationship generally focused on overall commitment or affective commitment and this overall commitment concept is generally close to affective commitment; I propose that POS will mediate the relationship between organizational fairness and affective organizational commitment.

Hypothesis 1e: *Organizational fairness - affective organizational commitment relationship will be mediated by POS.*

1.5 Consequences of Organizational Commitment

Most research demonstrates that organizational commitment can have positive consequences for the organization and the individual employee (e.g., Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Meyer et al., 2002). Various outcomes in relation to organizational commitment were examined in the literature like turnover intentions (e.g., Cheng & Stockdale, 2003; Cohen, 1991; Lu et al., 2002; Narimawati, 2007; Schwepker Jr., 2001); turnover (e.g., Cohen, 1991; Cohen, 2000; Cuskelly & Boag, 2001); absenteeism (e.g., Cohen, 2000; Meyer et al., 2002), withdrawal cognition (e.g., Meyer et al., 2002), acceptance of change

(e.g., Iverson & Buttigieg, 1998) and performance (e.g., Chen, Lin, Lu, & Tsao, 2007; Cohen, 1991). Among those consequences, turnover and absenteeism are examples of behavioural outcomes those can be measured with a longitudinal design. In this study, the focus is on turnover intentions which is an attitudinal consequence and job performance which is a behavioural outcome.

1.5.1 Turnover Intentions:

All studies about turnover try to answer the main research question as to why people voluntarily leave their jobs? Different variables' relation to turnover were investigated like wage (Munasinghe, 2002), perceived alternative employment opportunities, job satisfaction, justice (Khatri, Budhwar & Fern, 1999), perceived organizational support (Maertz Jr, Griffeth, Campbell, & Allen, 2007), and theories were developed to explain voluntary turnover like turnover model by Steers and Mowday (1981), unfolding model by Lee and Mitchell (1994) and job embeddness by Mitchell, Holtom, Lee, Sablinski, and Erez (2001).

It is a general view that commitment is a psychological state that characterizes the employees' relation with the organization, and has implications for the decision to leave or stay in the organization (Meyer & Allen, 1991). But actual turnover is more difficult to measure and intentions are consistently related to turnover behaviour and variance explained in

turnover by intentions is more than other affective or emotional responses (Loi et al., 2006). For this reason, turnover intentions is one such consequence that has been examined in relation to commitment in almost all the articles in this issue.

In most of the studies, relation of commitment to turnover intention or turnover investigated separately (e.g., Meyer et al., 2002) while in some other commitment's relation to turnover intentions and turnover intention's relation to actual turnover were investigated (e.g., Vandenberghe et al., 2004). Although focus and foci of commitment were not the same and there are some exceptions (e.g., Chen, 2006); in most of the studies the results were consistent (e.g., Cheng & Stockdale, 2001; Meyer et al., 2002). Strongly committed employees were significantly less likely than those with weaker commitment to express intention to leave the organization. And continuously, turnover intentions was found to lead to increased turnover rates (e.g., Jaros, 1997; Loi et al., 2006; Vandenberghe et al., 2004).

Jaros (1997) argued that finding the correct linkages between three components of commitment and turnover intentions is important because turnover intentions is the best predictor of actual turnover. As the antecedents of AC, NC and CC are different; the correct linkages would help managers to find the most useful ways to deal with turnover. The results of the study showed that each component of commitment was significantly and negatively related to turnover intentions—both at the same time and longitudinally. When we look at the strengths of their correlations with turnover intentions,

affective commitment's correlation with turnover intentions was significantly stronger than normative and continuance commitment. Consequently, he implied that for reducing voluntary turnover behavior organizations can indirectly affect (i.e., through turnover intentions) by inducing affective commitment.

Chughtai and Zafar (2006) studied organizational commitment's antecedents and consequences among University Teachers in Pakistani and the results revealed a negative relationship between commitment and turnover intentions. Schwepker Jr. (2001) found a negative relationship between organizational commitment and turnover intentions among sales managers, while Chen (2006) reported that flight attendants' turnover intentions were negatively affected by normative commitment and continuance commitment but not affective commitment. Powell and Meyer (2004) concluded that normative commitment was positively related to turnover intentions whilst affective commitment and continuance commitment both were negatively related to it.

Cheng and Stockdale (2001) found that, increases in all three dimensions of commitment lead to decreases in turnover intentions of employees but unexpectedly continuance commitment's relation was stronger. Turkish context also revealed similar results. Ok (2007) and Poyraz and Kama (2008) found that overall organizational commitment and turnover intentions were significant negative predictor of turnover intentions. Besides those studies, Wasti (2002) examined the effects of affective and continuance

commitment on turnover intentions in addition to several other outcomes among private sector employees in Turkey. Although the results were stronger for affective commitment, both dimensions significantly and negatively contributed to the prediction of turnover intentions.

In terms of different foci of commitment, Lu et al. (2002) found a significant negative correlation between professional commitment and turnover intentions. Chang et al. (2007) conducted a study to explore the relationship between three-component organizational/ occupational commitment and organizational/occupational turnover intention. They reported that strongest correlation (negative) was between affective occupational commitment and occupational turnover intention while normative organizational commitment predicted organizational turnover intention more stronger than affective organizational commitment.

Also Meyer et al. (2002) expected to find that all three dimensions of organizational commitment correlated negatively with turnover intentions and turnover in their meta analysis. Consequently, affective commitment correlated most strongly followed by normative and continuance commitment.

In line with the literature, the following hypothesis was formed:

Hypothesis 2: Affective organizational commitment is a stronger negative predictor of turnover intentions than continuance and normative organizational commitment.

1.5.2 Job Performance

Job performance is the most important dependent variable in industrial psychology and for all of the main applications of this branch of psychology, such as employee training and job redesign. The focus is almost always on improving job performance. This emphasis on job performance means that it is quite important how performance is defined. Historically, job performance has had as its central core on task activities. These kinds of activities are typically identified in job analyses that focus on tasks and estimate their importance, frequency, and the like (e.g., closing the sale for a sales job, filing project papers for a clerical job). Task performance can be defined as the proficiency with which these tasks are performed. Recently, there has been considerable interest in a class of job performance that contributes importantly to organizational effectiveness but falls outside the domain of task performance.

So researchers like Borman (2004), Borman and Motowidlo (1997), Brief and Motowidlo (1986) and Organ (1988) introduced concepts (i.e., organizational citizenship behaviour - OCB, prosocial organizational behaviour – POB, contextual performance) which emphasize cooperative and helpful behaviours that go beyond formal role prescriptions and important for activities in an organization (Borman & Penner, 1998). Among those concepts, emphasis in this study is on task – contextual performance distinction.

Task performance can be defined as the effectiveness with which job incumbents perform activities that contribute to the organization's technical core either directly by implementing a part of its technological process, or indirectly by providing it with needed materials or services (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993) or it can be defined as the proficiency with which these tasks are performed (Borman, 2004). Examples of task performance dimensions for an officer working in a public institution might include writing letters, attending meetings, preparing tables and reporting to higher level supervisors.

The contextual performance is different in a way that it contributes to organizational effectiveness in ways that shape the organizational, social, and psychological context that serves as the catalyst for task activities and processes (Borman & Motowidlo, 1997). In other words it doesn't contribute through the organization's core technical processes but it does maintain the broader organizational, social, and psychological environment in which the technical core must function (Motowidlo, Borman, & Schmit, 1997).

Contextual activities include volunteering to carry out task activities that are not formally part of the job, persisting with extra effort when necessary to complete tasks successfully; following reasonable organizational rules and procedures even when they are personally inconvenient; endorsing, supporting and defending organizational objectives and helping and cooperating with others in the organization to get tasks accomplished (Borman, 2004; Borman & Motowidlo, 1997). Those elements are argued to

be criterion elements because they can be distinguished from task activities, and they appear important for organizational effectiveness, with organizational and business trends likely to make contextual performance even more important in the future. Research shows that experienced supervisors consider contextual performance on the part of subordinates when making overall performance ratings. A consistent finding is that supervisors weight contextual performance approximately as highly as task performance in making these judgements (Borman & Motowidlo, 1997).

The employees' relationship with the organization as assessed via his/her level of affective organizational commitment is an important antecedent which needs more emphasis to directly influence job performance (Vandenberghe et al., 2004). Chen et al. (2007) found that affective commitment significantly increased job performance. Similarly, Narimawati (2007) found that commitment was a significant predictor of job performance.

Vandenberghe et al. (2004) found that commitment to the supervisor had a significant direct effect on job performance and organizational commitment significantly affected job performance through supervisor commitment. Besides that, there have been contradictory results about commitment performance relationship. Shaw, Delery, and Abdulla (2003) studied the effects of affective commitment level of employees on helping – a dimension of contextual performance with overall performance. They found that affective commitment was unrelated to overall performance while it predicted helping in the opposite direction.

Becker and Kernan (2003) conducted a study to investigate the effects of affective and continuance commitment with two types of commitment foci (i.e., supervisors and organization) in relation to in role performance and three dimensions of extra role performance – courtesy, civic virtue and loyal boosterism. Affective organizational commitment was related to loyal boosterism but continuance commitment to organizations was unrelated to performance.

Commitment-performance relationship was investigated in a number of meta analyses, also. Meyer et al. (2002) found that affective and normative commitment correlated positively, while continuance commitment correlated negatively with job performance. Also affective commitment's relation to organization citizenship behaviour was positive and higher than its relation to general job performance. As a general conclusion, it can be said that commitment differentiates between in role and extra role performance.

Ricketta (2002) conducted a meta analysis to examine attitudinal organizational commitment and job performance relationship. He reported that although mean correlation was not very high, correlation for extra role performance was stronger than in role performance. Wright and Bonett (2002) reported that with increasing tenure, organizational commitment and job performance relationship decreased. LePine, Erez, and Johnson (2002) also found in their meta - analysis that there is a strong relationship between overall OCB and organizational commitment.

How performance is measured is another important issue thus making comparability between studies more difficult. In most of the studies supervisory ratings preferred (e.g., Becker & Kernan, 2003; Narimawati, 2007; Uygur, 2007) while some of them used self evaluations (e.g., Chughtai & Zafar, 2006; Siu, 2003) or more objective measures like change in operating profit (e.g., Benkhoff, 1997) in addition to the studies using more than one method to make a comparison (e.g., Restubog, Bordia, & Tang, 2006). Meyer et al. (2002) found that affective commitment correlated more strongly with supervisory ratings than self-ratings of performance. Also in another analysis, Mathieu and Zajac (1990) investigated performance – commitment relationship by using both others' (i.e., subordinates, peers and mainly supervisors) ratings of performance and output measures of performance. They concluded in that commitment's relationship with performance were low for both of the sources but others' ratings had higher correlation.

Benkhoff (1997) used three different measures to evaluate performance (i.e., overall sales target, subtarget for private settings, change in operating profit) and five different measures to evaluate commitment (i.e., Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) of Porter et al. (1974), Commitment Behaviour Scale (CBS) for self evaluations and evaluating superiors, and Hard Work Sub-scale of CBS for self evaluations and evaluating superiors). He found that the significant commitment scales (i.e., OCQ, CBS-superior, and Hard Work-self) were only linked to one outcome

variable each and accordingly he argued the importance of selecting appropriate performance measures and defining commitment. Riketta (2002) found in his meta analysis that correlation between objective indicators and self rated performance was stronger than its correlation with supervisory rated performance.

Stephens, Dawley and Stephens (2004) investigated effects of volunteer directors' levels of organizational commitment on self reported performance. The results indicated that normative and affective commitment enhanced self-reported performance while performance had the strongest correlation with affective commitment. Rodwell, Kienzle, and Shadur (1998) and Chughtai and Zafar (2006) also used self reports and they found a significant relationship between organizational commitment and performance.

Meyer, Paunonen, Gellatly, Goffin, and Jackson (1989) investigated affective and normative commitment's relationship with supervisory rated performance. The results showed that affective commitment correlated positively and continuance commitment correlated negatively with performance measures.

In Turkish context, Bilgiç (in press) conducted a study to examine the relationship between organizational commitment and perceived performance with the participation of 182 employees from different work places. The results showed that although organizational commitment significantly predicted performance, it was not strong. Wasti (2002) examined the effects of affective and continuance commitment on organizational citizenship in

addition to several other outcomes among private sector employees in Turkey. Affective commitment significantly and positively predicted organizational citizenship while continuance commitment was not a significant predictor of it. Uygur (2007) conducted a study in Turkish banking sector and the study illustrated a positive and significant direct relation between organizational commitment and performance.

Cho and Johanson (2008) investigated the relationships among organizational commitment, OCB and employee performance. The findings of the study showed that commitment had a significant relationship with citizenship behaviors. Additionally, Restubog et al. (2006) pointed out that organizational commitment may predict extra role or citizenship performance better than in-role or task performance.

In most of the studies, commitment was positively related to performance. When there was not a distinction between task and contextual performance, the scales were appropriate for measuring performance related to the job descriptions of employees that is task performance. In cases, overall performance or dimensions of performance (i.e., task and contextual performance) were measured in relation to commitment; both task and contextual performance were related to it. Some studies generated stronger relations for contextual performance. When employees are committed to their organizations, they will engage in behaviors of helping coworkers, voicing opinions and suggestions to improve work, paying extra attention to their work, and showing loyalty toward their employers (Cho & Johanson, 2008).

And, if the organization fails to deliver its psychological contract obligations, employees would feel demoralized, which severely hurts their commitment. This in turn would lead to a reduction in extra role behaviours (Restubog et al., 2006). As Meyer et al. (2002) and Powell and Meyer (2004) argued, affective commitment is expected to have the strongest positive correlation with desirable work behaviors (e.g., attendance, job performance and OCB) followed by normative commitment and lastly continuance commitment is expected to be unrelated or negatively related to these behaviors. In light of these studies:

Hypothesis 3: Both affective and normative organizational commitment are stronger predictors of contextual performance than task performance.

CHAPTER 2

METHOD

2.1 Overview

The purpose of this study was to examine some antecedents and consequences of organizational commitment. So, the relationship between three dimensions of organizational commitment (i.e., affective, normative and continuance commitment) and job characteristics, namely job variety, promotional opportunity, organizational fairness, and perceived organizational support were examined. Personal characteristics (i.e., education, age, tenure, gender) information was also collected to control their effect on organizational commitment. Two dimensions of performance (i.e., task and contextual performance) and turnover intentions were proposed as consequences of several aspects of organizational commitment. Furthermore, possible mediation between organizational fairness - affective organizational commitment relationship by perceived organizational support was also examined.

The present study had two phases. In the first phase, a pilot study for investigating the psychometric qualities of the measures used in this study, was conducted. Then, the proposed models were tested in the main study.

2.2 Pilot Study

The aim of the pilot study was to examine the measures of proposed antecedents (i.e., job variety, promotional opportunity, organizational fairness and perceived organizational support) and consequences of organizational commitment (i.e., turnover intentions and performance). The scales were translated from English to Turkish. In this process, three graduate psychology students translated the scales separately and then most appropriate translation of each item was selected by the thesis advisor. And lastly, back translations were done by a graduate psychology student to cross check the translations. When translating the scales, conceptual and linguistic equivalences were maintained.

Although there were Turkish versions of organizational commitment scales, they were also included in the pilot study. After this process, the reliabilities of the scales were examined. Because of the difficulties in collecting data from supervisors, supervisory performance scale was not included in the pilot study.

2.2.1. Participants

Forty five employees working in various public institutions participated in the pilot study and return rate was 64.3 % (45 out of 70). Twenty two of the participants were women (% 48.9), twenty two of the

participants were men (% 48.9) and one of the participants didn't indicate his/her sex (% 2.2). The mean age of the participants were 27.9 ranging from 23 to 42 with a standard deviation of 3.13. Of the participants, % 77.8 were graduated from a university, % 20 had a masters degree and and % 2.2 of the participants didn't indicate education level. The mean tenure of the participants in the organization was 3.44 years (SD = 3.26, ranging from 3 months to 19 years) and mean lifetime tenure was 4.03 years (SD = 3.21, ranging from 3 months to 19 years).

2.2.2. Procedure

Questionnaires consisting all measures were distributed to the several public institutions in Ankara based on availability by the author via e-mail and as hard copies. Subjects were informed about the voluntary nature of the participation in the study, the purpose and the process of the study. It is also assured that the responses will be confidential. They were given two weeks to complete the questionnaire.

2.2.3 Measures

The questionnaire used in the pilot study was composed of nine sections: organizational commitment, job variety, promotional opportunity, organizational fairness, perceived organizational support, turnover intentions

and performance. The questionnaire filled by the employees in the pilot study is provided in Appendix A.

Organizational commitment

The questionnaire was originally developed by Meyer, Allen, and Smith (1993). The revised version of the scale includes 18 items related to affective, normative, and continuance commitment components of commitment to the organization. The response items ranged from 1–Strongly disagree to 7–Strongly agree. Buka (2005) reported the reliability values as .77 for the affective component, .78 for the normative component, and .70 for the continuance component of the scale and .85 for organizational commitment scale as a whole in Albania.

The scale was adapted to Turkish by Wasti (1999) and she added 15 items to the 18 original items rated on a 7-point scale (1 = Strongly disagree, 7 = Strongly agree). In one study Wasti (2005) reported reliability values as .78 for the affective component, .80 for the normative component, and .61 for the continuance component of the scale with a total of 18-items. In this study, adapted version of the originally developed scale by Meyer et al. (1993) that included 18-item and rated on a 7-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly disagree, 7 = Strongly agree) was used.

Job variety

This instrument was a 5-point Likert type scale (1 = Strongly disagree, 5 = Strongly agree) including items related to perceived job variety of employees in the work place. These four items were originally developed by Curry et al. (1986) and adapted in the study of Lambert and Paoline (2008). Lambert and Paoline (2008) reported in their study that the scale had a reliability value of .65.

Promotional opportunity

This instrument was a 5-point Likert type scale ranging from 1- Strongly disagree to 5 - Strongly agree including five items. These items aimed to measure whether there is opportunity to promote or not. They were derived from Curry et al. (1986) and used in Lambert and Paoline (2008) study. This five item scale was reported to have an alpha value of .84 (Lambert & Paoline, 2008)

Organizational fairness

Employees' fairness perceptions in their organization were measured by a five item scale. The response options ranged from 1 = Strongly disagree to 5 = Strongly agree. Items of the scale were adapted from the scale used in the study of Lambert, Hogan, and Jiang (2008) and they reported the reliability value as .68.

Perceived organizational support

A scale developed by Eisenberger in 1984 were used to measure perceived organizational support. This instrument was a 7-point Likert type scale (1 = Strongly disagree, 7 = Strongly agree) including 8 items related to employee's perceived support in the organization. The original scale has 36 items but in this study "shortened version" consisting of 8 items was used.

Turnover intentions

Turnover intentions was measured by a five-item scale that was developed by Walsh, Ashford, and Hill (1985) and used in the study of Buka (2005). The measure ranged from 1-Very unlikely to 7-Highly likely. In the study of Buka (2005), the reported reliability alpha of the scale was .81.

Performance

A 5-point Likert type scale ranging from 1 = Strongly disagree to 5 = Strongly agree was used for self evaluations of performances by employees. The scale consisted of 14 items. 11 of the items in the study were used in the study of Karakurum (2005) and 3 items were developed for this study.

Performance of employees was measured in two dimensions: task performance and contextual performance and separate items were used for measuring these dimensions. Turkish-translation of 4 items developed by Beffort and Hattrup (2003) and 2 items developed by Karakurum (2005) were used for measuring task performance. On the other hand, 5 items were

developed for measuring contextual performance. Each item corresponds to the five aspects of contextual performance defined by Borman and Motowidlo (1993) (in Karakurum 2005, p.49-50). Karakurum (2005) reported reliability level of alpha as .81 for task performance (6 items) and .80 for contextual performance (5 items) and .85 for overall performance.

Demographic information.

The demographic information section of the instrument included questions on gender, age, educational level, tenure in the organization and total lifetime tenure.

2.3 Main Study

The aim of the main study was to test the proposed hypotheses.

2.3.1. Participants

A hundred and seventy five employees working in various public institutions participated in the main study and return rate was 54.7 % (175 out of 320). Seventy one of the participants were women (% 40.6), 98 of the participants were men (% 56) and six of the participants didn't indicate his/her sex (% 3.4). The mean age of the participants were 29 ranging from 23 to 50 with a standard deviation of 5.4. Of the participants, % 64.6 (113

employees) had a college/university degree, % 28.6 (50 employees) had a masters degree, % 2.9 (5 employees) had a doctoral degree, and % 4 (7 employees) didn't indicate their education level. The mean tenure in the organization was 4.2 years (SD = 5.4, ranging from 2 months to 30 years) and mean lifetime tenure was 5.2 years (SD = 5.6, ranging from 3 months to 30 years).

The performance data were collected from supervisors for fifty nine employees. Totally, twenty four supervisors participated in the study. They provided data for one employee to eight employees. Twenty two of the supervisors had a master's degree and two of the supervisors had a doctor's degree. The mean tenure in the organization was 11.5 years (SD = 3.8 ranging from 3 years to 19.5 years) and mean lifetime tenure was 13.5 years (SD = 3.6 ranging from 8 years to 23 years).

2.3.2. Procedure

After the University Ethical Committee's permission, same procedure in the pilot study was used in the main study. Additionally, questionnaires measuring employees' performance were distributed to supervisors of the employees based on availability.

It is important to note that although confidentiality of the responses were assured, participants hesitated to fill the questionnaires. Especially, when they were informed about the supervisory performance ratings, some

employees clearly stated their reluctance to participate in the study. Also, some supervisors didn't want to fill the performance questionnaires as they expressed their discomfortability for the confidentiality although they were assured about the issue. For this reason, supervisory ratings were limited in the analyses.

2.3.3. Measures

Main study included the same measures in the pilot study without dropping any items, namely organizational commitment, job variety, promotional opportunity, organizational fairness, perceived organizational support, turnover intentions, self performance and demographic information. Only the briefing part was different as questionnaire for supervisory performance was added in the main study. It can be seen in Appendix B. The questionnaire filled by the supervisors in the main study is also provided in Appendix C.

In addition to those measures, there was a separate scale to measure supervisors' performance ratings for each employee. The scale was used in the study of Becker and Kernan (2003) to measure both task and contextual performance. There were 20 items in the scale, 7 of the items measuring task performance and 13 of the items measuring contextual performance. Two of the items related to contextual performance were eliminated as they were inappropriate for public institutions those were "Encourages friends and

family to utilize organization products” and “Actively promotes the organization’s products and services to potential users”.

Items developed to measure courtesy, civic virtue, and loyal boosterism were summed up to form a single scale to measure contextual performance. Responses were given on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 - Strongly disagree to 7 - Strongly agree. In the present study, the first point was to collect performance data only from supervisors and it was decided to use the scale presented above. Then, a performance scale used in Turkish context to measure self performance was investigated in the study of Karakurum (2005) and this scale was added to the present study. Because of this reason, there were two separate scales to measure self and supervisory performance.

As it was in the pilot study, the scales were translated from English to Turkish. In this process, three graduate psychology students translated the scales separately and then most appropriate translation of each item was selected by the thesis advisor. And lastly, back translations were done by a graduate psychology student to cross check the translations. When translating the scales, conceptual and linguistic equivalences were maintained.

CHAPTER 3

RESULTS

3.1. Pilot Study

Factor analyses were not conducted for the scales as the sample size in the pilot study was inadequate.

Overall descriptive statistics together with reliabilities for the scales in the pilot study are presented in the Table 1:

Table 1:

Descriptive Statistics of the Scales in the Pilot Study

	Number of item	Cronbach alpha	Mean	SD	Min.	Max.
Org. C.*	18	.81	3.51	.90	1.83	5.72
Aff. C.	6	.86	3.47	1.43	1.00	6.50
Nor. C.	6	.78	3.10	1.38	1.00	5.67
Con. C.	6	.57	3.98	1.17	2.00	6.17
Job Variety**	4	.64	3.11	.69	2.00	4.50
Prom. Opp.**	5	.78	2.70	.78	1.00	4.60
Org. Fairness**	5	.80	2.76	.79	1.00	4.20
POS*	8	.87	2.87	1.14	1.00	6.25
Turn. Int.*	5	.90	4.10	1.68	1.20	7.00
Self Perf.**	14	.79	3.52	.49	2.20	4.80
Task P.	9	.74	3.56	.52	2.50	4.80
Contex. P.	5	.71	3.46	.72	1.40	4.80

* 7 point Likert type scale

** 5 point Likert type scale

Org. C. = Organizational Commitment, Aff. C. = Affective Commitment, Nor. C. = Normative Commitment, Con. C. = Continuance Commitment, Prom. Opp. = Promotional Opportunity, Org. Fairness = Organizational Fairness, POS = Perceived Organizational Support, Turn Int.= Turnover Intentions, Self Perf.= Self Performance, Task P. = Task Performance, Contex. P.= Contextual Performance.

When internal consistency reliabilities were analysed, reliability was satisfactory ($\alpha = .81$ with 18 items) for overall organizational commitment. For the three dimensions of organizational commitment, reliabilities for affective and normative commitment were also satisfactory which were .86 (6 items) and .78 (6 items) respectively. But reliability for continuance commitment was not very good ($\alpha = .57$ with 6 items).

For job variety, reliability was found to be .64 (4 items). But when 4th item that is “I get to do a number of different things on my job” was deleted, reliability of the scale increased to .83 (3 items). For promotional opportunity, reliability was found to be satisfactory ($\alpha = .78$ with 5 items). For organizational fairness, reliability was found to be satisfactory ($\alpha = .80$ with 5 items). For perceived organizational support, reliability was quite satisfactory ($\alpha = .87$ with 8 items). For turnover intentions, reliability was quite satisfactory ($\alpha = .90$ with 5 items). And lastly, for performance as a whole, reliability was satisfactory ($\alpha = .79$ with 14 items).

According to the results of the pilot study, the scales had acceptable reliabilities but with respect to the results of the main study deletion of above mentioned item in job variety scale was considered.

3.1.1. Intercorrelations Between Variables

After the reliability analyses, variables were computed from the means and intercorrelations between the variables were examined.

Among the correlations between commitment variables, only affective – normative commitment relationship was significant ($r = .589, p < .01$).

Turnover intentions was correlated negatively and significantly with affective and normative commitment while correlation with continuance commitment was not significant. Commitment variables' were not significantly correlated with self-rated task performance while affective ($r = .482, p < .01$) and normative commitment ($r = .519, p < .01$) were significantly correlated with contextual performance.

Antecedent variables were significantly correlated to both affective and normative commitment but their relationships with affective commitment were found to be stronger. Highest correlation was between affective commitment and promotional opportunity ($r = .644, p < .01$). Antecedent variables' correlations with self-rated task performance were not significant while job variety ($r = .335, p < .05$) and perceived organizational support ($r = .529, p < .01$) were significantly correlated to contextual performance. And finally they were all correlated negatively and significantly with turnover intentions and the highest correlation was between promotional opportunity and turnover intentions ($r = -.610, p < .01$).

3.2. Main Study

3.2.1. Overview

First of all, data cleaning was performed to eliminate out of range values, possible wrong entries and dealing with missing variables according to the principles suggested in Tabachnick and Fidell (2007). Then confirmatory factor analyses and reliability analyses were conducted. New variables were computed from the means of the items to be used in the later regression analyses.

3.2.2 Cleaning the Data

Firstly descriptives were checked to detect wrong entries and plausible standard deviations. One case had a very high standard Z score in age, “tenure in the organization” and “total lifetime tenure” but it was retained in the analysis as age and tenure are significant predictors of continuance commitment (e.g., Cohen, 1993). After that, Mahalanobis’ distance values were checked to identify multivariate outliers. One multivariate outlier was deleted accordingly.

Missing values in “tenure in the organization” and “total lifetime tenure“ variables were more than 5 % of the data and missing values in other variables were low. Random missing values in other variables were replaced

by expectation maximization method. Two cases with more than 50 % missing variables were deleted further from the study.

3.2.3 Factor Analysis and Reliabilities

Although there is clear evidence for three-dimensional structure of commitment (Meyer & Allen, 1991; Wasti, 2000), confirmatory factor analysis was conducted for three factor model of organizational commitment in addition to one factor model. The results for the two models were not very satisfactory but three factor model resulted in a better fit so it was retained in the further analyses. The confirmatory factor analyses of organizational commitment scale comparing one versus three factor structure is presented in Table 1 in Appendix D.

For testing the two factor structure (i.e., task and contextual) of self performance scale and supervisory performance scale and comparing the results with one factor structure, confirmatory factor analyses were conducted. The fit of both two factor and one factor model was very poor for supervisory performance scale while two factor solution was found to be better than one factor solution for self performance scale. For both self and supervisory performance scales, two factor models were retained in the analyses. Table 2 and Table 3 in Appendix D show the results of the analyses.

After analysing the factor structures, reliabilities of the scales were analysed. All the reliabilities were found to be satisfactory except job variety

scale. The reliability for these scale were also low in the pilot study. Internal consistency reliability for job variety was .65 with 4 items, but deletion of 4th item increased its reliability to .76. In the remaining analysis, 4th item of job variety that is “I get to do a number of different things on my job” was excluded. Overall descriptive statistics together with reliabilities for the scales are presented in the Table 2.

Table 2:
Descriptive Statistics of the Scales in the Main Study

	Number of item	Cronbach alpha	Mean	SD	Min.	Max.
Org. C.*	18	.80	3.88	.92	1.67	5.72
Aff. C.	6	.88	4.24	1.51	1.00	7.00
Nor. C.	6	.80	3.68	1.38	1.00	7.00
Con. C.	6	.70	3.73	1.17	1.17	6.67
Job Variety**	3	.76	2.92	.93	1.00	5.00
Prom. Opp.**	5	.80	2.88	.90	1.00	5.00
Org. Fairness**	5	.84	2.96	.85	1.00	5.00
POS*	8	.88	3.38	1.21	1.00	6.88
Turn. Int.*	5	.90	3.50	1.63	1.00	7.00
Self Perf.**	14	.88	3.74	.58	1.74	5.00
Task P.	9	.88	3.82	.62	1.78	5.00
Contex. P.	5	.75	3.59	.72	1.20	5.00
Superv.P.*	18	.94	5.85	.79	2.78	6.94
Task P.	7	.89	6.27	.78	3.29	7.00
Contex. P.	11	.91	5.60	.84	2.45	7.00

* 7 point Likert type scale

** 5 point Likert type scale

Org. C. = Organizational Commitment, Aff. C. = Affective Commitment,
 Nor. C. = Normative Commitment, Con. C. = Continuance Commitment,
 Prom. Opp. = Promotional Opportunity, Org. Fairness = Organizational
 Fairness, POS = Perceived Organizational Support, Turn Int.= Turnover
 Intentions, Self Perf.= Self Performance, Superv. P.= Supervisory
 Performance, Task P. = Task Performance, Contex. P.= Contextual
 Performance.

3.2.4 Intercorrelations Between Variables

For investigating the relations among antecedents, consequences and commitment, bivariate correlations between those variables were analysed. Results are presented in Table 3. Affective organizational commitment had low but significant correlation with tenure in the organization ($r = -.23, p < .01$) and lifetime tenure ($r = -.20, p < .05$). Antecedent variables all had positive and high correlations with affective organizational commitment with the highest correlation between POS and affective commitment ($r = .66, p < .01$).

Normative organizational commitment was not correlated significantly with any of the demographic variables. It also had positive but lower correlations with antecedent variables when compared to affective organizational commitment.

Continuance organizational commitment's relations with demographic variables were not very high but significant for all variables except education level. Its relations with promotional opportunity, organizational fairness and perceived organizational support were low and negative.

For the antecedent variables as a whole it can be said that as employees' job variety, promotional opportunity, organizational fairness and support perceptions increase, their affective and normative organizational commitment also increase. On the contrary, increasing promotional opportunity, organizational fairness and support perceptions decrease continuance organizational commitment.

When the relations between dimensions of organizational commitment were analysed, correlation was positive and significant for affective and normative organizational commitment relationship ($r = .70, p < .01$). The correlation was negatively low but significant for affective and continuance organizational commitment relationship ($r = -.17, p < .05$).

Correlations between antecedent variables were all significant and positive with the highest correlation between organizational fairness and perceived organizational support ($r = .72, p < .01$). Regarding the relationship between commitment and turnover intentions, affective and normative organizational commitment were negatively and significantly correlated with turnover intentions ($r = -.75, p < .01$ and $r = -.64, p < .01$ respectively) while continuance organizational commitment was not significantly correlated.

Self rated contextual performance relationship with affective organizational commitment was stronger than its relationship with self rated task performance ($r = .52, p < .01$ and $r = .17, p < .05$, respectively). Normative organizational commitment also had a moderate positive correlation with self rated contextual performance ($r = .51, p < .01$).

Task and overall supervisory rated performance were not significantly correlated with three dimensions or overall commitment but contextual performance was found to be positively and significantly correlated with overall commitment ($r = .34, p < .05$). This finding implies that as overall commitment of an employee increases, contextual performance also increases.

Table 3
Intercorrelations Between Variables

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1 Gender	1									
2 Age	-.224**	1								
3 Education	-.052	.065	1							
4 Partial Tenure	-.319**	.878**	.007	1						
5 Total Tenure	-.306**	.938**	.041	.948**	1					
6 Affective Orgal Commitment	.141	-.130	.040	-.227**	-.195*	1				
7 Normative Orgal Commitment	.071	-.033	.033	-.090	-.081	.698**	1			
8 Continuance Orgal Commitment	-.302**	.287**	.065	.358**	.337**	-.173*	-.099	1		
9 Overall Orgal Commitment	-.014	.032	.066	-.020	-.006	.830**	.847**	.279**	1	
10 Job Variety	-.024	-.037	.068	-.104	-.052	.495**	.479**	-.042	.481**	1
11 Promotional Opportunity	.247**	-.312**	-.096	-.367**	-.373**	.625**	.468**	-.229**	.492**	.337**
12 Orgal Fairness	.118	-.283**	.044	-.328**	-.329**	.632**	.523**	-.175*	.536**	.433**
13 Perceived Orgal Support	.176*	-.164*	.062	-.261**	-.236**	.657**	.595**	-.216**	.571**	.486**
14 Turnover Int	-.087	.082	.041	.167*	.147	-.746**	-.644**	.099	-.687**	-.471**
15 Task Perf - Self	-.084	.108	.295**	.123	.094	.171*	.118	.009	.156*	.206**
16 Contex Perf - Self	-.007	-.017	.199**	-.014	-.043	.518**	.508**	-.094	.507**	.356**
17 Overall Self Perf	-.060	.066	.291**	.078	.045	.350**	.314**	-.036	.335**	.300**
18 Task Perf - Supervisor	-.322*	-.134	-.191	-.054	-.122	.156	.100	.210	.220	-.023
19 Contex Perf- Supervisor	-.358*	-.034	-.313*	-.056	-.120	.216	.290	.176	.338*	-.059
20 Overall SupervPerf	-.360*	-.073	-.279	-.057	-.126	.203	.231	.197	.309	-.047

Note. ** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed), * Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed). Correlation Matrix is based on listwise deletion. Scale values for the scales: Gender: 1= Women, 2= Men; Education level: 1=Primary-secondary school, 2=High school, 3=University, 4=Master's degree, 5=Doctoral degree; Organizational commitment, Perceived organizational support, Supervisory performance: 1 = Strongly disagree, 7 = Strongly agree; Job variety, Promotional opportunity, Organizational fairness, Self performance: 1 = Strongly disagree, 5 = Strongly agree; Turnover intentions: 1=Very unlikely, 7=Highly likely.

Table 3 *continued*

	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
11 Promotional Opportunity	1									
12 Orgal Fairness	.694**	1								
13 Perceived Orgal Support	.598**	.722**	1							
14 Turnover Int	-.632**	-.626**	-.669**	1						
15 Task Perf - Self	.097	.271**	.195*	-.107	1					
16 Contex Perf - Self	.287**	.435**	.477**	-.388**	.539**	1				
17 Overall Self Perf	.200**	.381**	.348**	-.247**	.925**	.818**	1			
18 Task Perf - Supervisor	-.012	.316*	.068	.013	-.213	-.088	-.204	1		
19 Contex Perf- Supervisor	.087	.194	.081	-.101	-.279	.082	-.180	.818**	1	
20 Overall SupervPerf	.053	.316*	.080	-.062	-.198	.020	-.198	.925**	.975**	1

Note. ** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed), * Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed). Correlation Matrix is based on listwise deletion. Scale values for the scales: Gender: 1= Women, 2= Men; Education level: 1=Primary-secondary school, 2=High school, 3=University, 4=Master's degree, 5=Doctoral degree; Organizational commitment, Perceived organizational support, Supervisory performance: 1 = Strongly disagree, 7 = Strongly agree; Job variety, Promotional opportunity, Organizational fairness, Self performance: 1 = Strongly disagree, 5 = Strongly agree; Turnover intentions: 1-Very unlikely, 7-Highly likely.

3.2.5. Regression Analyses

There were two main purposes of this study which were investigating the role of antecedent variables namely job variety, promotional opportunity, organizational fairness and perceived organizational support on three dimensions of organizational commitment (i.e., affective, normative and continuance commitment) and examining the role of these three dimensions of organizational commitment on turnover intentions and two dimensions of performance namely task and contextual performance. Moreover, perceived organizational support's possible mediation effect between organizational fairness and affective organizational commitment was analyzed. For these purposes, linear regression analyses were conducted to identify control variables for each dependent variable. And then, several linear and hierarchical regression analyses were conducted.

3.2.5.1. Prediction of Affective, Normative, Continuance and Overall Organizational Commitment from Antecedent Variables

The results of the linear regression analyses for the affective, normative, continuance and overall commitment variables revealed that among the five demographic variables:

- (i) none of the demographic variables significantly predicted affective and normative organizational commitment in addition to overall organizational commitment.
- (ii) only gender was found to significantly predict continuance organizational commitment ($\beta = -.198, p < .05$).

As demographic variables didn't significantly predict affective, normative and overall organizational commitment, there was no control variables. So linear regression analyses were conducted for these commitment variables. But as gender significantly predicted continuance commitment, it was included as a control variable in the hierarchical regression analysis for the prediction of continuance commitment.

Linear regression analysis for affective organizational commitment variable yielded following results. Job variety ($\beta = .203, p < .01$), promotional opportunity ($\beta = .305, p < .001$) and perceived organizational support ($\beta = .298, p < .001$) were found to be significant predictors ($R^2 = .557$). Only organizational fairness was insignificant. Results related to this regression analysis are presented in Table 4.

Table 4:

Linear Regression Analysis for Prediction of Affective Organizational Commitment

	beta	t	R ²
Job Variety	.203**	3.438	.557
Promotional Opportunity	.305***	4.187	
Organizational Fairness	.113	1.347	
Perceived Organizational Support	.298***	3.787	

Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

Linear regression analysis for normative organizational commitment variable yielded the following results. Job variety ($\beta = .229, p < .01$) and perceived organizational support ($\beta = .358, p < .001$) were found to be significant predictors ($R^2 = .426$). Results related to this regression analysis are presented in Table 5.

Table 5:

Linear Regression Analysis for Prediction of Normative Organizational Commitment

	beta	t	R ²
Job Variety	.229**	3.409	.426
Promotional Opportunity	.138	1.664	
Organizational Fairness	.072	.749	
Perceived Organizational Support	.358***	3.994	

Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

For continuance commitment, a hierarchical regression analysis was conducted. In the first step, the only control variable gender was found to be a significant predictor of continuance commitment ($\beta = -.322, p < .001$). In the

second step, antecedent variables were entered into the analysis. It was found that only gender ($\beta = -.272, p < .01$) variable significantly contributed to the prediction of continuance commitment and none of the antecedent variables significantly predicted continuance commitment ($R^2 = .138$). Results related to this regression analysis are presented in Table 6.

Table 6:

Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Prediction of Continuance Organizational Commitment

	β	t	R^2	R^2 Change	F Change
Step 1 – Demo. V.			.104	.104	19.172***
Gender	-.322***	-4.379			
Step 2 – Ante. V.			.138	.034	1.595
Gender	-.272**	-3.529			
Job Variety	.039	.461			
Prom.al Opp.	-.084	-.799			
Org.al Fairness	-.008	-.069			
POS	-.136	-1.218			

Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

Demo. V. = Demographic Variables, Ante. V. = Antecedent Variables, Prom.al Opp.= Promotional Opportunity, Org.al Fairness = Organizational Fairness, Perceived Organizational Support

For overall organizational commitment variable, linear regression analysis yielded the following results. Job variety ($\beta = .260, p < .01$) and perceived organizational support ($\beta = .270, p < .001$) were found to be significant predictors of it ($R^2 = .422$). Additionally, promotional opportunity was marginally significant ($\beta = .164, p < .051$). Results related to this regression analysis are presented in Table 7.

Table 7:

Linear Regression Analysis for Prediction of Overall Organizational Commitment

	βeta	t	R ²
Job Variety	.260***	3.863	.422
Promotional Opportunity	.164	1.974	
Organizational Fairness	.114	1.188	
Perceived Organizational Support	.270***	2.998	

Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

In sum, job variety was found to be a positive predictor of both affective and normative organizational commitment while it was found to be unrelated to continuance organizational commitment. Hence, hypothesis 1a was fully supported. Promotional opportunity significantly predicted affective organizational commitment but it was not a significant predictor of normative and continuance organizational commitment. For this reason, hypothesis 1b was fully supported, too. Organizational fairness didn't predict any of the dimensions of organizational commitment significantly, so hypothesis 1c was not supported. But high correlation between organizational fairness and perceived organizational support ($r = .72, p < .01$) may be the reason of this result. And lastly, perceived organizational support was found to be a positive predictor of both affective and normative organizational commitment while it was found to be unrelated to continuance organizational commitment. So hypothesis 1d was fully supported.

3.2.5.2. Investigating the possible mediation of organizational fairness - affective organizational commitment relationship by perceived organizational support

To test the hypotheses stating that “Organizational fairness - affective organizational commitment relationship will be mediated by perceived organizational support (POS)” (Hypothesis 1e), procedures suggested by Baron and Kenny (1986) were used.

In the first step, initial variable’s possible correlation with the outcome was examined to see if there is a significant relation to be mediated (Baron and Kenny, 1986). So organizational fairness was regressed on affective organizational commitment and it was found to significantly predict affective organizational commitment ($\beta = .623, p < .001$). % 38.8 of the variance in affective organizational commitment was explained by organizational fairness.

In the second step, initial variable’s possible correlation with the mediator was examined (Baron and Kenny, 1986). So organizational fairness was regressed on perceived organizational support, and it significantly predicted perceived organizational support ($\beta = .718, p < .001$). Additionally, more than % 50 of the variance in perceived organizational support was explained by organizational fairness ($R^2 = .516$).

In the third step, mediator’s affect on the outcome variable was investigated (Baron and Kenny, 1986). So perceived organizational support

was regressed on affective organizational commitment, and it significantly predicted affective organizational commitment ($\beta = .660, p < .001$).

Additionally, % 43,5 of the variance in affective organizational commitment was explained by perceived organizational support ($R^2 = .435$).

And finally in the last step, both organizational fairness and perceived organizational support were regressed on affective organizational commitment for establishing the complete or partial mediation of the relationship. The results of the analysis revealed that along with POS ($\beta = .438, p < .001$), organizational fairness ($\beta = .308, p < .001$) was still a significant predictor of affective organizational commitment ($R^2 = .481$).

Additionally, Sobel test was conducted to see whether the indirect effect of organizational fairness on affective organizational commitment via POS is significantly different from zero. Sobel test result was found to be significant, meaning that organizational fairness has significant indirect effect on affective organizational commitment (Preacher & Leonardelli, 2006).

To sum up, the results of the consequent analyses revealed that first three steps of the analyses were relevant for a possible mediation. In the last step, it was found that although the effect of organizational fairness on affective organizational commitment was reduced when regressed with perceived organizational support, it still significantly predicted affective organizational commitment. So perceived organizational support partially mediated the organizational fairness - affective organizational commitment relationship which provides partial support for Hypothesis 1e.

3.2.5.3. Prediction of Turnover Intentions from Three Dimensions of Organizational Commitment

The results of linear regression analysis for turnover intentions variable revealed that among the five demographic variables only age was found to significantly predict turnover intentions ($\beta = -.456, p < .05$). For this reason, only age was included at the first step in the prediction of turnover intentions.

To test the hypotheses stating that “Affective organizational commitment is a stronger negative predictor of turnover intentions than continuance and normative organizational commitment.” (Hypothesis 2), a hierarchical regression analysis for turnover intentions was conducted.

In the first step, the only control variable age was not found to be a significant predictor of continuance commitment ($\beta = .070, p < .05$). In the second step, affective, normative and continuance organizational commitment variables were entered into the analysis. It was found that affective and normative organizational commitment significantly predicted turnover intentions ($\beta = -.585, p < .001$ and $\beta = -.231, p < .01$) while continuance organizational commitment didn't significantly contribute to the prediction of turnover intentions ($R^2 = .579$). Results related to this regression analysis are presented in Table 8.

Table 8:

Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Prediction of Turnover Intentions

	β	t	R ²	R ² Change	F Change
Step 1 – Demo. V.			.005	.005	.833
Age	.070	.912			
Step 2 – Com. V.			.579	.574	75.980***
Aff. O.C.	-.585***	-8.240			
Nor. O.C.	-.231**	-3.289			
Cont. O.C.	-.025	-.469			

Note. * p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001.

Demo. V. = Demographic Variables, Com. V. = Commitment Variables, Aff. O.C. = Affective Org.al Commitment, Nor. O.C. = Normative Org.al Commitment, Cont. O.C. = Continuance Org.al Commitment

In sum, affective and normative organizational commitment significantly predicted turnover intentions and affective commitment was a stronger predictor of turnover intentions as proposed by hypothesis 2. But continuance organizational commitment didn't significantly predict the dependent variable that is opposite to the hypothesis. Hence, hypothesis 2 was partially supported.

3.2.5.4. Prediction of Job Performance from Three Dimensions of Organizational Commitment

In the present study, separate analyses for self rated performance and supervisory performance variables were conducted. Additionally, task and contextual performance with overall job performance were analyzed as dependent variables.

The results of linear regression analysis for the self rated performance variables revealed that among the five demographic variables only education level significantly predicted task, contextual and overall performance ($\beta = .300, p < .001, \beta = .207, p < .01$ and $\beta = .298, p < .001$ respectively). For this reason, education level was included in the first step for the prediction of self rated performance variables.

The results of linear regression analysis for the supervisory performance variables revealed that among the five demographic variables,

- i. none of the demographic variables significantly predicted supervisory task performance.
- ii. gender and education level significantly predicted supervisory contextual performance ($\beta = -.360, p < .01$ and $\beta = -.319, p < .05$ respectively). For this reason, gender and education level were included in the first step for the prediction of supervisory contextual performance.
- iii. gender and education level significantly predicted overall supervisory performance ($\beta = -.333, p < .05$ and $\beta = -.287, p < .05$ respectively).

In this regard, gender and education level were included in the first step for the prediction of overall supervisory performance.

To test the hypothesis stating that “Both affective and normative organizational commitment are stronger predictors of contextual performance than task performance.” (Hypothesis 3), linear and hierarchical regression analyses for job performance were conducted.

For self rated task performance, a hierarchical regression analysis was conducted. In the first step, the only control variable education level significantly predicted self rated task performance ($\beta = .301, p < .001$). In the second step, affective, normative and continuance organizational commitment variables were entered into the analysis. It was found that education level still significantly predicted self rated task performance ($\beta = .295, p < .001$) but none of the organizational commitment variables significantly predicted self rated task performance ($R^2 = .114$). Results related to this regression analysis are presented in Table 9.

Table 9:

Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Prediction of Self Rated Task Performance

	beta	t	R ²	R ² Change	F Change
Step 1 – Demo. V.			.091	.091	16.458***
Edu. Level	.301***	4.057			
Step 2 – Com. V.			.114	.024	1.437
Edu. Level	.295***	3.981			
Aff. O.C.	.147	1.416			
Nor. O.C.	.009	.090			
Cont. O.C.	.001	.013			

Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

Demo. V. = Demographic Variables, Edu. Level = Education level, Com. V. = Commitment Variables, Aff. O.C. = Affective Org.al Commitment, Nor. O.C. = Normative Org.al Commitment, Cont. O.C. = Continuance Org.al Commitment

For self rated contextual performance, a hierarchical regression analysis was conducted. In the first step, the only control variable education level significantly predicted self rated contextual performance ($\beta = .204, p < .01$). In the second step, affective, normative and continuance organizational commitment variables were entered into the analysis. It was found that education level still significantly predicted self rated contextual performance ($\beta = .295, p < .001$) and affective and normative organizational commitment significantly predicted self rated contextual performance ($\beta = .306, p < .01$ and $\beta = .282, p < .01$) while continuance organizational commitment didn't significantly contribute to the prediction of it ($R^2 = .337$). Results related to this regression analysis are presented in Table 10.

Table 10:

Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Prediction of Self Rated Contextual Performance

	beta	t	R ²	R ² Change	F Change
Step 1 – Demo. V.			.042	.042	7.169**
Edu. Level	.204**	2.678			
Step 2 – Com. V.			.337	.296	24.091***
Edu. Level	.185**	2.882			
Aff. O.C.	.306**	3.403			
Nor. O.C.	.282**	3.171			
Cont. O.C.	-.015	-.225			

Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

Demo. V. = Demographic Variables, Edu. Level = Education level, Com. V. = Commitment Variables, Aff. O.C. = Affective Org.al Commitment, Nor. O.C. = Normative Org.al Commitment, Cont. O.C. = Continuance Org.al Commitment

For self rated overall performance, a hierarchical regression analysis was conducted. In the first step, the only control variable education level significantly predicted self rated overall performance ($\beta = .297, p < .001$). In the second step, affective, normative and continuance organizational commitment variables were entered into the analysis. It was found that education level ($\beta = .285, p < .001$) and affective organizational commitment ($\beta = .238, p < .05$) significantly predicted self rated overall performance while continuance and normative organizational commitment didn't significantly contribute to the prediction of self rated overall performance ($R^2 = .207$). Results related to this regression analysis are presented in Table 11.

Table 11:

Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Prediction of Self Rated Overall Performance

	beta	t	R ²	R ² Change	F Change
Step 1 – Demo. V.			.088	.088	15.980***
Edu. Level	.297***	3.998			
Step 2 – Com. V.			.207	.118	8.067***
Edu. Level	.285***	4.054			
Aff. O.C.	.238*	2.415			
Nor. O.C.	.133	1.364			
Cont. O.C.	-.006	-.082			

Note. * p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001.

Demo. V. = Demographic Variables, Edu. Level = Education level, Com. V. = Commitment Variables, Aff. O.C. = Affective Org.al Commitment, Nor. O.C. = Normative Org.al Commitment, Cont. O.C. = Continuance Org.al Commitment

For supervisory task performance variable, linear regression analysis was conducted and none of the organizational commitment variables significantly predicted supervisory task performance ($R^2 = .027$). Results related to this regression analysis are presented in Table 12.

Table 12:

Linear Regression Analysis for Prediction of Supervisory Rated Task Performance

	beta	t	R ²
Aff. O.C.	.023	.127	.027
Nor. O.C.	-.101	-.554	
Cont. O.C.	.133	.980	

Note. * p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001.

Aff. O.C. = Affective Org.al Commitment, Nor. O.C. = Normative Org.al Commitment, Cont. O.C. = Continuance Org.al Commitment

For contextual and overall supervisory performance variables, hierarchical regression analyses were conducted. In the first step, control variables gender ($\beta = -.335, p < .01$ and $\beta = -.319, p < .01$ respectively) and education level ($\beta = -.351, p < .01$ and $\beta = -.330, p < .01$ respectively) were found to be a significant predictors of both contextual and overall supervisory performance. In the second step, affective, normative and continuance organizational commitment variables were entered into the analysis. Gender ($\beta = -.341, p < .01$ and $\beta = -.318, p < .05$ respectively) and education level ($\beta = -.382, p < .01$ and $\beta = -.345, p < .01$ respectively) significantly predicted contextual and overall supervisory performance but commitment variables didn't significantly contribute to the prediction of the performance variables ($R^2 = .267$ and $R^2 = .218$ respectively). Results related to this regression analyses are presented in Table 13 ve Table 14.

Table 13:

Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Prediction of Supervisory Rated Contextual Performance

	β	t	R ²	R ² Change	F Change
Step 1 – Demo. V.			.225	.225	7.835**
Gender	-.335**	-2.793			
Edu. Level	-.351**	-2.926			
Step 2 – Com. V.			.267	.042	.980
Gender	-.341**	-2.744			
Edu. Level	-.382**	-3.123			
Aff. O.C.	-.020	-.122			
Nor. O.C.	.221	1.362			
Cont. O.C.	.017	.135			

Note. * p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001.

Demo. V. = Demographic Variables, Edu. Level = Education level, Com. V. = Commitment Variables, Aff. O.C. = Affective Org.al Commitment, Nor. O.C. = Normative Org.al Commitment, Cont. O.C. = Continuance Org.al Commitment

Table 14:

Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Prediction of Supervisory Rated Overall Performance

	β	t	R ²	R ² Change	F Change
Step 1 – Demo. V.			.201	.201	6.804**
Gender	-.319*	-2.622			
Edu. Level	-.330**	-2.709			
Step 2 – Com. V.			.218	.016	.353
Gender	-.318*	-2.473			
Edu. Level	-.345**	-2.733			
Aff. O.C.	.000	.002			
Nor. O.C.	.126	.752			
Cont. O.C.	.038	.296			

Note. * p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001.

Demo. V. = Demographic Variables, Edu. Level = Education level, Com. V. = Commitment Variables, Aff. O.C. = Affective Org.al Commitment, Nor. O.C. = Normative Org.al Commitment, Cont. O.C. = Continuance Org.al Commitment

To sum up, the analyses revealed different outcomes for self rated and supervisory performance ratings.

According to self rated performance ratings, three dimensions of commitment were not significant predictors of task performance while both affective and normative commitment predicted contextual performance significantly and positively. As expected, affective commitment was a stronger predictor than normative commitment. So, hypothesis 3 was partially supported. Additionally, overall self rated performance was significantly predicted by only affective commitment.

According to supervisory performance ratings, three dimensions of commitment were not significant predictors of task, contextual or overall performance. In this respect, hypothesis 3 was not supported.

CHAPTER 4

DISCUSSION

4.1 Summary of the Findings

In the present study organizational commitment's relationship with a number of antecedents and consequences were examined. In more detail, first the effects of job characteristics (i.e., job variety, promotional opportunity, organizational fairness and perceived organizational support) on three dimensions of organizational commitment namely affective, normative and continuance commitment were examined. Second, how these three dimensions of organizational commitment predict two dimensions of performance (i.e., task and contextual performance) and turnover intentions were examined. Moreover, possible mediation of the relationship between organizational fairness and affective organizational commitment by perceived organizational support was investigated.

4.1.1 Demographic Variables Relationship with Organizational Commitment

Analysis of the demographic variables – commitment relationship was resulted in that they were not related to dimensions of commitment and overall commitment except gender - continuance commitment relationship.

Gender predicted continuance commitment negatively meaning that women had higher continuance commitment scores. In the literature, there are mixed results about demographic variables' relationship with commitment but generally weak relationships were found (e.g. Mathieu & Zajac, 1990). Education would be unrelated because almost all of the participants of the study were university graduates or had a master's degree so variability of the participants were low. Tenure was mostly related to commitment positively and weakly (e.g. Meyer et al., 2002). Especially increasing tenure was found to be predictive of continuance commitment as it represents investments or sunk costs in the organization (Iverson & Buttigieg, 1998). In this study, tenure's unrelatedness may be a result of most of the participants' low tenure. Although findings for age were inconsistent in the literature, it was mostly found to be unrelated to commitment (e.g. Lambert & Paoline, 2008) which is consistent with the findings of this study.

4.1.2 Job Characteristics Relationship with Organizational Commitment

Job characteristics as antecedents of commitment have created considerable results. In the literature, studies for job variety had mixed results as in some studies it was unrelated to commitment (e.g., Gaertner, 1999) and in others it was positively related to commitment (e.g., Lambert & Paoline, 2008). In the regression analyses, job variety positively predicted both affective and normative organizational commitment, but not continuance

commitment. Additionally, job variety predicted overall commitment and the relationship was stronger than its relationship with affective and normative commitment. So Hypothesis 1a was fully supported. These findings state that as employees perform a number of different tasks in their organizations, they become more emotionally and morally attached to their organizations.

According to the findings in the literature, promotional opportunity is a predictor of affective commitment as it describes the employees' perceptions about their opportunities to be promoted to new and challenging positions (Lambert et al., 2008). In this line promotional opportunity was proposed to be a positive predictor of affective organizational commitment but not normative and continuance commitment" (Hypothesis 1b). The results of the regression analysis revealed that promotional opportunity predicted only affective commitment among three dimensions of commitment. It predicted overall commitment also, although the relationship was weak. That is, as employees believe that they have chance to promote, their overall commitment but especially emotional attachment increases. So Hypothesis 1b was fully supported, too.

Organizational fairness has been widely studied as a multidimensional construct as well as a single construct. Although the results were not consistent in all studies, most of the findings stated it as a significant predictor of affective and normative commitment (e.g., Meyer et al., 2002). Regarding these findings, it was proposed to be positive predictor of affective and normative organizational commitment but not continuance commitment

(Hypothesis 1c). In the regression analyses, it was unproductive of all three dimensions of commitment in addition to overall commitment. So the results were inconsistent with the literature and Hypothesis 1c was rejected. But this result needs caution as organizational fairness was found to have high positive and significant correlations with all commitment variables except continuance commitment. Additionally, it was found to have a high positive correlation with perceived organizational support and there is clear evidence for perceived organizational support's mediation of organizational fairness – commitment relationship (e.g., Rhoades et al., 2001). This finding would better be discussed after presenting the findings of Hypothesis 1e.

Perceived organizational support may be conceptualized as perceptions of the employees regarding the degree their organizations value their contributions and cares about their well-being (Eisenberger et al., 2004). There are many studies on perceived organizational support's relationship with commitment (e.g., Rhoades et al., 2001; Tansky & Cohen, 2001). As the description of the concept signals, a supportive environment in the organization may affect employees emotionally thus leading to increased affective commitment. Also there is evidence for the normative commitment's lower but significant relationship with perceived organizational support (e.g., Makenjee et al., 2006). In line with these findings, it is proposed that “Perceived organizational support is a positive predictor of affective and normative organizational commitment but not continuance commitment.” (Hypothesis 1d). The results of the regression analyses revealed that,

perceived organizational support was a significant and positive predictor of both affective and normative organizational commitment while it was not related to continuance commitment. So Hypothesis 1d was fully supported. Additionally, it predicted overall commitment significantly but lower than affective and normative commitment. An interesting finding would be the slightly higher relationship with normative commitment. An explanation for this result may be that as organizations value the contributions and well being of the employees, they feel an obligation to continue working in the organization.

As suggested by the literature, fair treatment may be perceived as the organization's respect of employees' rights which may contribute positively to perceived organizational support (Loi et al., 2006). Increases in both organizational fairness and support perceptions lead to increased levels of commitment as stated in the above parts. With respect to these findings, perceived organizational support was proposed to mediate organizational fairness - affective commitment relationship (Hypothesis 1e). Results partially supported the hypothesis as organizational fairness was still significantly predictive of affective commitment after regressed with perceived organizational support. This result should be assessed with the result of Hypothesis 1c regarding the organizational fairness - commitment relationship.

Organizational fairness did not significantly predict any of the three dimensions of commitment or overall commitment although it had significant

correlations with all commitment variables. High correlation with perceived organizational support was presented as the possible reason for this finding. But perceived organizational support didn't fully mediate the fairness – commitment relationship so there may be other mediators of the relationship. In this study, possible mediators can be promotional opportunity and job variety. Conceptually, promotional opportunity would be more related to fairness perceptions. If employees believe they have the chance to promote in case they work harder and gain experience in the organization, this may also increase their perceptions for the fair treatment of the organization. High correlation between these two concepts that is close to fairness- support correlation, strengthens this possibility. Gaertner (1999) also found a significant positive correlation between promotional chances and distributive justice in his meta analysis. In addition to other possible mediators, there may be other reasons for the insignificant result. Fair treatment perceptions of employees in the organization would stem from a specific source like supervisors. Organization itself is a more general concept that may cause low connections with employees fairness perceptions. In this regard, organizational fairness would significantly predict not organizational commitment but supervisory commitment.

In general, job characteristics had strongest effects on affective commitment among three dimensions of commitment. Three of four job characteristics variables significantly predicted affective commitment and they accounted for 56 % of the variance of it. This result reveals that if

employees feel they have a variety of jobs to do, have chance to promote in case they work hard and the organization values their efforts, they become more emotionally committed. Results for normative commitment were also valuable although variance accounted by job characteristics was lower (% 43) than affective commitment. The results were consistent with the literature except insignificant results for organizational fairness – commitment relationships (e.g., Iverson & Buttigieg, 1998; Lambert et al., 2002; Makanjee et al., 2006; Meyer et al., 2002). None of these variables were significant predictors of continuance commitment which implies that job characteristics don't affect employees' perceptions about their investments in the organization.

4.1.3 Turnover Intentions Relationship with Organizational Commitment

Turnover intentions is an important outcome that has been examined in relation to commitment in almost all the articles in this issue (e.g., Cheng & Stockdale, 2001; Meyer et al., 2002; Vandenberghe et al., 2004). Employees' intention to leave the organization was consistently found to lead to actual turnover (e.g., Loi et al., 2006). In various studies, more committed employees' were found to have lower turnover intentions (e.g., Cheng & Stockdale, 2001; Jaros, 1997). In this study it was expected that all three dimensions of commitment would be a negative predictor of turnover intentions, while affective commitment would be a stronger predictor

(Hypothesis 2). The results of the regression analysis revealed that turnover intentions was significantly and negatively predicted by both affective and normative commitment while it was unrelated to continuance commitment. As continuance commitment was not a significant predictor of turnover intentions, hypothesis was partially supported. Low average tenure and age of the participants in the study may be the reason for this finding. As expected, affective commitment's relationship with turnover intentions was very strong and together with normative commitment, more than fifty percent of the variance in turnover intentions was explained by commitment. Thus, morally and emotionally committed employees tend to stay more in their organizations.

4.1.4 Performance Relationship with Organizational Commitment

With regard to the commitment – performance relationship, two dimensions of performance (i.e., task and contextual performance) were studied. Additionally, self rated and supervisory ratings were collected to investigate differences between supervisors' and self evaluations. But in the study, supervisory ratings were limited as difficulties arised in persuading both employees and supervisors about the confidentiality of the data. In the literature, commitment was generally found to be a significant predictor of performance (e.g., Becker & Kernan, 2003; Vandenberghe et al., 2004) while in some studies affective commitment - contextual performance relationship

was found to be stronger (e.g., Meyer et al., 2002) and in some others continuance commitment was unrelated to performance (e.g., Becker & Kernan, 2003).

Regarding the findings in the literature, affective and normative organizational commitment were proposed to positively predict contextual performance and task performance but the relationships for contextual performance would be stronger than task performance (Hypothesis 3). The regression analyses performed with self ratings revealed that none of the three dimensions of commitment was predictive of task performance while affective and normative commitment significantly and positively predicted contextual performance. As expected, affective commitment's relation was stronger than normative commitment's relation but because of the insignificant result for task performance in the regression analysis, hypothesis 3 was partially supported. In addition to those, only affective commitment significantly and positively predicted overall self performance in the regression analysis.

In terms of supervisory ratings, overall commitment was positively correlated with contextual performance so more committed employees had higher ratings of contextual performance by their supervisors. In the regression analyses, none of the three dimensions of commitment was predictive of neither task - contextual performance nor overall performance. This finding was interesting as significant results were obtained in the literature with self rated performance ratings. An explanation for unrelatedness of the concepts may be supervisors' high performance ratings

(mostly 6 or 7 in the 7 point scale) which may be a result of supervisors' hesitation about the confidentiality of the data. In this regard, they may not differentiate between task or contextual performance items and rated all the items similarly. Another reason may be the limited number of data provided by supervisors. Although regression analyses didn't reveal significant results, positive correlation between overall commitment and contextual performance is an important signal for stronger relationships with a larger sample and better persuaded supervisors.

Affective and overall commitment were significantly correlated with self rated task performance. But for both self rated and supervisory rated performance, all dimensions of commitment were unrelated to task performance in the regression analyses. An explanation for this may be the scales used in the study. Behaviours resulting in better contextual performance are similar across jobs while task behaviours may vary for different jobs (Borman & Motowidlo, 1997). Adaptation of the items for task performance items were limited and it would be better to further discuss with supervisors in the organizations for adapting the items to public organizations. Items questioning the task behaviours more accurately would result in stronger relationships.

4.2 Implications for Human Resource Practices

This study revealed that among three dimensions of commitment, affective commitment had the strongest effects on the outcome variables. First of all, emotionally committed employees had a lower tendency to leave their organization. Moreover, affective commitment increased employees' performance not only in terms of contextual performance but also overall performance. These findings have important implications for practitioners. Turnover has considerable costs for the organizations. Training expenses may reach to enormous amounts after the recruitment and also throughout the whole working life. Additionally, the organizations not only lose the employees but also accumulated knowledge and experience required for fulfilling the job requirements. In this regard, practitioners should find ways to improve employees' affective commitment to reduce intention for leaving.

Performance is also an important variable that practitioners always work on to improve. More emotionally committed employees perform better in terms of extra role behaviours thus they engage more in volunteer activities, help and cooperate with other employees, pay extra effort and defend organizational objectives (Borman & Motowidlo, 1997). Although not as strong as contextual performance, affective commitment was found to be effective on overall performance meaning that it provides improvements in performance levels regarding fulfillment of formal job duties and core activities of the organization. So practitioners' efforts to improve employees'

affective commitment would not only reduce employees' turnover intentions but also improve their performances.

Although not as strong as affective commitment's effects, normative commitment was also predictive of turnover intentions and contextual performance. In this line, it can be said that valuable outcomes were revealed from attitudinal aspect of commitment.

In relation with the above discussions, an important issue for practitioners is finding ways for improving commitment level of employees. In this respect, antecedent variables of commitment worth mentioning. Antecedents in job characteristics group significantly and positively affected both affective (i.e., job variety, promotional opportunity, and perceived organizational support) and normative commitment (i.e., job variety and perceived organizational support). So if considered together with the consequences presented in above discussions, practitioners' would design jobs consisting of a variety of tasks and engage in activities to assure employees' about organization's support to them. These activities would increase employees' affective and normative commitment thus leading to decreased turnover intentions and increased job performance. In this regard, affective and normative commitment' mediation of the antecedents – consequences relationship may be examined. Additionally, practitioners' should find ways to affect employees' perceptions positively about their chance to promote in case they work hard and gain experience by the time. This would also increase affective commitment resulting in positive outcomes for the organization. And

finally, although organizational fairness was unproductive of commitment, its high correlations with commitment variables suggest that fairness perceptions of employees also affect their commitment. Practitioners' efforts to persuade employees about the fair treatment of the organization may improve commitment levels.

4.3 Limitations of the Study

There are several limitations of this study. First, the present study is a cross-sectional one. For this reason, strong causal inferences could not be made based on the findings. According to the results, there are relationships between the proposed variables but there is not strong evidence for which one is the antecedent and which one is the consequence.

Another limitation is the use of self-report measures for all variables except performance. This may cause inflation of common method variance. Additionally, data relevant to both independent and dependent variables were collected at the same time which may result in inflation of common method variance (Kline, Sulsky, & Rever-Moriyama, 2000).

Third limitation is that data for supervisory performance ratings was limited as stated in performance discussion part. The sample size was insufficient for some of the analyses like confirmatory factor analysis. In the literature, supervisory ratings are accepted as a better source of performance evaluations as employees have a tendency to highly rate themselves. But in

this study, self ratings revealed better results which is inconsistent with the literature.

Fourth limitation is that as an outcome variable turnover intentions was used instead of actual turnover. Although turnover intentions is one of the strongest predictors of turnover, employees' attitudes regarding this issue do not always result in actual behaviour. So actual turnover data should be collected to analyze the relationships with the predictors and outcomes.

Fifth limitation is that only commitment to the organization was evaluated in this study. But in many studies commitment to different work-related domains or foci was analyzed to better understand workplace commitment as a whole (e.g., Vandenberghe et al., 2004). Supervisory, team or career commitment are examples of different domains. It would be better to analyze different domains in addition to organizational commitment to further understand relationships with antecedents and outcomes.

4.4 Directions for Future Research

In the present study, average age and tenure of the participants were low which may affect their commitment levels. Especially the results for continuance commitment would have been affected by age and tenure as increasing age and tenure signals sunk costs of the employees. This may be the reason for insignificant relationships with continuance commitment. In addition to these, variability in the educational level was low and employees

were at least university graduates. In this regard, it would be better to use a more representative sample in the future studies especially in terms of age and tenure.

Only four antecedents' (under job characteristics group) relationship was investigated in addition to demographic variables. But there is a wide range of antecedents studied in the literature. Selected variables in this study were mostly accepted as antecedents of affective commitment and possibly because of its high correlation with affective commitment, two of the variables were related to normative commitment, too. With the inclusion of different variables, predictors of continuance commitment may also be investigated. For this reason, it would be better to incorporate different antecedent variables those may be proposed to predict all three dimensions of commitment.

For measuring performance objectively supervisory ratings were collected but the results were not satisfactory because of the limited number of data as stated above. It would be better to use different sources of data like co-workers or objective indexes for measuring performance. This may also eliminate the disadvantages of self-report measures like common method variance mentioned above. Additionally, separate scales to measure self and supervisory performance ratings were used which would cause comparison of the results difficult. Adapting the same scale for different evaluators would create better and comparable results in addition to being more practical.

For investigating the causal nature of the relationship between the variables included in the study, longitudinal studies should be used. In addition to this, we would be able to observe changes in the relationships by the time. So, in the future research repeated measures taken at different times would be beneficial to examine the differences between leavers and stayers of an organization.

Only public sector employees' attitudes were analyzed in this study. In the future research, collecting data from private sector employees in addition to public sector employees would enable to make comparisons. These comparisons would add value to the generalizability of the findings.

REFERENCES

- Allen, N. J. (2003). Organizational commitment in the military: A discussion of theory and practice. *Military Psychology, 15*(3), 237-253.
- 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*, 1-18.
- Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51*, 1173-1182.
- Bashir, S., & Ramay, M. I. (2008). Determinants of organizational commitment: A study of information technology professionals in Pakistan. *Journal of Behavioral and Applied Management, 9*, 226-238.
- Becker, H. S. (1960). Notes on the concept of commitment. *American Journal of Sociology, 66*, 32-40.
- 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.
- Benkhoff, B. (1997). Ignoring commitment is costly: New approaches establish the missing link between commitment and performance. *Human Relations, 50*(6), 701-725.
- Bentein, K., Stinglhamber, F., & Vandenberghe, C. (2002). Organization-, supervisor-, and workgroup-directed commitments and citizenship behaviours: A comparison of models. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 11*(3), 341-362.
- Bies, R. J., & Moag, J. S. (1986). Interactional justice: Communication criteria of fairness. *Research on Negotiation in Organizations, 1*, 43-55.
- Bilgiç, R. (baskıda). İşe ilişkin tutumlar, iş rolü algıları ve algılanan performans arasındaki ilişki. *Amme İdaresi Dergisi*.
- Bishop, J., Scott, D., Goldsby, M., & Cropanzano, R. (2005). A construct validity study of commitment and perceived support variables: A multi-foci approach across different team environments. *Group & Organization Management, 30*(2), 153-180.

- Borman, W. C. (2004). The concept of organizational citizenship. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 13*, 238-241.
- Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1997). Task performance and contextual performance: The meaning for personnel selection research. *Human Performance, 10*(2), 99-109
- Brief, A. P., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1986). Prosocial organizational behaviors. *Academy of Management Review, 11*, 710-725.
- Brooks R.,G., & Wallace P., Joseph (2006). A discursive examination of the nature, determinants and impact of organizational commitment. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources, 16*(4), 483-504.
- Buka, M. (2005). The job attitude differences among public and private school teachers in Albania. Unpublished manuscript. Middle East Technical University: Ankara.
- Chang, H., Chi, N., & Miao, M. (2007). Testing the relationship between three-component organizational/occupational commitment and organizational/occupational turnover intention using a non-recursive model. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 70*, 352-368.
- Chen, C. (2006). Job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and flight attendants' turnover intentions: A note. *Journal of Air Transport Management, 12*, 274-276.
- Chen, S., Lin, P., Lu, C., & Tsao, C. (2007). The moderation effect of HR strength on the relationship between employee commitment and job performance. *Social Behavior and Personality, 35*(8), 1121-1138.
- Chen, Z.X., Tsui, A.S., & Farh, J. (2002). Loyalty to Supervisor vs. Organizational Commitment: Relationships to Employee Performance in China. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 75*, 339-356.
- Cheng, Y., & Stockdale, M. S. (2003). The validity of the three-component model of organizational commitment in a Chinese context. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 62*, 465-489.
- Cho, S., & Johanson, M. M. (2008). Organizational citizenship behavior and employee performance: A moderating effect of work status in restaurant employees. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research, 32*(3), 307-326.

- Chughtai, A. A. & Zafar, S. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of organizational commitment among Pakistani university teachers. *Applied H.R.M. Research, 11*(1), 39-64.
- Cohen, A. (1991). Career stage as a moderator of the relationships between organizational commitment and its outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Occupational Psychology, 64*, 253-68.
- Cohen, A. (1993). Age and tenure in relation to organizational commitment: a meta-analysis. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 14*(2), 143-159.
- Cohen, A. (1998). An examination of the relationship between work commitment and work outcomes among hospital nurses. *Scandinavian Journal of Management, 14*(1-2), 1-17.
- Cohen, A. (2000). The relationship between commitment forms and work outcomes: A comparison of three models. *Human Relations, 53*(3), 387-418.
- Cohen, A. (2007). Commitment before and after: An evaluation and reconceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review, 17*, 336–354.
- Currivan, D.B. (1999). The causal order of job satisfaction and organizational commitment in models of employee turnover. *Human Resource Management Review, 9* (4), 495-524.
- Cuskelly, G., & Boag, A. (2001). Organizational Commitment as a Predictor of Committee Member Turnover among Volunteer Sport Administrators: Results of a Time-Lagged Study. *Sport Management Review, 4*, 65–86
- Eisenberger, R., Aselage, J., Sucharski, I. L., & Jones, J. R. (2004). Perceived organizational support. In J. Coyle-Shapiro, L. Shore, S. Taylor, & L. Tetrick (Eds.), *The employment relationship: Examining psychological and contextual perspectives*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Eisenberger, R., Fasolo, P., & Davis-LaMastro, V. (1990). Perceived organizational support and employee diligence, commitment, and innovation. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 75*, 51-59.
- Eisenberger, R., Hungtington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 71*, 500-507.

- Erdogan, B. (2002). Antecedents and consequences of justice perceptions in performance appraisals. *Human Resource Management Review*, 12, 555–578.
- Folger, R., & Cropanzano, R. (1998). Organizational justice and human resource management. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Follett, M. P. (1996). The giving of orders. In Shafritz, J.M. & Ott, J.S. (Eds.). *Classics of organization theory* (pp.156-162). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Fornes, S. L., Rocco, T. S., & Wollard, K. K. (2008). Workplace Commitment: A Conceptual Model Developed From Integrative Review of the Research. *Human Resource Development Review*, 7(3), 339-357.
- Frederick W. Taylor, *The Principles of Scientific Management* (New York: Harper Bros., 1911)
- Gaertner S. (1999). Structural determinants of job satisfaction and organizational commitment in turnover models. *Human Resource Management Review*, 9(4), 479-493.
- Gaither, C. A., Kahaleh, A. A, Doucette, W. R., Mott, D. A., Pederson C. A., & Schommer, J. C. A (2008). Modified model of pharmacists' job stress: The role of organizational, extra-role and individual factors on work related outcomes. *Research in Social and Administrative Pharmacy*, 2(4), 231-243.
- Hartman, L. C., & Bambacas, M. (2000). Organizational commitment: A multimethod scale analysis and test of effects. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 8, 89-108.
- Iverson, R. D., & Buttigieg, D. M. (1999). Affective, normative and continuance commitment: Can the 'right kind' of commitment be managed? *Journal of Management Studies*, 36(3), 307-333.
- Jaros, S. J. (1997). An assessment of Meyer and Allen's (1991) three-component model of organizational commitment and turnover intentions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 51, 319–337.
- Karakurum, M. (2005). The effects of person-organization fit on employee job satisfaction, performance and organizational commitment in a Turkish public organization. Unpublished manuscript. Middle East Technical University: Ankara.

- Khatri, N., Budhwar, P., & Tze, F. C. (1999). Employee Turnover: Bad Attitude or Poor Management?’, Singapore Business School, Working Papers.
- Kline, T. J. B., Sulsky, L. M., & Rever-Moriyama, S. D. (2000). Common method variance and specification errors: A practical approach to detection. *The Journal of Psychology*, *134*, 401-421.
- Lambert, E., Hogan, N., & Jiang, S. (2008). Exploring Antecedents of Five Types of Commitment among Correctional Staff: It Matters What You Measure. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, *19*(4), 466-490.
- Lambert, E., & Paoline, E.A., III, (2008). The Influence of Individual, Job, and Organizational Characteristics on Correctional Staff Job Stress, Job Satisfaction, and Organizational Commitment, *Criminal Justice Review*, *33*, 541-564.
- Lee, K., Allen, N. J., Meyer, J. P., & Rhee, K.Y. (2001). The three-component model of organizational commitment: An application to South Korea. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, *50*, 596-614
- Lee, T. W., & Mitchell, T. R. (1994). An alternative approach: The unfolding model of voluntary employee turnover. *Academy of Management Review*, *19*, 51–89.
- Lee, J., & Peccei, R. (2007). Perceived organizational support and affective commitment: The mediating role of organization-based self-esteem in the context of job insecurity. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *28*(6), 661-685.
- LePine, J. A., Erez, A., & Johnson, D. E. (2002). The Nature and Dimensionality of Organizational Citizenship Behavior: A Critical Review and Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *87*(1), 52–65.
- Loi, R., Hang-yue, N., & Foley, S. (2006). Linking employees’ justice perceptions to organizational commitment and intention to leave: The mediating role of perceived organizational support. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *79*, 101–120.
- Lord, A., & Hartley, J. (1998). Organizational commitment and job insecurity in a changing public service organization. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *7*(3), 341–354.
- Lu, K., Lin P., Wu, C., Hsieh, Y., & Chang, Y. (2002). The relationships among turnover intentions, professional commitment, and job satisfaction of hospital nurses. *Journal of Professional Nursing*, *18*(4), 214–219.

- Maertz Jr, C. P., Griffeth, R. W., Campbell, N. S., & Allen, D. G. (2007). The effects of perceived organizational support and perceived supervisor support on employee turnover. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 28, 1059–1075.
- Makanjee, C., Hartzer, Y., & Uys, I. (2006). The effect of perceived organizational support on organizational commitment of diagnostic imaging radiographers. *Radiography*, 12(2), 118-126.
- 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), 171–194.
- Mathis, R L., & Jackson, J. H. (2004). *Human Resource Management*. International Student Edition. South-Western Educational Publishing (12th ed.).
- Merton, R. K. (1968). *Social Theory and Social Structure*, Free Press.
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1(1), 61–89.
- Meyer, J. P., Allen, N. J., & Smith, C. A. (1993). Commitment to organizations and occupations: Extension and test of a three-component conceptualization. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78, 538–551.
- Meyer, J. P., Paunonen, S. V., Gellatly, I. R., Goffin, R. D., & Jackson, D. N. (1989). Organizational commitment and job performance: It's the nature of the commitment that counts. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74, 152-156.
- Meyer, J. P., Stanley, D. J., Herscovitch, L. & Topolnytsky, L. (2002). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: A meta-analysis of antecedents, correlates, and consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 61(1), 20-52.
- Mitchell, T. R., Holtom, B. C., Lee, T. W., Sablinski, C. J., & Erez, M. (2001). Why people stay: Using job embeddedness to predict voluntary turnover. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44, 1102–1121.
- Motowidlo, S. J., Borman, W. C., & Schmit, M. J. (1997). A theory of individual differences in task and contextual performance. *Human Performance*, 10, 71-83.

- Munasinghe, L. (2001). A theory of wage and turnover dynamics. Unpublished manuscript, Department of Economics, Barnard College, Columbia University.
- Narimawati, U. (2007). The influence of work satisfaction, organizational commitment and turnover intention towards the performance of lecturers at West Java's private higher education institution. *Journal of Applied Sciences Research*, 3(7), 549-557.
- Ok, A. B. (2007). Correlates of organizational commitment: A special emphasis on organizational communication. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Middle East Technical University: Ankara.
- Organ, D. W. (1988). Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome. Lexington, MA: Lexington.
- Park, S. M., & Rainey, H. G. (2007). Antecedents, mediators, and consequences of affective, normative, and continuance commitment: Empirical tests of commitment effects in federal agencies. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 27(3), 197-226.
- Parker, R., Kohlmeyer, J. (2005). Organizational justice and turnover in public accounting firms: A research note. *Organizations and Society*, 30, 357-369.
- Pazy, A., & Ganzach, Y. (2009). Pay contingency and the effects of perceived organizational and supervisor support on performance and commitment. *Journal of Management*. 35(4), 1007-1025.
- 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.
- Powell, D. M., & Meyer, J. P. (2004). Side-bet theory and the three-component model of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 65, 157-177.
- Poyraz, K & Kama, B. (2008). Algılanan iş güvencesinin, iş tatmini, örgütsel bağlılık ve işten ayrılma niyeti üzerindeki etkilerinin incelenmesi. Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi, 13(2),143-164.
- Preacher, K. J. & Leonardelli, G. J. Calculation for the sobel test : An interactive calculation tool for mediation tests. Retrieved July 23, 2010, from <http://www.people.ku.edu/~preacher/sobel/sobel.htm>

- Raghunathan, B., Raghunathan, T. S., & Tu, Q. (1998). An empirical analysis of the organizational commitment of information systems executives. *Omega*, 26(5), 569-580.
- Restubog, S. L. D., Bordia, P., & Tang, R. L. (2006). Effects of psychological contract breach on performance of IT employees: The mediating role of affective commitment. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 79, 299–306.
- Rhoades, L., Eisenberger, R., & Armeli, S. (2001). Affective commitment to the organization: The contribution of perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 825-836.
- Ricketta, M. (2002). Attitudinal organizational commitment and job performance: A meta- analysis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23(3), 257-266.
- Rodwell, J. J., Kienzle, R., & Shadur, M. A. (1998). The relationship among work-related perceptions, employee attitudes, and employee performance: The integral role of communications. *Human Resource Management*, 37(3-4), 277-293.
- Salami, S. O. (2008). Demographic and psychological factors predicting organizational commitment among industrial workers. *Anthropologist*, 10(1), 31-38.
- Schaubroeck, J., Walumbwa, F. O., Ganster, D. C., & Kepe, S. (2007). Destructive leadership traits and the neutralising influence of an ‘enriched’ job. *Leadership Quarterly*, 18(3), 236-251.
- Schwepker, C.H. (2001). Ethical climate’s relationship to job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intention in the salesforce. *Journal of Business Research*, 54, 39– 52.
- Shaw, J. D., Delery, J. E., & Abdulla, M. H. A.(2003). Organizational commitment and performance among guest workers and citizens of an Arab country. *Journal of Business Research*, 56, 1021–1030.
- Siu, O. (2003). Job stress and job performance among employees in Hong Kong: The role of Chinese work values and organizational commitment. *International Journal of Psychology*, 38(6), 337–347.
- Steers, R. M., & Mowday, R. T. (1981). Employee turnover and post-decision accommodation processes. In L. L. Cummings & B. M. Staw (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior*, 3, 235-281. Greenwich, CT: JAI.

- Stephens, R. D., Dawley, D. D., & Stephens, D. B. (2004). Commitment on the board: a model of volunteer directors' levels of organizational commitment and self-reported performance. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 6(4), 483-504.
- Sutanto, E. M. (1999). The relationship between employee commitment and job performance. *Jurnal Manajemen dan Kewirausahaan*, 1(1), 47-55.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using Multivariate Statistics* (5th Ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Tansky, J. W., & Cohen, D. J. 2001. The relationship between organizational support, employee development, and organizational commitment: An empirical study. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 12(3), 285-300.
- Tett, R. P.; Meyer, J. P. (1993). Job satisfaction, organizational commitment, turnover intention: Path analyses based on meta-analytic findings. *Personnel Psychology*, 46, 259-293.
- Uygur, A. (2007). Örgütsel bağlılık ile işgören performansı ilişkisini incelemeye yönelik bir alan araştırması. *Ticaret ve Turizm Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 1, 71-85.
- Vandenberghe, C., Bentein, K., & Stinglhamber F. (2004). Affective commitment to the organization, supervisor, and work group: Antecedents and outcomes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 64, 47-71
- Wasti, S. A. (1999). Organizational Commitment and Collectivism: The Case of Turkey. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign.
- Wasti, S. A. (2000). Örgütsel bağlılığı belirleyen evrensel ve kültürel etmenler: Türk kültürüne bir bakış. In Z. Aycan (Ed.) *Akademisyenler ve profesyoneller bakış açısıyla Türkiye’de yönetim, liderlik, ve insan kaynakları uygulamaları* (pp. 201-224). Türk Psikologlar Derneği Yayınları.
- Wasti, A. S. (2002). Affective and continuance commitment to the organization: test of an integrated model in the Turkish context. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 26(5), 525-550.
- Wasti, A. S. (2005). Commitment profiles : Combinations of organizational commitment forms and job outcomes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 67, 290-308.

- Wasti, S. A., & Can, Ö. (2008). Affective and normative commitment to organization, supervisor, and coworkers: do collectivist values matter?. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 73(3), 404-413.
- Wright, T. A. & Bonett, D. G. (2002). The moderating effects of employee tenure on the relation between organizational commitment and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(6), 1183-1190.
- Yoon, J., & Thye, S. R. (2002). A dual process model of organizational commitment: Job satisfaction and organizational support. *Work and Organization*, 29, 97-124.

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE FILLED BY THE EMPLOYEES IN THE PILOT STUDY

Sayın Katılımcı,

Bu anket, Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi Endüstri ve Örgüt Psikolojisi Bölümü Yüksek Lisans öğrencisi F. Betül EKREM DUMAN tarafından Doç. Dr. Reyhan BİLGİÇ'in danışmanlığında yürütülen tez çalışması kapsamında yapılmaktadır. Bu araştırmanın amacı, katılımcıların işe yönelik tutum ve eğilimleriyle iş performanslarına ilişkin bilgi edinmek ve elde edilen verileri bilimsel yöntemlerle analiz etmektir.

Bu anketten elde edilecek bilgiler sadece bilimsel araştırma amaçlı kullanılacaktır. Araştırma sonuçlarında araştırmanın yapıldığı kurumun adı ile anketi dolduran çalışanların isimleri kullanılmayacaktır. Değerlendirmelerimiz grupların ortalaması olarak ve kimlik bilgisinden bağımsız olarak yapılacaktır. Bu nedenle isminizi belirtmenize gerek yoktur. Vereceğiniz cevaplar kesinlikle gizli tutulacak ve araştırmacılar tarafından değerlendirilecektir; elde edilecek bilgiler bilimsel yayımlarda kullanılacaktır. Talep edildiği takdirde araştırma sonuçları grup ortalaması bazında açıklanabilecektir. Soruları cevaplarken göstereceğiniz dikkat ve içten cevaplar vermeniz araştırmanın sağlıklı ve güvenilir olabilmesi bakımından büyük önem taşımaktadır.

Soruları yanıtlamak için ayırdığınız zaman ve gösterdiğiniz çaba ile araştırmaya sağladığınız katkılar için şimdiden teşekkür ederim.

Saygılarımla,

F. Betül EKREM DUMAN

ÖRGÜTSEL BAĞLILIK ANKETİ

Aşağıdaki cümleler kişilerin çalıştıkları kuruluş hakkında çeşitli duygu ve fikirlerini yansıtmaktadır. Lütfen bu cümlelere şu anda çalıştığınız kuruluş açısından ne ölçüde katıldığınızı belirtiniz. Her soru için, katılım derecenizi belirten rakamı yuvarlak içine alınız.

1 = Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum
2 = Katılmıyorum
3 = Bir parça katılmıyorum
4 = Tarafsızım

5 = Bir parça katılıyorum
6 = Katılıyorum
7 = Kesinlikle Katılıyorum

1. Meslek hayatımın kalan kısmını bu kuruluşta geçirmek beni çok mutlu eder.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. Kuruluşuma karşı güçlü bir aitik hissim yok.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. Bu kuruluşun benim için çok kişisel (özel) bir anlamı var.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. Bu kuruluşun meselelerini gerçekten de kendi meselelerim gibi hissediyorum.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. Bu kuruluşu kendimi “duygusal olarak bağlı” hissetmiyorum.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. Kendimi kuruluşumda “ailenin bir parçası” gibi hissetmiyorum.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. Kuruluşuma çok şey borçluyum.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. Buradaki insanlara karşı yükümlülük hissettiğim için kuruluşumdan şu anda ayrılmazdım.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. Benim için avantajlı da olsa, kuruluşumdan şu anda ayrılmamın doğru olmadığını hissediyorum.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10. Mevcut işverenimle kalmak için hiçbir manevi yükümlülük hissetmiyorum.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11. Kuruluşumdan şimdi ayrılırsam kendimi suçlu hissederim.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12. Bu kuruluş benim sadakatimi hak ediyor.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13. Şu anda kuruluşumda kalmam mecburiyetten.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14. İstesem de, şu anda kuruluşumdan ayrılmak benim için çok zor olurdu.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15. Şu anda kuruluşumdan ayrılmak istediğime karar versem, hayatımın çoğu alt üst olur.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
16. Bu kuruluştan ayrılmamın az sayıdaki olumsuz sonuçlarından biri alternatif kıtlığı olurdu.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
17. Bu kuruluşu bırakmayı düşünemeyeceğim kadar az seçeneğim olduğunu düşünüyorum	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
18. Eğer bu kuruluşu kendimden bu kadar çok vermiş olmasaydım, başka yerde çalışmayı düşünebilirdim.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

İŞ ÇEŞİTLİLİĞİ - YÜKSELME FIRSATI - KURUMSAL ADALET

Bu bölümde kişilerin çalıştıkları kurumda yaptıkları işin çeşitliliğine, yükselme fırsatına sahip olup olmadıklarına ve çalışanlara adil davranılıp davranılmadığına ilişkin düşünceleri ortaya konmaya çalışılmaktadır. Aşağıda sunulan ifadelere ne derece katıldığınızı her ifadenin yanında verilen ölçek üzerinde uygun rakamı daire içine alarak belirtiniz.

1 = Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum

4 = Katılıyorum

2 = Katılmıyorum

5 = Kesinlikle Katılıyorum

3 = Tarafsızım

İş Çeşitliliği					
1. İşim aynı şeyleri tekrar tekrar yapmamı gerektirir.	1	2	3	4	5
2. İşim sürekli olarak yeni şeyler öğrenmemi gerektirir.	1	2	3	4	5
3. İşim çok yaratıcı olmamı gerektirir.	1	2	3	4	5
4. İşimde farklı şeyleri yapmaya hazırım.	1	2	3	4	5
Yükselme Fırsatı					
1. İşimde iyi bir yükselme fırsatı vardır.	1	2	3	4	5
2. İlerleyebilmek için iyi bir şans vardır.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Terfiler düzenli olarak yapılır.	1	2	3	4	5
4. Terfi şansı mevcuttur.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Kariyer açısından sonu açık olmayan bir işteyim.	1	2	3	4	5
Kurumsal Adalet					
1. Bu iş yerinde çalışma performansımı değerlemek için kullanılan kriterler adil ve nesnedir.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Terfiler yapılan işin kalitesinden ziyade kimleri tanıdığınıza bağlıdır.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Benim kendi çalışmalarım, iyi performans gösteren bir çalışan olarak farkedilmemi sağlayacaktır.	1	2	3	4	5
4. Yaptığım iş iyi bir performans olarak takdir edilir.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Kendi yaptığım iş, iyi bir çalışan olarak tanınmamı sağlayacak.	1	2	3	4	5

ALGILANAN ÖRGÜTSEL DESTEK

Bu bölümde kişilerin çalıştıkları kurumdan kendilerine sağlanan desteğe ilişkin düşünceleri ortaya konmaya çalışılmaktadır. Aşağıda sunulan ifadelere ne derece katıldığınızı her ifadenin yanında verilen ölçek üzerinde uygun rakamı daire içine alarak belirtiniz.

1 = Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum

2 = Katılmıyorum

3 = Bir parça katılmıyorum

4 = Tarafsızım

5 = Bir parça katılıyorum

6 = Katılıyorum

7 = Kesinlikle Katılıyorum

1. Kurumum iyiliğine olan katkılarıma değer verir.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. Bu Kurum benden gelen herhangi bir ilave çabayı takdir etmez.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. Bu Kurum bazı şikayetlerime aldırış etmeyebilir.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. Bu Kurum kişisel refahıma gerçekten özen gösterir.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. Yapabileceğim en iyisini yapsam dahi kurum bunu fark etmeyebilir.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. Bu Kurum işteki genel tatminimi umursar.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. Bu Kurum beni çok az önemser.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. İşte gösterdiğim başarılarından dolayı Kurum benimle gurur duyuyor.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

İŞTEN AYRILMA NİYETİ

Bu bölümde kişilerin çalıştıkları işten ayrılmaya ilişkin düşünceleri ortaya konmaya çalışılmaktadır. Aşağıda sunulan 5 ifadeye ne derece katıldığınızı her ifadenin yanında verilen ölçek üzerinde uygun rakamı daire içine alarak belirtiniz.

1 = hiç olası değil

5 = biraz olası

2 = olası değil

6 = olası

3 = pek olası değil

7 = çok olası

4 = Tarafsızım

1. Bu işte çalışan insanlar sık sık işi bırakmayı düşünmektedirler.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. Sıklıkla bu işi bırakmayı düşünürüm.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. Büyük ihtimalle gelecek yıl içinde bu işi bırakacağım.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. Başka bir organizasyonda yeni bir iş arıyorum.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. Başka bir iş bulur bulmaz bu işi bırakacağım.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

PERFORMANS

Aşağıdaki cümleler kişilerin çalıştıkları kurumda sergiledikleri performans hakkındaki düşüncelerini yansıtmaktadır. Sunulan 15 ifadenin işyerindeki performansınızı ne derece yansıttığını her ifadenin yanında verilen ölçek üzerinde uygun rakamı daire içine alarak belirtiniz.

1 = Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum

4 = Katılıyorum

2 = Katılmıyorum

5 = Kesinlikle Katılıyorum

3 = Tarafsızım

1.Yüksek kalitede iş ortaya koymaktayım.	1	2	3	4	5
2.İşimin esasını oluşturan ana görevlerimi başarıyla yerine getirmekteyim	1	2	3	4	5
3.İşimi yaparken zamanı verimli bir şekilde kullanabilmekte ve iş planlarına bağlı kalmaktayım	1	2	3	4	5
4.İş başarılı bir şekilde yapabilmek için gerekli teknik bilgiyi görevlerimi yerine getirirken etkili bir şekilde kullanabilmekteyim.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Görevlerimi yerine getirirken sözlü iletişim becerisini etkili bir şekilde kullanabilmekteyim.	1	2	3	4	5
6.Görevlerimi yerine getirirken yazılı iletişim becerisini etkili bir şekilde kullanabilmekteyim.	1	2	3	4	5
7.Kendi işimin bir parçası olmayan işleri de yapmak için gönüllü oluştayım.	1	2	3	4	5
8.Kendi işlerimi yaparken büyük bir heves ve gayret içerisindeyim.	1	2	3	4	5
9. Gerektiğinde çalışma arkadaşlarıma yardım etmekte ve onlarla işbirliği içerisinde çalışmaktayım.	1	2	3	4	5
10.Kurum kurallarını ve prosedürlerini onaylamakta ve bunlara uyum göstermekteyim.	1	2	3	4	5
11.Çalıştığım işyerinin hedeflerini desteklerim.	1	2	3	4	5
12.Arkadaşlarım işimi iyi yaptığımı düşünürler.	1	2	3	4	5
13.Amirim performansımı iyi değerlendirir.	1	2	3	4	5
14. İşimin gereklerini çok iyi başarmaktayım.	1	2	3	4	5

DEMOGRAFİK BİLGİLER

Aşağıda sizinle ilgili demografik bilgilere ilişkin sorular bulunmaktadır. Lütfen bu soruları eksiksiz olarak doldurunuz.

Cinsiyetiniz: Kadın ___ Erkek ___

Yaşınız:

Öğrenim düzeyiniz:

İlk-Ortaokul ___

Lise ___

Üniversite ___

Yüksek Lisans ___

Doktora ___

Kurumda Çalışma Süreniz:

Toplam çalışma süreniz (Daha önce çalışmış olduğunuz kurumlar dahil):

.....

Anketin içeriği, anlaşılabilirliği ve uygulaması ile ilgili yorum ve önerileriniz varsa aşağıda belirtebilirsiniz.

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

Çalışmama sağladığınız değerli katkılar için teşekkür ederim.

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE FILLED BY THE EMPLOYEES IN THE MAIN STUDY

Sayın Katılımcı,

Bu anket, Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi Endüstri ve Örgüt Psikolojisi Bölümü Yüksek Lisans öğrencisi F. Betül EKREM DUMAN tarafından Doç. Dr. Reyhan BİLGİÇ'in danışmanlığında yürütülen tez çalışması kapsamında yapılmaktadır.

Bu araştırmanın amacı, katılımcıların işe yönelik tutum ve eğilimleriyle iş performanslarına ilişkin bilgi edinmek ve elde edilen verileri bilimsel yöntemlerle analiz etmektir.

Araştırma sonuçlarında araştırmanın yapıldığı kurumun adı ile anketi dolduran çalışanların isimleri kullanılmayacaktır. Bu nedenle isminizi belirtmenize gerek yoktur. Vereceğiniz cevaplar kesinlikle gizli tutulacak ve araştırmacılar tarafından değerlendirilecektir; elde edilecek bilgiler bilimsel yayımlarda kullanılacaktır. Çalışanın iş performansı bağlı bulunduğu birimin yöneticisi tarafından birim yöneticisine ayrı olarak verilecek performans değerlendirme formunun doldurulmasıyla değerlendirilecek ve bu şekilde çalışanların anket bilgileri yönetici tarafından görülmeyecektir. Yönetici-çalışan eşleştirmesi ise anketlerin üzerinde yer alan katılımcı numaraları aracılığıyla yapılacak ve kişilerin kimlik bilgileri hiçbir surette araştırmacı tarafından bilinmeyecektir. Soruları cevaplarken göstereceğiniz dikkat ve içten cevaplar vermeniz araştırmanın sağlıklı ve güvenilir olabilmesi bakımından büyük önem taşımaktadır.

Soruları yanıtlamak için ayırdığınız zaman ve gösterdiğiniz çaba ile araştırmaya sağladığınız katkılar için şimdiden teşekkür ederim.

Saygılarımla,

F. Betül EKREM DUMAN

NOTE: Main study included the same measures in the pilot study without dropping any items. So please see Appendix A for the rest of the questionnaire.

APPENDIX C

QUESTIONNAIRE FILLED BY THE SUPERVISORS IN THE MAIN STUDY

Sayın Katılımcı,

Bu anket, Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi Endüstri ve Örgüt Psikolojisi Bölümü Yüksek Lisans öğrencisi F. Betül EKREM DUMAN tarafından Doç. Dr. Reyhan BİLGİÇ'in danışmanlığında yürütülen tez çalışması kapsamında yapılmaktadır.

Araştırmanın amacı, katılımcıların işe yönelik tutum ve eğilimleriyle iş performanslarına ilişkin bilgi edinmek ve elde edilen verileri bilimsel yöntemlerle analiz etmektir.

İşe yönelik tutum ve eğilimler çalışanlara verilecek anketlerle değerlendirilecek olup çalışanın iş performansı birim amirlerine ayrı olarak verilecek performans değerlendirme formunun doldurulmasıyla değerlendirilecektir. Araştırma sonuçlarında araştırmanın yapıldığı kurumun adı ile anketi dolduran çalışanların ve amirlerinin isimleri kullanılmayacaktır. Vereceğiniz cevaplar kesinlikle gizli tutulacak ve araştırmacılar tarafından değerlendirilecektir; elde edilecek bilgiler bilimsel yayımlarda kullanılacaktır. Yönetici-çalışan eşleştirmesi ise anketlerin üzerinde yer alan katılımcı numaraları aracılığıyla yapılacak ve kişilerin kimlik bilgileri araştırmacı tarafından bilinmeyecektir. Soruları cevaplarken göstereceğiniz dikkat ve içten cevaplar vermeniz araştırmanın sağlıklı ve güvenilir olabilmesi bakımından büyük önem taşımaktadır.

Soruları yanıtlamak için ayırdığınız zaman ve gösterdiğiniz çaba ile araştırmaya sağladığınız katkılar için şimdiden teşekkür ederim.

Saygılarımla,

F. Betül EKREM DUMAN

DEMOGRAFİK BİLGİLER

Aşağıda sizinle ilgili demografik bilgilere ilişkin sorular bulunmaktadır. Lütfen bu soruları eksiksiz olarak doldurunuz.

Cinsiyetiniz: Kadın ___ Erkek ___

Öğrenim düzeyiniz:

İlk-Ortaokul ___

Lise ___

Üniversite ___

Yüksek Lisans ___

Doktora ___

Kurumda Çalışma Süreniz:

Toplam çalışma süreniz (Daha önce çalışmış olduğunuz kurumlar dahil):
.....

PERFORMANS

Aşağıda sunulan cümleler çalıştığınız kurumdaki kişilerin sergilediği performans hakkındaki düşünceleri yansıtmaktadır. kişisine ilişkin olarak aşağıda yer alan ifadelere ne derece katıldığınızı her ifadenin yanında verilen ölçek üzerinde uygun rakamı daire içine alarak belirtiniz.

1 = Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum

2 = Katılmıyorum

3 = Bir parça katılmıyorum

4 = Tarafsızım

5 = Bir parça katılıyorum

6 = Katılıyorum

7 = Kesinlikle Katılıyorum

1. Verilen görevleri yeterli bir şekilde yerine getirir	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. İşin resmi performans gereksinimlerini karşılar.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. Yapması gereken işin bazı yönlerini ihmal eder.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. İş tanımında belirlenen sorumlulukları yerine getirir.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. Performansını olumlu olarak etkileyecek faaliyetlerde bulunur.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. Kendinden beklenen görevleri yerine getirir.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. Düzenli olarak işlerini yüksek bir kalitede yerine getirir.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. Yaptıklarından veya kararlarından etkilenebilecek insanların veya benim fikrimi alır.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. Başkalarının haklarını suistimal etmez.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10. Diğer çalışanlarla oluşabilecek sorunlara karşı önlemler alır.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11. Önemli bir işlem yapmadan önce beni bilgilendirir.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12. Kurumdaki değişikliklere ayak uydurur.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13. Zorunlu olmayan ancak kurumun imajına katkıda bulunacak faaliyetlere katılır.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14. Kurumu ilgilendiren toplantılara iştirak eder ve katkıda bulunur.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15. Kurumun gelişimi için çalışır.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
16. Diğer çalışanlar kurumu eleştirdiğinde o savunur.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
17. Dışarıdan insanlar kurumu eleştirdiklerinde onlara karşı kurumu savunur.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
18. Kamu önünde kurumunu temsil etmekten gurur duyar.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Çalışmama sağladığınız değerli katkılar için teşekkür ederim.

APPENDIX D

**CONFIRMATORY FACTOR ANALYSES RESULTS OF
COMMITMENT AND PERFORMANCE SCALES**

Table 1:

*Confirmatory Factor Analysis Results for Three and One Factor Models of
Commitment*

	X ²	df	p	GFI	AGFI	NFI	NNFI	CFI	RMSEA
M1	413.514	132	.00	.779	.714	.712	.746	.781	.116
M2	647.87	135	.00	.704	.625	.641	.663	.703	.149
M1 vs M2	234.356	3							

Note: M1 = 3 Factor Model (Model 1), M2 = 1 Factor Model (Model 2)

X² = Chi-square, df = Degrees of Freedom, GFI = Goodness of Fit Index,
AGFI = Adjusted Goodness of Fit Index, NFI = Normed Fit Index, NNFI =
Non-Normed Fit Index, CFI = Comparative Fit Index, RMSEA = Root Mean
Square Error of Approximation ($\chi^2 = 7.81473$, df=3, p < .05)

Table 2:

*Confirmatory Factor Analysis Results for Two and One Factor Models of Self
Performance Rating Scale*

	X ²	df	p	GFI	AGFI	NFI	NNFI	CFI	RMSEA
M1	206.82	76	.00	.853	.797	.810	.843	.869	.100
M2	308.89	77	.00	.795	.720	.740	.756	.793	.133
M1 vs M2	102.07	1							

Note: M1 = 2 Factor Model (Model 1), M2 = 1 Factor Model (Model 2)

X² = Chi-square, df = Degrees of Freedom, GFI = Goodness of Fit Index,
AGFI = Adjusted Goodness of Fit Index, NFI = Normed Fit Index, NNFI =
Non-Normed Fit Index, CFI = Comparative Fit Index, RMSEA = Root Mean
Square Error of Approximation ($\chi^2 = 3.84146$, df = 1, p < .05)

Table 3:

Confirmatory Factor Analysis Results for Two and One Factor Models of Supervisory Performance Rating Scale

	X ²	df	p	GFI	AGFI	NFI	NNFI	CFI	RMSEA
M1	1115.94	134	.00	.570	.451	.634	.613	.661	.212
M2	1169.16	135	.00	.568	.453	.616	.594	.642	.212
M1 vs M2	53.22	1							

Note: M1 = 2 Factor Model (Model 1), M2 = 1 Factor Model (Model 2)

X² = Chi-square, df = Degrees of Freedom, GFI = Goodness of Fit Index, AGFI = Adjusted Goodness of Fit Index, NFI = Normed Fit Index, NNFI = Non-Normed Fit Index, CFI = Comparative Fit Index, RMSEA = Root Mean Square Error of Approximation ($\chi^2 = 3.84146$, df = 1, p < .05)
