



Ulusal ve Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi
The Journal of International Social Research
Volume: 3 Issue: 14 Fall 2010

FACTORS AFFECTING ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT: A MULTI-DIMENSIONAL STUDY*

Saeed MORTAZAVI**

Ali SHIRAZI***

Abstract

The purpose of this research is to identify the key factors affecting organizational commitment and to determine the type and magnitude of their predictive strength of the affective, normative and continuance commitment at four job levels in a large regional electric power company. In-depth interviews over several months using purposive sampling identified 8 factors, including organizational reputation, manager's competence, managerial support, organizational justice, organizational value, reciprocal commitment, job satisfaction and job security. A questionnaire based on these factors was designed to assess the current condition and the importance of each factor in the company. The findings showed that the mean score of the three dimensions of commitment is higher than average score. Further, it was revealed that while positive variations in affective commitment were predicted by organizational justice and reciprocal commitment, positive variations in normative commitment were predicted by managerial competence and positive variations in continuance commitment were predicted by organizational values, but at a decreasing rate.

Key Words: Affective Commitment, Normative Commitment, Continuance Commitment, Managers' Competence, Organizational Justice, Reciprocal Commitment, Organizational Values.

Introduction

A combination of economic, political and technological changes over the last quarter of a century has revolutionized the way organizations are structured and managed. Numerous research studies have found the interplay between performance improvement, leadership, culture and strategy. In addition to these factors, it has long been recognized that a great deal of our understanding of organizational performance can be explained by personal characteristics, including attitudes and skills. One of the most recent developments in organizational behavior is the effects of organizational commitment on organization culture and performance and the strategy that managers adopt to promote and maintain it.

It is argued that organizations increasingly face with uncertain and turbulent environmental conditions, fierce competition and new technologies. One of the main consequences of such a market condition is the primacy of organization members and the role they play in leveraging organization resources and capabilities to identify opportunities and to gain competitive advantage over competitors. Hence, managers are confronted with the difficult task of retaining their employees, particularly the most knowledgeable and valuable ones, in a highly adversarial job market where competitors use novel approaches

* The authors wish to acknowledge and thank the assistance of the Central Research Committee of Khorasan Regional Power Company in conducting this research

** Associate Professor, faculty of Administrative and Economic Sciences, Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Iran, mortazavi@um.ac.ir

*** Assistant Professor, faculty of Administrative and Economic Sciences, Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Iran, a-shirazi@um.ac.ir

to lure the most talented individuals away from their employers. There is little doubt that what is commonly referred to as “head-hunting” will become the norm rather than the exception in the future and it is the leading organizations that will likely lose the most in a head-to-head confrontation with their rivals. What makes these organizations so vulnerable to head-hunting games are many, but the most important are the difficulty of replacing quality employees and the resource and time required to identify, train and retain the employees that are or will be on “the wanted list” of other organizations. This is because success in hypercompetitive markets depends heavily on talented employees to develop and produce new quality products and services, to devise efficient processes, to deliver products and service as fast as possible and to provide superior customer service (Shirazi, 2000). No other factors, internal or external to organizations, have such a potent influence on organization performance and success.

The trend in the market, particularly as the result of the recent financial crisis and global recession, is an indicative of further tightening of the job market in this sector, as organizations try to hedge themselves against further deterioration or improvement in the economic conditions. Either way, they have nothing to lose. If the economic condition worsens, then organizations need the best workforce to keep their head above the water, and if things turn for better, they are in an ideal position to take advantage of their fortune.

From human resource management perspective, attracting and retaining high caliber employees, even in virtual organizations, requires a new management mindset that promotes employees’ positive attitudes toward managers and reinforces the bond between organizations and their employees. Instead, what is often recommended regarding employees’ motivating is narrowly focused on temporary solutions and external motivators such as financial incentives and flexible work schedules. While pay increases, financial and material gains and promotions are important motivators, they are not as long-lasting and effective as meaningful job, professional development and positive energy. This research applies a three dimensional model of organizational commitment to identify predictive factors that affect employees’ commitment. The findings could be valuable in job design and work conditions for promoting organizational commitment.

Organizational Commitment

Organizational commitment has been studied from behavioral and attitudinal perspectives. Behavioral dimension focuses on the relationship between employees’ actions and their feeling of belongingness to their organization. Attitudinal dimension, on the other, studies the employees’ mindsets and their influence on organizational identification. Porter and his colleagues (1974: 603-609) define organizational commitment as the relative strength of a person’s identification with a particular organization and his or her sustained and long-lasting involvement in it. This definition has three distinctive components. First, person has a strong belief in the organization’s goals and values (identification); second, it drives the person to significant efforts to help organization achieve its goals (involvement); third, it creates a strong desire in the person to stay in the organization (loyalty). Similarly, Angel and Perry (1981: 1-14) argue that organizational commitment should be studied in the context of commitment to stay in the organization and commitment to its goals and values.

Allen and Meyer (1990: 18-38, 1993: 49-61), based on the work of Porter and others (1974), Becker (1960: 32-34) and Kanter (1968: 499-551), suggest a three-dimensional model of organizational commitment that includes affective commitment, continuance commitment and normative commitment. While affective commitment is related to a person’s genuine desire to stay in the organization and to be identified by it, continuance commitment is about costs associated with the person’s departure from the organization, and normative commitment is discussed in terms of the person’s loyalty to the organization. In other words, affective commitment shows what a person “want to”, continuance commitment shows what a person “need to”, and finally normative commitment shows what a person “ought to”. From this perspective, commitment is a psychological state by which a person feels dependent on an organization. This model explains the concept of organizational commitment more comprehensively compared to previous models. Further, the research instrument based on this model has frequently been shown to have high validity and reliability (Meyer and Allen, 1997; Muthueloo and Che Rose, 2005: 1095-1100).

Factors affecting organizational commitment

Dessler (1993) claims that organizational commitment is a key competitive advantage. Hence, he poses to two fundamental questions: 1) what factors affect employees' commitment?; 2) how can managers promote employees' commitment to their organization? His research found 8 factors that affect and promote organizational commitment, including people-first values, communion, transcendental mediation, double-talk, value-based hiring, securitizing, hard-side rewards and actualizing.

Dockel (2003) in his review of 85 articles published between 1993 and 1995, found that organizational commitment appears to be affected by several factors, including personal characteristics, service compensation, role state, job career, job characteristics, organizational characteristics and group-supervisor relations. Fornes and Rocco (2004) found that clarity of purpose, fairness, empowerment, recognition and feedback, autonomy and interesting work are the most important factors that affect organizational commitment. Further, the more workers are committed to their organization, the higher loyal, productive and accountable they tend to be. Han and his colleagues (1995: 39-68) in a study based on expectancy theory of motivation in South Korea, concluded that job satisfaction can act as a mediatory factor in affecting organizational commitment and is influenced by environmental and personal variables, such as positive attitude toward organization, active involvement and structural factors.

Meyer and his colleagues (1991) in their study of factors affecting organizational commitment and their correlational strengths found that while personal characteristics (locus of control) and job competencies had the most influence on affective commitment, continuance commitment were affected by substitute job opportunities, person's investment on current job and job characteristics, normative commitment were influenced by personal characteristics, organization investment on the individual and the extent of employee's socialization. Other studies found a positive relationship between continuance commitment and job dissatisfaction, tenure, age and costs of job-quitting (Meyer and Allen, 1997) and between normative commitment and commitment to colleagues, organizational trust and participative management (Dod-McCue and Wright, 1996: 1065-1091; Commerias and Fournier, 2002: 239-259).

Some researchers have examined the correlational power between the three dimensions of organizational commitment. For example, Brown and Gaylor (2002) found that while affective and normative commitment, in one hand, and normative and continuance commitment, on the other, are positively and meaningfully correlated, affective and continuance commitment are negatively and meaningfully correlated. The results in another study (Iverson and Buttigieg, 1998), with the aim of determining the relationship between types of organizational commitment and job-quitting, organizational justice and job security, revealed that there exists a positive and significant relationship between affective and normative commitment, a negative and significant relationship between job-quitting and affective and normative commitment, a negative and significant relationship between continuance commitment (as it relates to the lack of substitute job), affective and normative commitment, a negative and significant relationship between job security and affective and normative commitment, and a positive and significant relationship between job security and affective commitment. Finally, they found a positive and significant relationship between organizational justice (distributive justice), affective and normative commitment, and a negative and significant relationship with continuance commitment, a positive and significant relationship between length of service, supervisor and colleague supports, promotion opportunities, and a negative and significant relationship between promotion opportunities and affective commitment. The current research seeks to identify factors affecting the dimensions of organizational commitment and their predictive strengths on each dimension in a utility company.

Methodology

The population of the research is 423 employees of a regional power generation company in the city of Mashhad, a capital of the north eastern province in Iran. Given the continuity of variables under study, a stratified sampling technique, using Cochran's (1977) formulae, was used to determine the research sample

population. The calculated value was 140 (n), however to increase the chance of adequate useable returns, 250 questionnaires were distributed which at the end 180 questionnaires were returned and analyzed. Of this number of respondents, 92% were men and the rest were women. The distribution of sample among four types of employees included: 1) technical managers and specialists 50%, 2) non-technical managers and specialists 20%, 3) technicians 18% and 4) non technical employees 12%. The minimum and maximum years of service were 9 and 32 respectively with the mean of 15.5 years. In addition, the minimum and maximum years of service in the present job were 1 and 31 respectively with the mean of 9 years. Finally, while the youngest respondent aged 26, the oldest was 63 years old with the mean age of 40 years old.

Research Instrument

In-depth interviews were the principle method used to identify the key variables affecting the organizational commitment. A purposive sampling method (Saunders, et al. 1997) was used to non-randomly select 45 interviewees from four occupation groups described above. The key selection criteria were job knowledge, length of service, experience and positive individual performance, and informed about the company's history and performance. The transcripts of these interviews were coded and content analyzed. A questionnaire with 58 items based on 8 factors, including reputation, managers' competence, managerial support, organization justice, organizational values, reciprocal commitment, job satisfaction and job security mentioned above was designed to assess each factor and their importance using 5 and 8 Likert scales respectively. The following formula is used to determine weighted mean (performance x importance) of each factor affecting organizational commitment:

$$\text{Numerical criterion} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i \beta_i}{\sum \alpha_i \cdot \text{Max} \beta_i} \times 100$$

(α_i) represents the importance of each questionnaire item given by a respondent, (β_i) and ($\text{Max} \beta_i$) show the respondent's score for the current organization conditions as relate to a specific factor and the highest score given for the desirable organization conditions for the same factor respectively. The application of this formula for each factor and its relevant items in the questionnaire results in a score that the closer it is to 100, the more desirable is the organization conditions for a particular factor from the respondent's perspective. The questionnaire then was distributed among a primary chosen sample of 45 individuals, whose responses confirmed all items, i.e. scoring higher than median. Finally, the secondary sample of 180 individuals completed the questionnaire.

Further, an 18 items organizational commitment questionnaire based on 5-likert scale (Meyer and Allen, 1997) was also used to assess the current organization commitment. This questionnaire assesses the organizational commitment in the context of affective, continuance and normative commitment and is preferred over similar instruments, including Porter and others questionnaire (1994) that focuses mainly on affective commitment. Another advantage of the Meyer and Allen's (1997) questionnaire is the inclusion of reverse items that increases its accuracy.

The Cronbach's coefficient alpha test was used to calculate the internal reliability of the questionnaires. Table 1 and Table 2 show the results for the factors questionnaire and commitment questionnaire respectively.

Table 1: Reliability test results for 8 factors

Item	Factor	α
1	Reputation	0.84
2	Managers' competence	0.85
3	Managerial support	0.91
4	Organization justice	0.87
5	Organizational values	0.83
6	Reciprocal commitment	0.69
7	Job satisfaction	0.62
8	Job security	0.67

Table 2: Reliability test results

Item	Commitment dimension	α
1	Affective	0.88
2	Continuance	0.63
3	Normative	0.84

The validity was determined by using content and face validity. The Friedman Chi ² test, variance analysis, the Least Significant Difference test (LSD), t test and multi regression models were used in inferential statistics.

Findings

Table 3 shows the mean score for each of the three dimensions of organizational commitment based on organizational levels.

Table 3: Mean of organizational commitment variables at four job levels

Job level \ Variable	Technical Managers and Specialists	Non-technical Managers and Specialists	Technicians	Non-technicians	Company
Affective commitment	3.77	3.45	3.82	3.92	3.72
Continuance commitment	3.37	3.11	3.53	3.67	3.37
Normative commitment	3.30	3.30	3.33	3.12	3.12

Table 4 and 5 show the results of mean ranking tests and the analysis of variance (ANOVA) tests respectively. As shown in Table 4, there is a significant difference at 5% level between mean scores of affective, continuance and normative commitment. Of the three dimensions of commitment, affective commitment ranked the highest, and continuance commitment ranked the lowest.

Table 4. Friedman test for the mean rank of dimensions of commitment

Variable	Mean Rank	Chi ²	Degree of Freedom	Significance	Number
Affective commitment	2.49				
Continuance commitment	1.85	64.677	2	0.000	161
Normative commitment	1.66				

Table 5: Variance analysis (ANOVA) of dimensions of commitment between and within groups

Variable		Sum of Squares	Degree of Freedom	Mean Squared	F	Significance
Affective commitment	Between groups	4.019	3	1.34	2.5	0.061
	Within groups	89.771		0.534		
Continuance commitment	Between groups	4.788	3	1.596	3.72	0.013
	Within groups	74.619		0.429		
Normative commitment	Between groups	4.866	3	1.622	3.98	0.009
	Within groups	67.235		67.235		

As is shown in Table 5, there is a difference between the mean scores of normative and continuance commitment among different types of job levels. The results of the LSD test show that there is a significant difference between all job levels at 5% level, except the technical managers and specialists level. The mean score of normative commitment of non-technical employees is higher than those of technicians and non-technical managers and specialists. It should be noted here that the results also show that there is no difference between the mean scores of normative commitment for technical managers and specialists and the other three job levels that indicates their level of affective commitment is similar to those of other job levels.

Given that the difference between means scores of continuance commitment at all organization levels is confirmed, the LSD test results show that there is a significant difference between the mean score of continuance commitment at the technical managers and specialists level and the two lower levels, i.e. non-technical managers and specialists and technicians. It was also found that the mean scores of the continuance commitment for employees at the technical managers and specialists level are higher than those obtained at technicians and non-technical employees.

In addition to assessing the organizational commitment in the context of its three dimensions, the data related to factors affecting organizational commitment, as summarized in Table 6, were analyzed.

Table 6: Scores from 100 for factors affecting organizational commitment at job levels and the company

Job level Factor	Technical Managers and Specialists	Non-technical Managers and Specialists	Technicians	Non- technicians	Company
Reputation	82.04	85.70	82.10	85.53	83.18
Managers' competence	62.63	61.32	68.75	70.21	64.09
Managerial support	59.49	60.99	65.35	68.65	61.84
Organizational justice	57.15	58.52	61.79	62.97	51.87
Organizational values	62.10	59.41	70.50	74.88	64.19
Reciprocal commitment	66.59	66.87	69.97	73.74	64.07
Job satisfaction	66.28	69.03	70.02	76.00	68.59
Job security	51.07	50.76	49.68	42.90	50.00

Table 7 and 8 show the results of Friedman mean ranking test and consolidated results of variance analysis of factors affecting organizational commitment.

Table 7: Friedman test for the mean rank of factors affecting commitment

Statistics Factor	Mean Rank	Chi ²	Degree of Freedom	Significance
Reputation	7.79			
Managers' competence	5.39			
Managerial support	5.14			
Organizational justice	4.46	331.897	7	0.000
Organizational values	4.31			
Reciprocal commitment	3.77			
Job satisfaction	3.21			
Job security	1.94			

Table 8: Consolidated results of the ANOVA test

Factor	Significant Difference at Job Level	F
Reciprocal commitment	No	0.164, F=1.72
Job satisfaction	Yes	0.12, F=3.75
Job security	Yes	0.024, F=3.22
Reputation	No	0.134, F=1.88
Managers' Competence	Yes	0.01, F=3.88
Managerial support	No	0.054, F=2.604
Organizational justice	No	0.202, F=1.56
Organizational values	Yes	0.000, F=7.06

As seen in Table 8, high and low scores for reputation and job security are confirmed. This implies that employees regards the company as reputable, but feel insecure about the future of their job. Tables 9 and 10 show the results of correlational relationships and the multi-variables regression respectively.

Table 9: Results of correlational relationships

Variable Factor	Affective commitment	Normative commitment	Continuance commitment	Company
Reputation	0.264**	0.121	0.121	0.242**
Managers' competence	0.444**	0.419**	-0.15	0.486**
Managerial support	0.539**	0.390**	-0.073	0.522**
Organizational justice	0.428**	0.300**	-0.032	0.408**
Common values	0.462**	0.441**	-0.186	0.645**
Reciprocal commitment	0.415**	0.359**	-0.145	0.654**
Job satisfaction	0.317**	0.293**	-0.212	0.412**
Job security	Jan-00	-0.129	-0.194	0.14

Table 10: Results of regression analysis

Job level Variable	Technical Managers and Specialists	Non-technical Managers and Specialists	Technicians	Non-technicians	Company
Affective Commitment	P=0.000 F=9.07 R ² =0.42 AC=3.06+0.03OJ +0.25JS	P=0.000 F=22.05 R ² =0.61 AC=+0.041MC	P=0.001 F=13.02 R ² =0.92 AC=-0.278+ 0.026MS + 0.061JS	P=0.005 F=25.31 R ² =0.86 AC=-7.32+ 0.068R+0.067JoS	P=0.000 F=21.30 R ² =0.38 AC=1.32+0. 026+OJ+0.0 13RC
Continuance Commitment	P=0.003 F=5.57 R ² =0.36 CC=3.71- MC+0.28MS	P=0.018 F=4.30 R ² =0.46 CC=4.51+0.038OJ- 0.026OV	P=0.071 F=3.86 R ² =0.67 CC=5.09-0.026JoS	*	P=0.009 F=7.04 R ² =0.14 CC=3.84- 0.012OV
Normative Commitment	P=0.000 F=7.90 R ² =0.63 NC=2.47+0.018MC	P=0.001 F=4.63 R ² =0.30 NC=1.26+0.21MC	P=0.024 F=6.37 R ² =0.77 NC=2.47+0.016MC	*	P=0.000 F=22.23 R ² =0.25 NC=1.91+0. 022MC

Note: AC=Affective Commitment, CC=Continuance Commitment, NC=Normative Commitment, OJ=Organizational Justice, RC=Reciprocal Commitment, JS=Job Security, MC=Managers' Competence, MS=Managerial Support, JoS=Job Satisfaction, R=Reputation, OV=Organizational Value

* Collinear

As shown in Table 10, variations in affective commitment at four different job levels identify other predictive variables. For example, organizational justice and reciprocal commitment as predictive factors account for 38% of variations in affective commitment at the company level. At the technical managers and specialists level, organizational justice and job security explain 42% of variations in affective commitment. At the non-technical managers and specialists level, only managers' competence remains in regression model, accounting for 61% of variations in affective commitment. At the technician level, two variables, namely managerial support and job security predict the variations in affective commitment. However, variations of managerial support and job security have the same direction as affective commitment. The coefficient of determination in the model is $R^2 = 0.85$, meaning that these three variables predict 85% of variations in affective commitment. Finally, at the non-technicians level, 92% of variations in affective commitment are predicted by two variables of job satisfaction and company's reputation.

The same analysis for normative commitment represents a special case, since the regression model has not retained any variable at company level and job units, except at the non-technicians level due to its collinearity. The only variable that predicts variations in normative commitment is management competencies. The variable coefficient in all cases is positive that means the variations in this variable and normative commitment have the same direction. On the other hand, as we move from the company level to the technician level, the coefficient of determination gets larger, so that while it is 0.25 at the company level, it reaches 0.85 at the technicians level. In other words, 85% of variations in normative commitment at the technician level are due to the management competency.

Similarly, of the 8 variables in the regression model, only organizational values predict variations in continuance commitment. The determination coefficient of 0.14 means that 14% of variations in continuance commitment are predicted by this variable. As seen in Table 10, this coefficient is negative that means to the extent the company lacks cohesion or a trusting climate, continuance commitment increases; not a desirable consequence for the company.

While the managers' competence and managerial support account for 36% of variations in continuance commitment at the technical managers and specialists level, the organizational justice and organizational values account for 46% of variations in continuance commitment at the non-technical managers and specialists level. At the technician level, 67% of variations in continuance commitment are predicted by job satisfaction.

Discussion

The examination of research findings in the context of three dimensions of organizational commitment highlights that the mean score of affective commitment, normative commitment and continuance commitment are higher than the average mean score and hence could be generalized to the company. The mean ranking tests show that affective commitment, normative commitment and continuance commitment are the company's first, second and third priorities respectively. This finding indicates that affective commitment of human resources in the company is stronger compared to the other two dimensions, implying that employees really like working for the company. Such attitude is healthy and could be considered as the company's strength. The sequence of priority of the commitment dimensions in this research is similar to those of Smith's (2004) in Australia, Arciniega and Gonzalez (2006: 35-50) in Spain, and Gill and Zain (1999) in Malaysia. They concluded that high affective commitment is an important factor for workers cooperation to achieve organizational goals.

Affective commitment at various job levels shows similar results. This finding backs up the claim that employees, on relative terms, feel the same way about this dimension. In other words, they enjoy working in the company. Similarly, the positive relationship between affective and normative commitment and their inverse relationship with continuance commitment found in this study confirms Allan and Meyer's (1990), Brown and Gaylor (2002) and Smith's findings (2004) in that the high coefficient of correlation between affective and normative commitment is an indication of feeling of employees' belonging to the company. The low continuance commitment means score reconfirms this finding.

The positive correlation between affective and normative commitment and the negative correlation of these two commitment dimensions with continuance commitment is similar to Francesco and Chen (2004)

and Hofstede's (1980: 42-63, 1991) findings that differentiate cultures along individualism-collectivism continuum. The feeling of belonging (affective commitment) and duty to organization (normative commitment) could be examples of the collectivity approach.

The findings also show that the company reputation with the score of 83 and job security with the score of 50 on the basis of the score of 100 have earned the highest and lowest points respectively, indicating that while employees regard the company's reputation in the wider society as being high, they feel insecure about the future of their job in the company. Furthermore, several in-depth interviews conducted by the researchers confirm that from employees' perspective, people in the community have a positive image toward the company. Given that positive image and reputation are achieved over time and reflect the employees' commitment to the company and feelings of belongingness toward their job, it is imperative for the company to strive to maintain and promote such a highly valued strength. No company can afford to ignore the importance of positive image from key stakeholders' perspective

On the other hand, the job security low score across the company, and at job levels, is the company's weakness. The management instability, privatization policy, downsizing, tight job market are among the external factors causing this phenomenon. However, if the problem is looked at from inside, it becomes evident that employee's knowledge, skills and capabilities are not high enough to give them a sense of control over environmental turbulence and limitations. This underscores what Senge (1990) refers to the personal mastery as one of the key elements in learning organizations. This finding also supports Dessler's (1993) suggestion that managers should hire people for life, but hinge their continued employment on self-development and empowerment.

The results derived from the data analysis of three dimensions of commitment revealed that 38% of affective commitment at the company level is predicted by organizational justice and reciprocal commitment. This finding confirms with Dessler's (1993) view when he says that the reduction in class gap somehow undermines justice, and also what Greenberg (1990) emphasizes in the content theory of reaction regarding individual's style of response to interventions and unfair treatments. In other words, people expect to receive rewards, at least equal to what they bring to their job. Therefore, when they are treated fairly, they reciprocate in kind. This finding supports Williams (2003) and Wagner's (1998: 2-6) findings that suggest the lack of organization loyalty toward employees adversely affect their reciprocal commitment.

The regression model shows that of the eight variables included in the research, only one variable i.e. managerial competence, predicts normative. This finding supports the Lawler's (1992) view that managers are the ultimate competitive advantage for organizations, and also Dockel's (2003) finding regarding the effect of management behavior on employees' commitment. The respondents throughout the current study, particularly during interviews, repeatedly referred to several managerial competencies, such as decisiveness and role-model (do as they say), as important factors that influence their commitment to the company. Hence, Dessler (1993) recommends that creating commitment-oriented organizations requires that managers' actions be louder than their words.

Conclusions

In this study, affective commitment was found to be the company's strength that not only plays a key role in moving employees in the direction of company's goals but is effective in retaining the most valuable and experienced employees. In addition, employees' feeling of being proud of the company's reputation is a significant advantage. However, employees' feeling of job insecurity across company and management lack of attention to address the problem is among major concerns that may undermine this competitive advantage.

Of all factors affecting organizational commitment, while justice and reciprocal commitment influence affective commitment the most, managerial competence and attention to organizational values affect normative commitment and continuance commitment the most respectively. It seems that if these factors are managed properly, they could picture a commitment-oriented company in the future. Therefore, creating a commitment-oriented organization requires a comprehensive analysis of key dimensions in the organization. In the current study, despite collecting data from various jobs and at the company level, the findings and the

basis for recommendations are related to the company as a whole. With this approach in mind, recommendations applicable to the company are: 1) Maintenance and improvement of the company's reputation and image require the management of effect. Thus, knowledge of employees, particularly new employees, about company's history, highly regarded managers and hardworking employees should be increased. In addition, proper treatment of new employees during their orientation is one of the most effective ways of socialization that helps to plant the seed of commitment. Here is where the HRM unit should play a major role. It should be given the resources and time required to design the content, implement approach and management style of the first contact so that the new recruits are positively affected in their first experience of the company. 2) All reputable and superior companies need to have competent and capable managers. Given that the company in the study has had considerable experience of being managed by some prominent individuals, it is essential to ensure that competencies and capabilities play the most important role in appointing managers, particularly the Chief Executive Officer, so that management stability and performance is maintained and reinforced. 3) The organizational justice seems to affect commitment in the company. Hence, the company should set the tone and context in which organizational justice and its dimensions are discussed and eventually a common understanding on the issues is reached. Management, on the other hand, should create a participative climate where all stakeholders within the company feel that they play a meaningful role in devising procedures, methods and operational standards in areas that have the most effects on their job. 4) This research found that the organizational values moderate the effects of utilitarian behaviors. Hence, the company should define, express and promote those values and their related criteria that reflect the company's type of work and activities and its long-term objectives.

REFERENCES

- ALLEN, N. J. and Meyer, J. P. (1993). "Organizational commitment: Evidence of career stage effect?", *Journal of Business Research*, Volume 26, Issue 1, pp. 49-61.
- ALLEN, N. J. and Meyer, J. P. (1990). "The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization", *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, Volume 63, Issue 1, pp. 18-38.
- ANGLE, H. L. and Perry, J. L. (1981). "An empirical assessment of organizational commitment and organizational effectiveness", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Volume 26, Issue 1, pp. 1-14.
- ARCINIEGA, L. M. and Gonzalez, L. (2006). "What is the influence of work values relative to other variables in the development of organizational commitment", *Revista de Psicología Social*, Volume 21, Issue 1, pp. 35-50.
- BECKER, H. S. (1960). "Notes on concept of commitment", *American Journal of Sociology*, Volume 66, pp. 32-42.
- BROWN, III, U. J. and Gaylor, K. P. (2002). *Organizational commitment in higher education*, Jackson State University.
- CHU, R. (2002). "Stated - Importance versus Derived - Importance customer satisfaction measurement", *Journal of Service Marketing*, Volume 1, Issue 4, pp. 285-301.
- COCHRAN, W. G. (1977). *Sampling Techniques*, (3rd ed.). Wiley.
- COMMERIAS, N. and Fournier, C. (2002). "Critical evaluation of Peter et al's organizational commitment Questionnaire: Implications for researchers", *Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management*, Volume 21, Issue 3, pp. 239-259.
- DESSLER, G. (1993). *Winning commitment: How to build and keep a competitive workforce*, McGraw-Hill.
- DOCKEL, A. (2003). *The effect of retention factors on organizational commitment: An investigation of high technology employees*, Unpublished M.A. Dissertation, University of Pretoria.
- DODD-MCCUE, D. and Wright, G. B. (1996). "Men women and attitudinal commitment: the effects of work experiences and socialization", *Human Relations*, Volume 49, Issue 8, pp. 1065-1091.
- FORNES, S. L. and Rocco, T. S. (2004). *Commitment elements reframed (Antecedents and consequences) for organizational effectiveness*, The proceeding of the AHRD conference, USA.
- FRANCESCO, A. M. and Chen, Z. X. (2004). "Collectivism in action", *Group and Organizational Management*, Volume 29, Issue 4.
- GILL, R. and Zain, A. Y. MD. (1999). "A psychometric assesement of the Malay version of Meyer and Allen's organizational commitment measure", *Malaysian Management Review*, June.
- GREENBERG, J. (1990). "Organizational justice: Yesterday, today and tomorrow", *Journal of Management*, Volume 16, Issue 2, pp. 399-432.

- HAN, N. C., Ko, J. W., Price, J. L. and Mueller, C. W., 1995. "Organizational commitment in South Korea", *Research and Practice in Human Resource Management*, Volume 3, Issue 1, pp. 39-68.
- HOFESTEDE, G. (1980). "Motivation, leadership and organization: Do American theories apply abroad?", *Organizational Dynamics*, Volume 9, Issue 1, pp. 42-63.
- HOFESTEDE, G. (1991). *Cultures and organizations: Intercultural cooperation and its importance for survival*, New York: McGraw-Hill.
- IVERSON, R. D. and Buttigieg, D. M. (1998). *Affective, normative and continuance commitment: Can the right kind of commitment be managed?*, Working paper, Issue 7, University of Melbourne.
- KANTER, R. M. (1968). "Commitment and social organization: A study of commitment mechanisms in utopian communities", *American Sociological Review*, Volume 33, Issue 4, pp. 499-551.
- LAWLER, E. E. (1992). *The ultimate advantage: Creating high involvement organization*, Jossey-Bass.
- MEYER, J. P. and Allen, N. J. (1997). *Commitment in the workplace: Theory, research and application*, Thousand Oaks: Sage Publication.
- MEYER, J. P., Bobocel, D. R. and Allen, N. J. (1991). "Development of Organizational commitment during the first year of employment: A longitudinal study of pre- and post- entry influences", *Journal of Management*, Volume 17, Issue 4, pp. 717-733.
- MUTHUVELOO, R. and Che Rose, R. (2005). "Antecedents and outcomes of organizational commitment among Malaysian Engineers", *American Journal of applied Sciences*, Volume 2, Issue 6, pp. 1095-1100.
- PORTER, L. W., Steers, R. M., Mowday, R. T. and Boulian, P. V. (1974). "Organizational commitment, job satisfaction and turnover among psychiatric technicians", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Volume 59, Issue 5, pp. 603-609.
- SENGE, P. M. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organisation*, New York: Doubleday/Currency.
- SHIRAZI, A. (2000). *Perceptions of Effective Management Performance in the 21st Century*, Unpublished PhD Dissertation, Queensland University of Technology, Australia.
- SMITH, D. (2004). *The impact of performance – Contingent rewards on multiple dimensions of accountant's organizational commitment*, Monash University, Australia.
- SAUNDERS, M., Lewis, P. and Thornhill, A. (1997). *Research methods for business students*, Pitman Publishing.
- WAGNER, J. (1998). "Downsizing effects on organizational development capabilities at an electric utility", *Journal of Industrial Technology*, Volume 15, Issue 1, pp. 2-6.
- WILLIAMS, G. C. (2003). *Organizational commitment during public sector downsizing* Memorial University.