

Organizational Commitment among Selected Employees of a Local University in Manila

Nil Edward F. Panuelos

Prime Rose Teodulice M. Lanete – Fabul

Jean J. Perez – Ramirez

College of Physical Therapy, Pamantasan ng Lungsod ng Maynila

nefpanuelos@plm.edu.ph

ORCID: [0000-0001-7941-975X](https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7941-975X)

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.56738/issn29603986.geo2023.4.37>

Abstract

Organizational commitment is the emotional bond employees have with their workplace. Employees devoted to their organization typically experience a bond with it, a sense of belonging, and an awareness of its goals, vision, and mission. Employees are said to be dedicated to the organization when their aims align with those of the organization, when they are willing to invest effort on its behalf, and when they wish to retain their relationship with the business. There has been a rise in interest in studying employee commitment to their organizations. There is much curiosity about organizational commitment because it predicts things like turnover, attitude, and happiness. Research in this field has shaped commitment on the job, in one's profession, in one's work group, and in one's work as a whole. Using Meyer and Allen's concept, this research examines the three facets of organizational commitment among a selected group of employees at the Pamantasan ng Lungsod ng Maynila (PLM) to determine if

there is a correlation between them. In addition, the research report analyzed how employees with different demographic profiles rate on a scale of organizational commitment.

Keywords: Organizational commitment, employees, workplace,

Introduction

Organizational commitment pertains to the emotional connection that employees establish with their workplace. Those who are truly committed to their organization typically form a strong connection, experience a feeling of inclusion, and possess a deep understanding of the organization's objectives, vision, and mission. According to Kessler (2013), organizational commitment can be described as an employee's emotional attachment and loyalty to the organization to which they are affiliated. A sign of this commitment is when employees share the organization's goals, willingly dedicate their efforts on its behalf, and intend to maintain their association with the company. Employees who exhibit organizational commitment are those who prioritize the organization's objectives over their personal ones. They voluntarily sustain their active involvement within the team, even when alternative opportunities arise. This is why individuals may even adapt their own fundamental values and personal convictions to align with those of the organization they are part of (Clayton, 2000).

There has been a rise in interest in studying employee commitment to their organizations. There is much curiosity about organizational commitment because it predicts things like turnover, attitude, and happiness. Ghosh and Swamy (2014) state that the notion of commitment in the workplace is still an active topic of study and an intriguing aspect of employee behavior. Research in this field has shaped commitment on the job, in one's profession, in one's work group, and in one's work as a whole.

In 1997, Meyer and Allen introduced their field of study regarding organizational commitment; they divided commitment into three unique categories: affective, normative, and continuance dedication. The breadth and depth of their ideas have made them famous. Using

Meyer and Allen's concept, this research examines the three facets of organizational commitment among a selected group of employees at the Pamantasan ng Lungsod ng Maynila (PLM) to determine if there is a correlation between them. In addition, the article analyzed how employees with different demographic profiles rate on a scale of organizational commitment.

Statement of the Problem

This study employed Allen and Meyer's (1990) and Meyer and Allen's (1991) three-component model of organizational commitment as its theoretical foundation. The three-component multidimensional model proposed by Meyer and Allen posits that organizational commitment consists of three components: affective commitment, continuation commitment, and normative commitment. These components are organizational commitment's sub-constructs. In this study, these characteristics of organizational commitment were treated as distinct phenomena. Therefore, the researchers want to establish if there is a difference among the three components in terms of employee demographic profile. In addition, this study aims to investigate the relationship among each construct.

Hypothesis:

The aims to establish the following hypothesis:

Ho1: There is no significant difference between the construct of each organizational commitment with the subject's demographic profile.

Ho2: There is no significant relationship between each construct of organizational commitment.

Review of Related Literature

The literature on management and leadership has identified organizational commitment as an essential dimension that warrants ongoing evaluation. Affective, continuation and

normative commitment are the three components of organizational commitment. The three-factor model of organizational commitment developed by Allen and Meyer (1997) has been extensively studied and discussed in management and organization.

Herscovitch and Meyer (2002) hypothesized that the interplay between several kinds of organizational commitment could result in consequences that would be invisible when evaluating only one form of commitment at a time. As Johnson et al. (2009) pointed out, a lack of a preexisting theoretical framework may account for the paucity of research into the interplay between various forms of organizational commitment.

While factors like the age of an organization impact employees' levels of commitment to the company, factors including employees' lengths of service, ages, and levels of experience also have a role. In India, Kumar and Giri (2009) examined how age and experience level affected employees' dedication to the company. To conclude, they found that while demographic factors like race and gender did not significantly impact employee loyalty, demographic factors like tenure, age, and career stage did. Brimeyer et al. (2010) found that training can change people's commitment to norms and that normative commitment is higher for permanent workers than temporary ones.

The three parts of organizational commitment identified by Allen & Meyer (1991) are shown to be distinct and measurable. The results of their research, which emphasizes the physiological aspects of commitment, reveal that there are, in fact, three factors that contribute to organizational loyalty: (1) eagerness (affective commitment), (2) need (continuance commitment), and (3) obligation (normative continuance).

Affective Commitment

Affective commitment occurs when employees experience a sense of belonging and satisfaction due to their work. As described by Meyer & Allen (1997), affective commitment measures how much of an employee's investment is in the company's success. Affective commitment occurs when employees take an interest in and remain dedicated to the company's inner workings. Thus, organizational commitment and employee attitudes indicate that the company is like a family.

When employees' values align with their employer, it leads to a feeling of emotional investment in the company. Emotional commitment develops when employees recognize congruence between their personal and company values. A worker with emotional commitment is ecstatic to join the organization and does not consider quitting due to his or her sense of belonging (Meyer & Herscowitch, 2002).

Continuance Commitment

The concept of Continuance Commitment is that employees maintain their organization membership and dedication due to personal expectations and profitability. As it is termed in the literature, reasonable continuance is workers' knowledge of the cost of quitting the organization (Chen & Francesco, 2003). Continuance commitment can mean employees' notion that leaving the organization will be expensive. Employees remain with the company for other reasons due to social, physiological, and economic factors such as fear of not finding a better job, hesitation in leaving friends, reluctance to relocate, family concerns, and financial loss, among others (Allen & Grisafe, 2001).

Normative Commitment

A normative commitment is a preference to remain in an organization due to past relationships. This commitment consists of a mandatory requirement. This devotion results from the employees' training or good working relationships. In other words, this commitment is distinct from the other two since the employee considers staying with the organization a responsibility. Typical commitment is influenced by company culture, age, education, and length of service (Dordevic, 2004)

Methodology

An inferential design utilizing a survey questionnaire was used in the investigation. This approach was aligned with the study problem, which was to see the difference in organizational commitment scores based on demographic profiles and to determine the relationship among each construct. Participants are Pamantasan ng Lungsod ng Maynila (PLM) personnel who were chosen using convenience and snowball sampling methods. All current university employees were invited, and 56 participants voluntarily participated in the investigation.

Instrumentation

A single survey instrument was utilized for the research method. The survey instrument, or measurement tool, consisted of six demographic profile questions, Meyer and Allen's (1990) Employee Commitment Survey.

Using a survey questionnaire checklist, the researchers collected demographic variables: gender, age, educational attainment, type of office, employment status, and post. The Meyer and Allen Organizational Commitment Scale is a 24-item, Likert-type response instrument. Response options range from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree) on each item. The results of the

rankings on the 18 commitment statements indicate the respondent's commitment. Since the early 1990s, the Meyer and Allen Organizational Commitment Model has been considered the leading assessment method for studying organizational commitment. Survey data was collected from non-unionized employees at two manufacturing firms and a university to test reliability. The authors (Meyer & Allen, 1990) reported reliabilities of 0.87 for the affective commitment scale, 0.75 for the continuance commitment scale, and 0.79 for the normative commitment scale. Construct validity demonstrating the conceptually distinct aspects of each commitment scale was examined in two separate studies (Allen & Meyer, 1990, 1996). Results from both studies indicated that three components of organizational commitment were empirically distinguishable from each other and could be reliably measured.

Table 1.

Descriptive Equivalents

Interval Scores		For Reverse
6.22 – 7.00	Strongly Agree	Strongly Disagree
5.35 – 6.21	Moderately Agree	Moderately Disagree
4.48 – 5.34	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree
3.61 – 4.47	Neither agree nor disagree	Neither agree nor disagree
2.74 – 3.60	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree
1.87 – 2.73	Moderately Disagree	Moderately Agree
1.00 – 1.86	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Agree

Procedure

The survey instrument, consent form, and accompanying letter were given to university employees. The accompanying letter and consent form explained the study's goal, requested

participation, and guaranteed respondents' anonymity and confidentiality. Researchers requested that respondents submit completed questionnaires. The researcher's contact information was provided to assist with inquiries or alternate arrangements for questionnaire gathering.

The data were processed using SPSS statistical software. Descriptive statistics and inferential statistics were used to analyze the data. Descriptive statistical analyses were computed using SPSS Version 21 for Macintosh. The means, standard deviations, percentages, and frequency distributions were compiled and reported. The descriptive analysis allows the researcher to describe variables in a general fashion. It also allows for summarization, organization, and graphic representation of quantitative data or information. The Spearman Rho correlation coefficient will determine the relationship among constructs (affective, continuance, normative commitment). Comparison (differences) between constructs and their demographic profiles will be analyzed using a T-Test and analysis of variance (ANOVA).

Table 2.

Level of Significance

Ranges	Interpretation
$\pm 0.80 - 1.00$	Significant, very high relationship
$\pm 0.60 - 0.79$	Significant high relationship
$\pm 0.40 - 0.59$	Significant moderate relationship
$\pm 0.20 - 0.39$	Significant low relationship
$\pm 0.00 - 0.19$	No significant relationship

Positive (+) and negative (-) values denote direct and indirect/inverse.

Results and Discussion

A quantitative investigation of the relationships between affective, continuance, and normative constructs and the differences between the constructs to the respondent's demographic profiles were determined. Results were summarized and arranged as follows:

Table 3.

Demographic Profiles of the Respondents

	Demographic Profile	N=56	Percentage
Gender	Male	30	53.6
	Female	26	46.4
	Total	56	100.0
Age	21-30 years old	13	23.2
	31-40 years old	15	26.8
	41-50 years old	14	25
	51 years old and above	14	25
	Total	56	100.0
Education	Bachelor's Degree	30	53.6
	Post Graduate Degree	26	46.4
	Total	56	100.0
Type of Office	Academic Office	27	48.2
	Non-Academic Office	29	51.8
	Total	56	100.0
Employment	Contractual/Temporary	25	44.6
	Permanent	31	55.4
	Total	56	100.0
Post	Head of Office or Faculty with Administrative Position	15	26.8
	Faculty	20	35.7
	Administrative Staff	21	37.5
	Total	56	100.0

Table 3 presents the demographic profiles of the respondents. Out of fifty-six (56) respondents, thirty (30), or 53.6 percent, are males, and twenty-six (26), or 46.4 percent, are females. Most respondents (n = 15; 26.8 percent) are between the ages of 31 and 40, while the

minority (n = 13; 23.2 percent) are between the ages of 21 and 30. In terms of educational attainment, thirty (30), or 53.6 percent of the respondents, are bachelor's degree graduates, while the remaining twenty-six (26) respondents, or 46.4 percent, have a post-graduate degree. Regarding the status of their employment, twenty-five (25), or 44.6 percent, are contractual, and the remaining thirty-one (31), or 55.4 percent, are permanent. Twenty-seven (47.2%) work in the academic office, while twenty-nine (51.8%) are assigned to the non-academic support office. Lastly, fifteen (15) of the respondents are office heads, twenty (20) are members of the faculty, and twenty-one (21) are from the administrative staff.

Table 4.

Mean Score of the Respondents according to Affective Commitment

Affective Commitment	X+SD	Dec. Equiv
1. I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization.	5.32 ± 1.114	Slightly Agree
2. I enjoy discussing my organization with people outside.	5.16 ± 1.218	Slightly Agree
3. I really feel as if this organization's problems are my own.	5.39 ± 0.846	Moderately Agree
4. I think that I could easily become as attached to another organization as I am to this one. (R)	3.57 ± 1.594	Slightly Agree
5. I do not feel like a 'part of the family' at my organization. (R)	2.59 ± 1.172	Slightly Agree
6. I do not feel 'emotionally attached' to this organization. (R)	2.70 ± 1.387	Moderately Agree
7. This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me.	5.09 ± 1.564	Slightly Agree
8. I do not feel a strong sense of belonging to my organization. (R)	2.43 ± 1.263	Moderately Agree
Over-all Mean	4.03 ± 0.031	Neither

Table 4 shows respondents' mean score according to their affective organizational commitment. The highest mean score for positive affective questions is 5.39 ± 0.846 (moderately agree) for statement number 3: "I really feel as if this organization's problems are my own," while the rest of the positively asked questions received a slight level of agreement. For negatively asked questions (reversed), statement number 8: "I do not feel a strong sense of belonging to my organization," has the highest mean score of 2.43 ± 1.263 (moderately agree), while statement 4: "I think that I could easily become as attached to another organization as I am to this one" has a low mean score of 3.57 ± 1.594 (slightly agree).

Table 5.

Mean Score of the Respondents according to Continuance Commitment

Continuance Commitment	Mean	Dec. Equiv
1. I am not afraid of what might happen if I quit my job without having another one lined up. (R)	3.14 ± 1.967	Slightly Agree
2. It would be very hard for me to leave my organization right now, even if I wanted to.	4.41 ± 1.682	Neither
3. Too much in my life would be disrupted if I decided I wanted to leave my organization now.	4.25 ± 1.890	Neither
4. It wouldn't be too costly for me to leave my organization now. (R)	3.36 ± 1.689	Slightly Agree
5. Right now, staying with my organization is a matter of necessity as much as desire.	4.73 ± 1.471	Slightly Agree
6. I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving this organization. (R)	2.88 ± 1.415	Slightly Agree
7. One of the few serious consequences of leaving this organization would be the scarcity of available alternatives.	4.21 ± 1.423	Neither

8. One of the major reasons I continue to work for this organization is that leaving would require considerable personal sacrifice—another organization may not match the overall benefits I have.	4.68 ± 1.441	Slightly Agree
Over-all Mean	3.96 ± 0.750	Neither

Table 5 presents the respondents' mean scores regarding their continued organizational commitment. Statement five, "Right now, staying with my organization is a matter of necessity as much as desire," got the highest mean score of 4.73 ± 1.471 (slightly agree), followed by statement number eight, "One of the major reasons I continue to work for this organization is that leaving would require considerable personal sacrifice—another organization may not match the overall benefits I have," with a mean of 4.68 ± 1.441 and a descriptive equivalent of "slightly agree." All negatively constructed questionnaires have a descriptive equivalence of slightly agreeing, with statement six ("I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving this organization") having the highest mean of 2.88 ± 1.415 .

Table 6.

Mean Score of the Respondents according to Normative Commitment

Normative Commitment	Mean	Dec. Equiv
1. I think that people these days move from company to company too often.	5.45 ± 1.235	Moderately Agree
2. I do not believe that a person must always be loyal to his or her organization. (R)	2.95 ± 1.667	Slightly Agree
3. Jumping from organization to organization does not seem at all unethical to me. (R)	3.63 ± 2.076	Neither
4. One of the major reasons I continue to work for this organization is that I believe loyalty is important and therefore I feel a sense of moral obligation to remain.	5.54 ± 1.095	Moderately Agree
5. If I got another offer for a better job elsewhere, I would not feel it was right to leave my organization.	4.07 ± 1.896	Neither

6. I was taught to believe in the value of remaining loyal to one organization.	5.05 ± 1.577	Slightly Agree
7. Things were better in the days when people stayed with one organization for most of their careers.	5.07 ± 1.219	Slightly Agree
8. I do not think that wanting to be a “company man” or “company woman” is sensible anymore. (R)	3.14 ± 1.566	Slightly Disagree
Over-all Mean	4.36 ± 0.537	Neither

The table above (Table 6) presents the respondents' mean score according to their normative organizational commitment. Statement four, "One of the major reasons I continue to work for this organization is that I believe that loyalty is important and therefore feel a sense of moral obligation to remain," got the highest mean score with 5.73 and a descriptive equivalent of moderately agree. On the other hand, statement one, "I think that people these days move from company to company too often," got the second highest mean score of 5.80, having a descriptive equivalent of moderately agree among all positively asked questions.

Table 7.

Differences in Organizational Commitment according to gender, educational attainment, type of office, employment status

		Affective		Continuance		Normative	
Profile		X ± SD	P-value	X ± SD	P-value	X ± SD	P-value
Gender	Male	4.13 + 0.452	.054	4.11 + 0.719	.107	4.33 ± 0.565	.632
	Female	3.91 + 0.412		3.78 + 0.761		4.40 ± 0.511	
Educational Attainment	Bachelor	4.08 + 0.416	.434	3.91 + 0.693	.633	4.37 + 0.589	.892
	Post-graduate	3.98 + 0.479		4.01 + 0.822		4.35 + 0.481	

Type of Office	Academic	4.06 + 0.486	.591	4.13 + 0.736	.098	4.40 + 0.597	.585
	Non-academic	4.00 + 0.409		3.80 + 0.740		4.32 + 0.482	
Employment status	Contractual	4.20 + 0.418	.012	4.17 ± 0.667	.056	4.41 ± 0.583	.592
	Permanent	3.90 + 0.427		3.79 ± 0.779		4.33 ± 0.504	

Table 7 shows the difference in organizational commitment according to gender. The affective commitment has a p-value of .054, the continuance commitment with a p-value of .107, and the normative commitment with a p-value of .632. It shows the difference in organizational commitment according to educational attainment. The affective commitment has a p-value: of .434, the continuance commitment with a p-value of .633) and the normative commitment with a p-value of .892. The type of office was divided into academic office units and non-academic office units. The result yields the following: affective commitment, p-value: .591), continuance commitment, p-value: .098, and normative commitment p-value: .585. All constructs of organizational commitment have a significant value greater than 0.05. Therefore, the results failed to reject the null hypothesis and state that there is no significant difference between the organizational commitment of the respondents according to their gender, educational attainment, and type of office.

Lastly, the table also shows the difference in organizational commitment according to employment status. The affective commitment has a p-value of .012, the continuance commitment with a p-value: of .056, and the normative commitment with a p-value of .592. The constructs of organizational commitment for continuance and normative have a significant value greater than 0.05, while affective commitment has a significant value of less than 0.05. The

results failed to reject the null hypothesis and state that there is no significant difference between continuance and normative organizational commitment. However, there is a significant difference in affective commitment regarding employment status.

Table 8.

The difference in Organizational Commitment According to Age and Post

Profile	Affective		Continuance		Normative	
	X $\pm$ SD	P-value	X $\pm$ SD	P-value	X $\pm$ SD	P-value
Age	4.03 $\pm$ 0.445	.039	3.96 $\pm$ 0.750	.934	4.36 $\pm$ 0.537	.833
Post	3.98 + 0.479	.693	4.01 + 0.822	.457	4.35 + 0.481	.334

Table 8 shows the difference in organizational commitment according to their age. The age range of respondents is divided into 4, specifically, 21-30-year-olds, 31-40-year-olds, 41-50-year-olds, and 51 years old and above. The affective commitment has a p-value of 0.39, the continuance commitment with a p-value of .934, and the normative commitment with a p-value of .833. On the other hand, the difference in organizational commitment according to their post is also presented in the same table. The affective commitment has a p-value: of .693, the continuance commitment with a p-value: of .457, and the normative commitment with a p-value of .334. Constructs of organizational commitment in terms of affective domain and age have a significant value greater than 0.05. Therefore, the results failed to reject the null hypothesis and state that there is no significant difference between the affective organizational commitment of

the respondents according to their age. Conversely, the other domains/constructs for age and post are rejected.

Table 9.

Relationship between constructs of organizational commitment

Variables	Correlation	Descriptive Equivalent	Decision on Ho*	Sig p-value	Interpretation
Affective and Continuance	.630	Significant high relationship	Reject	.000	Significant relationship
Affective and Normative	.656	Significant high relationship	Reject	.000	Significant relationship
Continuance and Normative	.579	Significant high relationship	Reject	.001	Significant relationship

Ho: There is a significant relationship between constructs of organizational commitment

Table 9 shows the relationship of the respondents' organizational commitments in-between constructs. There is a significant relationship between affective and continuance with a correlation of .630 (significant high relationship), affective and normative with a correlation coefficient of .656 (significant high relationship), and continuance and normative with a correlation score of .579 (significant moderate relationship). Relationships among constructs are all below 0.05. Therefore, it rejects the hypothesis and states that there is a significant relationship among constructs.

The discussion focused on the data analysis, including its similarity or disagreement with the other studies done in the past.

This study primarily investigated the differences among organizational commitment constructs (affective, continuance, and normative) based on the demographic profile (age, gender, education level, type of office, employment status, and designation/post).

Age. This study showed that age significantly differs, specifically in affective construct only. This result was consistent with the studies of Jena (2015) and Tandon (2020), which displayed that age has a significant difference in both affective (Yucel, 2012) and normative constructs. Individuals in the high age group possess more organizational commitment than fresh entries (Khan, 2013). Moreover, this phenomenon was also supported by monetary benefits like pay, pension, funds, and allowances (Nawaz& Kundi, 2010, as cited by Khan, 2013). However, in the study of Ozbag and Arslan, age has no significant difference in any of the constructs.

Employment status. A significant difference was found in the permanency start of this study, specifically in the affective construct. More literature was needed to study this demographic profile; however, some studies gave the tenure much attention. It was found in most studies that affective (Jena, 2015; Ozbag & Arslan, 2018; Tandon, 2020; AVCI, 2022) and continuance constructs (Agrawal, 2020) have a significant difference in the years of experience. Some of the reasons behind this result could be the energy and experiment of employees concerning age. At the beginning of their career, they are not convinced that job opportunity is still vast for them, thus a higher possibility of switching jobs. Another thing might be attributed to permanency's benefits, incentives, and facilities, which can make the employee stay and be committed (Clarence & George, 2018).

Gender. No significant difference was found between males and females in any organizational commitment construct. It is striking that inconsistencies were discovered about

gender when the studies of commitment literature were reviewed. The citation of Ozbag and Arslan (2018) in the study of Salami (2008), Pourghaz (2011), Tandon (2020), and Agrawal (2020) revealed that gender has nothing to do with organizational commitment. Some studies also show that more significant commitment was found in male employees compared to female Affum- (Osei et al., 2015; Kumasey, 2014) and vice versa (Angle & Perry, 1981; Mowday et al., 1982). Specific organization commitment, like the normative (AVCI et al., 2022) and affective (Jena, 2015), was higher in males than females. On the other hand, the normative construct was found to be more prominent in the female population in other studies (Jena, 2015). The result, which implies that men have more substantial organizational commitment than women, may be attributed to the thinking that men choose work. However, family comes first, which was why some studies stated that females have more outstanding commitment.

Educational Level. Not significant. Consistent with the results of Agrawal (2020), AVCI (2022). On the opposite note, the study of Khan (2013) revealed that employees with low levels of education have higher commitment because they fear transferring to a new job faster. Akinayo (2010) stated that highly qualified employees are more committed because of a sense of belongingness.

Type of office and Designation. No significant difference was found in this study. The same is true in the study of Khan (2020). However, Nawaz and Kundi (2010) and AVCI (2022) stated that high-ranking employees are more committed.

The study found that respondents who reported solid emotional ties to their University valued familial ties highly. According to research by Meyer et al. (2002), employees' feelings of emotional investment in their organization may stem, at least in part, from their belief in the

firm's commitment to them as individuals. One of the reasons the respondent is content to spend their entire working life at the University is the encouragement they receive from the organization.

The concept of "continuance organizational commitment" addresses the idea that employees have no choice but to remain with their current employer because of the costs they would incur by quitting. The majority of respondents strongly disagree with the notion that it would be easy for them to quit the University.

Hersecovitch and Meyer (2002) contend that an increase in the employee's cost of leaving the firm can foster a commitment to staying put. More specifically, the fact that respondents generally think that continuing with the organization at present is as much a matter of necessity as desire.

Employees' sense of obligation to the company, or normative commitment, can be fostered in several ways, as Meyer and Allen (1997) described. Employees who have a deep sense of normative commitment to their organization are loyal because they believe they have a moral duty to do so. This finding corroborates the study's finding that most respondents (who gave a moderate level of agreement) considered loyalty to be an essential factor in deciding whether to stay with their current employer.

Normative organizational commitment among employees may also emerge due to a psychological contract between the company and the worker (Meyer & Allen, 1997). The study results did not back up this claim since they indicated that respondents only moderately agreed that contemporary employees switch jobs too frequently. The interviewees also have little concern over whether or not hopping from one employer to another is ethical.

According to the findings, there is a noteworthy connection between all constructs.

According to research by Becker (1960), referenced by Lin, Chien (2012), affective commitment does not play a significant role in determining an employee's level of continuation commitment.

Without an emotional investment, individuals are motivated to stick to a plan of action only by the substantial costs of deviating from it. The findings of the study did not support this.

According to the findings, a highly significant correlation exists between affective and continuance commitment ($r=.630$; $p.000$).

Conclusions

The results of this study provide some evidence that the demographic characteristics of the respondents correlate differently with the affective, continuation, and normative conceptions of organizational commitment. On top of that, it aims to establish causal links between various conceptual elements. The researchers reached the following conclusions after compiling their data. When it comes to age ranges, the majority of responses fall between 31 and 40 years old and are male. Most responders have at least a bachelor's degree and work in academic administration as faculty or department chairs.

In the mean scores of the affective commitment construct. The highest mean comes from statement one, "I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization," having a descriptive equivalent of moderately agree. While statement four, "I think that I could easily become as attached to another organization as I am to this one," got the lowest mean of 3.96, respectively.

Statement six, "I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving this organization." Statement eight, "One of the major reasons I continue to work for this organization is that

leaving would require considerable personal sacrifice—another organization may not match the overall benefits I have," both got the highest mean in the continuance commitment construct with a descriptive equivalent of slightly agree.

The mean score of normative commitment that posted the highest mean score is from statement one, "I think that people these days move from company to company too often." It has a descriptive equivalent of moderately agree.

There is no significant difference in the affective, continuance, and normative constructs regarding the respondents' gender, educational attainment, type of office, employment status, and age. Regarding the post, there is no significant difference in the affective and normative construct, but there is a significant difference in the result of the continuance commitment construct.

Lastly, there is a significant relationship between the three constructs, ranging from significant-high to a significant moderate positive relationship. Having a p-value of less than 0.05, the researchers reject the null hypothesis.

References

- Allen, N.J. & Grisaffe, D.B. (2001). Employee Commitment to the Organization and Customer Reactions: Mapping The Linkages. *Human Resource Management Review*.
- Brimeyer, T. M., Perrucci, R., & Wadsworth, S. M. (2010). Age, tenure, resources for control, and organizational commitment. *Social Science Quarterly*, 91(2), 511–530.
- Chen, Z.X. & Francesco, A.M. (2003). The Relationship Between The Three Components Of Commitment and Employee Performance in China, *Journal of Vocational Behavior*.
- Clayton, S. (2000). *Takımızın Yeteneklerini Geliştirmede Yönetim*, (Çev. M. Zaman), İstanbul: Hayat Yayınları.
- Dordevic, B. (2004). Employee Commitment in Times of Radical Organizational Changes, *Facta Universitatis, Series, Economics and Organization*.
- Ghosh, S., & Swamy, D. (2014). A Literature Review on Organizational Commitment – A Comprehensive Summary. *International Journal of Engineering and Research Application*, 4(12), 04–14.
- Herscovitch, L., & Meyer, J. P. (2002). Commitment to organizational change: Extension of a three-component model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(3), 474–487.
- Johnson, R. E., Groff, K. W., & Taing, M. U. (2009). Nature of the interactions among organizational commitments: Complementary, competitive, or synergistic? *British Journal of Management*, 20(4), 431–447.
- Kessler, E. H. (2013). *Encyclopedia of Management Theory*. London: SAGE Publications.

- Kumar, B., & Giri, V. N. (2009). Effect of age and experience on job satisfaction and organizational commitment. *ICFAI Journal Of Organizational Behavior*, 8(1), 28-36.
- Meyer, J., & Allen, N. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*
- Meyer, P. J., & Allen, J. N. (1997). *Commitment in the Workplace: Theory, Research, And Application*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Meyer, P. J., & Herscovitch, L. (2001). Commitment in the Workplace: Toward A General Model. *Human Resource Management Review*, pp. 11, 299–326
- Organizational Commitment Literature Review. (2018). 2018 2nd International Conference on e-Education, e-Business and Information Management (EEIM 2018). doi 10.23977/eeim.2018.005
- Werf, R. van der. (2018, January 23). 3 Key Types of Organisational Commitment. Retrieved from <https://www.effectory.com/knowledge/blog/3-key-types-of-organisational-committment/>.