
Organisational Commitment and Job Engagement- an Empirical Study of University and College Teachers

S.P. SINGH

Professor

Faculty of Management Studies, Gurukul Kangri University
Haridwar, Uttarakhand, India

JAMUNA KARKI

Research Scholar

Faculty of Management Studies, Gurukul Kangri University
Haridwar, Uttarakhand, India

ABSTRACT

This paper investigates the relationship between the organizational commitment, demographic variables and job engagement. Data were collected using 2 structured questionnaires containing a five point Likert scale, Organizational Commitment Scale by Allen and Meyer (1991) and Job Engagement Scale (JES) by Rich, LePine & Crawford (2010). The study sample consisted of 150 teachers and simple random sampling was used as a sampling technique and this study was ex-post facto in nature. For the purposes of data analysis, correlation and multiple- regression were applied. The findings of the research revealed that age and income significantly correlated with organizational commitment, while job engagement is positively and significantly correlated with age, marital status, education, income, and work experience of the teachers. The study found that continuance commitment was the significant predictor of job engagement. Implication, limitation and suggestion for future research are discussed.

Keywords: Demographic variables, Organizational Commitment and Job Engagement.

Introduction

Organizational Commitment

The concept of commitment in organizations has generated a great deal of awareness over the past few decades. The concept's popularity is increasing in every profession due to the assumed impact that organizational commitment has on employees and organizational outcomes (Suliman, et.al 2000; Porter, Steers, Mowday, & Boulian, 1974; Meyer et al. 1989; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990). Many researchers have acknowledged that committed workforce performs better (e.g. Legge, 1995; Guest, 1997; Morrow, 1993) and link organizational commitment with greater organizational effectiveness (Scholl, 1981), superior long term performance (Jaros et. al 1993), lower turnover and absenteeism rates (Idowu, 2005; Salami, 2008), increased job and extra-role performance.

Organizational commitment considered as a psychological state that binds an employee to an organization, thereby reducing the incidence of turnover (Allen & Meyer, 1990), and as a

mindset that takes different forms and binds an individual to a course of action that is of relevance to a particular target (Meyer & Herscovitch, 2001). Meyer and Allen (1997) divided organizational commitment into three sub-dimensions, namely affective commitment, continuance commitment and normative commitment. Based on the multidimensional nature of organizational commitment, there is growing support for a three-component model proposed by Meyer and Allen (1991). Affective commitment is related to the employee's sense of belonging, attachment and loyalty to the organization (Mueller et al., 1992). Employees with a strong affective commitment remain in the organization as they feel they want to, those with strong continuance commitment because they feel they need to and those with strong normative commitment feel they ought to (Adeyemo, 1999; Meyer et al., 1993; Yavuz, 2010). Therefore, there are arguments among researchers that these components are differentially linked to variables as antecedents and consequents (Meyer, Allen, and Smith, 1993; Abdul- Kadir & Orkun, 2009). The three-component model has received considerable interest from organizational researchers and has been tested in a variety of empirical settings (Westwood & Crawford 2005; Snape & Redman 2003).

Literature relevant to organizational commitment indicates a number of variables which determine organizational commitment. Some Researchers have found a positive correlation between organizational commitment and employee performance (Meyer et al., 1989; Suliman and Lles, 2000), organizational outcomes as job satisfaction (Mowday et al., 1982; Bateman & Strasser, 1984), motivation and attendance, (Mowday, Steer and Porter, 1984; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990). Further, Luchak and Gellatly (2007) found a positive relationship between affective commitment and three commonly studied work outcomes (turnover cognitions, absenteeism, and job performance). And others have found a negative relationship between organizational commitment and outcomes such as absenteeism and labor turnover (Cotton and Tuttle, 1986; Clegg, 1983). However, Adenguga¹, Adenuga² & Ayodele (2013) found that the three dimensions of organizational commitment determined the turnover intentions of employees in private universities. Affective commitment is more important in determining employees' turnover intention. Nagar (2012) concluded that greater job satisfaction among teachers also leads to increased organizational commitment

The studies linking organizational commitment with the demographics, Durna & Eren (2005) on Turkish education sector employees reported a significant relationship between affective and normative commitment and certain demographic factors, while no linkage was found between these factors and continuance commitment. Another study found that tenure had a very strong moderating effect on the commitment and performance correlation (Wright and Bonett, 2002). Whereas, Huang, 2004, King 2002, Brookover, 2002)) found no significant relationship between length of employment and organizational commitment According to (Abdulla & Shaw, 1999; Luthans, McCaul & Dodd, 1985; Morrow, 1993; Salami, 2008) demographic variables such as age, gender, educational level, job position and monthly income have been associated with organizational commitment. Whereas, Singh, S.P. & Mehta (2013) concluded that demographic variables like age, gender, marital status, experience and education significantly predicted organizational commitment of university teachers and showed that married, older, more educated and more experienced teachers had more organizational commitment than the single, younger, less educated and less experienced ones. Abdulkadir &

Orkun (2009) also found demographic factors including gender, marital status, educational status and job type significantly predicted organizational commitment and turnover intention among private university employees. However, (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Weidmer, 2006) found that demographic factors were not a significant predictor of organizational commitment. Also, in support of this findings (Mannheim et al., 1997; Morrow, 1993; Salami, 2008) reported that educational status, job type and tenure are good predictors of organizational commitment.

JOB ENGAGEMENT

The recent focus of present era management is now on managing and engaging human capital to produce more output with less input. Nevertheless, there is a large discrepancy between practitioners' interest in job engagement and the amount of academic research on these issues, research in the area of job engagement is needed (Sawang, 2011). However, although scholars have made great strides over the past decade in identifying correlates of engagement (e.g., Harter, Schmidt, & Hayes, 2002; Kahn, 1992; Leiter, 2005; Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004), little theory or empirical observation accounts for the role of engagement as a means through which organizations can create competitive advantages. In particular, researchers have not examined the role of job engagement as a mechanism that links to organizational commitment of the employees and their job performance.

Job engaged workers are energetic, are positively connected to their job and feel they are doing their jobs effectively. It is a persistent and broad affective, cognitive state. Schaufeli et al. (2002) view it as a positive, fulfilling work related state of mind that is characterized by vigor, dedication and absorption. Vigor is characterized by high levels of energy, the willingness to invest energy in one's work and persistence in difficult times; dedication is characterized by high levels of work involvement and feelings of pride and challenge from one's work; and absorption is characterized by deep concentration in one's work the sense that time passes quickly and one is reluctant to leave their work. However, Kahn (1990) originally described engagement as a unique and important motivational concept: the harnessing of an employee's full self in terms of physical, cognitive, and emotional energies to work role performances.

Previous researches found linkages of job engagement with performance, job behaviors and job related variables. Harter et al. (2002) found that engagement was positively correlated with business-unit performance (e.g. customer satisfaction and loyalty, unit profitability, unit productivity, turnover levels and safety). Further, a study of front-line service workers and their customers, reported that job engagement predicted service climate, which in turn predicted employee performance and then customer loyalty (Salanova et al., 2005). Further, Schaufeli and Salanova (2007, 2008) associated it with positive employee attitudes, proactive job behaviors, higher levels of psychological wellbeing, and increased individual job and organizational performance.

Schaufeli and Bakker (2004) found job resources (social support, supervisor coaching, feedback) were positively related to engagement and negatively related to burnout. However, Leiter and Harvie (1998), in a study reported that job engagement moderated the relationship of supportive supervision, confidence in management, effective communication and work meaningfulness and acceptance of the change. Another study of the correspondence between

supervisors and staff members during major organizational changes, Leiter and Harvie (1997) demonstrated supervisors' confidence in the organization, their work engagement and assessment of work hazards, contributed to predicting staff members' job engagement, and supervisor cynicism and exhaustion contributed to staff member cynicism and professional efficacy. In addition, engagement mediated the effect of job resources on turnover intention. Mauno et al. (2005) in a study reported lower work engagement among permanent employees and found different predictors of job engagement in different organization sectors. While Demerouti et al. (2001) reported that high work demands and high control were associated with higher engagement. In addition, occupation type and organizational level had some effects on engagement; managers, executives and entrepreneurs score relatively high on engagement while blue collar workers, police officers and home care staff score relatively low on engagement. Mauno et al. (2005) also reported an association of high time pressures with higher levels of job engagement. Lyndsay & Buitendach (2011) in a sample of 123 support staff members from a tertiary education institution in South Africa found a significant positive relationship between affective organizational commitment and job engagement and also between job engagement and happiness. Finally, added that job engagement have predictive value for affective organizational commitment. Albdour & Altarawneh (2014) concluded that employees who have high job engagement and organizational engagement will have high level of affective commitment and normative commitment. Also, high employees' job engagement can meaningfully affect employees' continuance commitment.

However, it is obvious that there is lack of work done in academic setting to know the organizational commitment and job engagement of teachers. Therefore, the study represents an attempt to provide a small addition to the literature, taking these two constructs organizational commitment and job engagement.

Objectives of the Study

This study conducted for the fulfillment of the following objectives:

1. To study the relationship between organizational commitment and job engagement of teachers.
2. To investigate the relationship of demographic factors, i.e. age, gender, marital status, education, designation and work experience to organizational commitment.
3. To investigate the relationship of demographic factors to job engagement of teachers.

Hypotheses

1. Organizational commitment do not significantly predict job engagement of teachers.
2. Demographic variables do not significantly predict organizational commitment of teachers.
3. There is no significant relationship between demographic variables and job engagement of teachers.

Methodology

Research Design

This study explores the organizational commitment and job engagement of 145 teachers of 2 universities and 5 colleges of Haridwar. The study adopted an ex-post facto survey research design where questionnaire instruments were used to collect data from the respondents on their organizational commitment and job engagement.

Sample

A sample of 150 full time teachers was randomly selected from 2 universities and 5 colleges located in Haridwar from the population of 4 universities and 8 colleges.

Administration

Job Engagement Scale (JES) and Organizational Commitment Scale (OCS) were administered on the full time teachers of 2 universities and 5 colleges located in Haridwar. A total of 150 questionnaires was distributed out of which 147 were recovered, giving a return rate of 98 percent and 145 were found to be usable for data analysis.

Instruments

The research instruments included two questionnaires:

1. Organizational Commitment Scale

The organizational commitment Scale by Allen and Meyer (1991) was used to measure the organizational commitment of the teachers. The scale consisted of 24 items, 8 items each relating to three components of commitment- Affective, Continuance and Normative. The respondents indicated the extent to which each item reflected their commitment to their organization on a 5-point likert scale ranging from 5 strongly agree to 1 strongly disagree. A higher score indicated a higher level of commitment to the organization. The reliability of the organizational commitment scale by Cronbach's alpha is $\alpha = .791$, indicating the adequate reliability of the scale.

2. Job Engagement Scale

The Job engagement scale (JES) by Rich, LePine & Crawford (2010) was used to measure job engagement of teachers. The measurement of the Job engagement variable consisted of three factors, namely Emotional, Physical and Cognitive engagement. This scale consists of 18 items, 6 for each variable. The respondents indicated the extent to which each item reflected their job engagement on a 5-point Likert scale. The reliability of the questionnaire by Cronbach's alpha is $\alpha = .925$.

DATA ANALYSIS & FINDINGS

The data collected were analyzed using Correlation and Multiple Regression analysis. The dependent variable was job engagement while the predictor variables were organizational commitment and some demographic factors (age, gender, marital status, income, education and job experience). Table1 presents a demographic profile of the respondents. The majority of

respondents were females (51.7%) and 71.7% are married with the age between 25 and 40 & above. The majorities of respondents were master’s degree holders with additional qualifications and have work experience between five to ten years.

Table 1: A Profile of the Respondent

| Demographic Factors | Criteria | Frequency | Percent |
|-----------------------------|--|-----------|---------|
| Age (years) | Below 25 | 5 | 3.5 |
| | 25-30 | 47 | 32.4 |
| | 30-35 | 15 | 10.3 |
| | 35-40 | 38 | 26.2 |
| | 40 & above | 40 | 27.6 |
| Gender | Male | 70 | 48.3 |
| | Female | 75 | 51.7 |
| Marital Status Education | Unmarried | 41 | 28.3 |
| | Married | 104 | 71.7 |
| | Master’s degree only | 5 | 3.4 |
| | Master’s Degree with M. Phil/NET/SLET/SET& Other | 73 | 50.3 |
| | Ph.D. | 67 | 46.2 |
| Experience | 1-5 years | 29 | 20.0 |
| | 5-10 | 47 | 32.4 |
| | 10-15 | 37 | 25.5 |
| | 15-20 | 22 | 15.2 |
| | 20 and above | 10 | 6.9 |
| Designation | Professor | 45 | 31.0 |
| | Associate Professor | 17 | 11.7 |
| | Assistant Professor | 73 | 50.3 |
| | Lecturer | 10 | 6.9 |
| Income | Less than 20000 | 11 | 7.6 |
| | 20000-30000 | 62 | 42.8 |
| | 30000-40000 | 19 | 13.1 |
| | 40000-50000 | 48 | 33.1 |
| | Above 50000 | 5 | 3.4 |

Table 2 shows the relationship between organizational commitment and job engagement. It also demonstrates the relationship between demographic variables and organizational commitment and job engagement. The results show no significant relationship between organizational commitment and job engagement. It can be inferred that the organizational commitment of teachers doesn’t predict job engagement. Organizational commitment was found to be significantly correlated with age and income. Gender, marital status, education, designation and work experience were not found to be correlated with organizational commitment. The results also indicate that job engagement is positively and significantly correlated with age, marital status, education, income and work experience of teachers and not with gender and designation.

Table 2: Mean, standard deviation and correlations among variables.

| S.no. | Variables | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
|-------|---------------------------|--------|-------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-------|-------|
| 1 | Age | 1 | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | Gender | .048 | 1 | | | | | | | |
| 3 | Marital Status | .456* | -.055 | 1 | | | | | | |
| 4 | Education | .622** | .048 | .233** | 1 | | | | | |
| 5 | Designation | .505** | .151 | .424** | .492** | 1 | | | | |
| 6 | Income | .665** | -.045 | .463** | .765** | .608** | 1 | | | |
| 7 | Working Experience | .389** | .128 | .477** | .363** | .448** | .453** | 1 | | |
| 8 | Organizational commitment | .210* | .004 | .154 | .119 | .078 | .181** | .035 | 1 | |
| 9 | Job Engagement | .265** | -.051 | .280** | .235** | .0121 | .320** | .237** | .131 | 1 |
| 10 | Mean | 3.42 | 1.52 | 1.72 | 2.43 | 2.67 | 2.82 | 3.07 | 97.50 | 74.01 |
| 11 | Standard Deviation | 1.289 | .501 | .452 | .562 | .993 | 1.084 | 1.284 | 6.136 | 7.009 |

Table 3 shows the correlation between organizational commitment and job engagement. The results show that continuance commitment was significantly correlated with the emotional, physical and cognitive engagement.

Table 3: Correlation between organizational commitment and job engagement

| Variables | Affective Commitment | Continuance Commitment | Normative Commitment |
|----------------------|----------------------|------------------------|----------------------|
| Emotional Engagement | .071 | .195* | .072 |
| Physical Engagement | -.006 | .701** | .067 |
| Cognitive Engagement | .050 | .204* | .109 |

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 4 presents the results of multiple regression analysis, where the three forms of organizational commitment was regressed on job engagement. The result on the table shows that continuance commitment significantly predicted job engagement. So it can be inferred that with the higher continued commitment more would be the teachers' job engagement.

Table 4: Multiple Regression Analysis

| | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | T | Sig. |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|-------|------|
| | B | Std. Error | B | | |
| Constant | 60.599 | 9.542 | | 6.351 | .000 |
| Affective commitment | -.268 | .343 | -.085 | -.781 | .436 |
| Continuance commitment | .717 | .325 | .229 | 2.209 | .029 |
| Normative Commitment | .037 | .298 | .014 | .123 | .902 |

Dependent Variable: Job engagement

DISCUSSION

This study examined the relationship between organizational commitment and job engagement of teachers. The results of the study indicate that organizational commitment did not significantly predict job engagement of the teachers. However, the study shows a significant correlation between continuance commitment and job engagement of teachers. It implies that higher the continuance commitment more would be the job engagement of the teachers. These results

support the work of other researchers who found that employees' job engagement can be meaningfully affected by employees' continued commitment (Albdour & Altarawneh, 2014; Commeiras and Fournier, 2001). A common explanation for this finding might be that the outcome of an individual's decision to remain with an organization may be because of the personal time and resources has been already devoted to an organization (Commeiras and Fournier, 2001) and also because they perceive poor alternatives or high costs associated with leaving (Allen & Meyer, 1990). However, in this study affective and normative organizational commitment did not significantly predict teachers' job engagement. These results contradict with the findings of researchers who found a significant positive relationship between affective commitment and job engagement (Lyndsay & Buitendach, 2011) and between normative commitment and job engagement (Albdour & Altarawneh, 2014; Saks, 2006). Higher job engagement will result in a higher affective commitment as engaged employees are more likely to have a greater attachment to their organization (Schaufeli and Bakker, 2004). Similarly who has higher normative commitment is more on job engaged because engagement is the extent to which an individual is psychologically present as a member of an organization (Saks, 2006). However, the literature has also shown that job engagement is an antecedent of organizational commitment because people who are deeply engaged in their work tend to be more committed to their organizations (Jackson, Rothmann & Van de Vijver, 2006; Saks, 2006; Chalofsky & Krishna, 2009). Thus, the findings of this study reveal that the teacher's decision to stay with their respective organization was due to the cost associated with leaving the company rather than the feeling of attachment (affective) and obligation (normative).

The findings of this study further showed that the age and income are significant predictors of organizational commitment of teachers. This shows that with age teachers tend to be more committed to their organization. Reason for this could be that teachers with age are more likely to experience commitment based on the internalization of organizational values and identification with those values (Balay, 2007). This finding is consistent with the finding of number of previous researchers who found age as significant predictor of organizational commitment (Singh, S.P. & Mehta, 2013; Samuel O.Salami, 2008; Balay, 2007; Abdulla & Shaw, 1999; Morrow, 1993). Similarly, income influences the teachers' organizational commitment. It implies that teachers who have high income are more engaged towards their job as compared to others. However, gender, marital status, education, designation and work experience were found not significantly correlated to organizational commitment. Several previous studies also concluded that demographic factors and commitment were unrelated and (AI-Ajmi, 2006; Swaminathan & Ananth, 2009; Chaughtai & Zafar, 2006; Weidmer, 2006; Rozenblatt, 2001).

The results also revealed that job engagement of teachers is positively and significantly correlated with age, marital status, education, income and work experience. This finding implies that teachers who are aged and married were more engaged in their job than the younger teachers and unmarried one. Experience and income have significant influence on engagement. That is, employees who have more experience and higher income are more engaged towards their job compared to others (J. Swaminathan and A. Ananth, 2009). Also, the teacher education level significantly influences their job engagement. The more educated teachers were more engaged than the less educated ones.

Limitations of The Research

Some limitations of the research should be noted to put the findings into a broader context. The sample of teachers in this study was small. It was not possible to determine the representativeness of those participated. The data were collected at one point in time making it difficult to determine causality. Finally, all the respondents are only from Haridwar region. It is not clear the extent to which results would generalize to other samples of teachers working in another area or state.

Future Implications

Future research needs to involve a larger and a representative sample of teachers drawn from different regions. In addition, a comparative study between colleges regarding these variables and teachers is suggested. Further, organizational commitment and job engagement can also be studied further by relating them with other variables. Thus, the result gives enormous scope for the improvement of teachers' organizational commitment and job engagement. The organizational authorities should identify the ways and means through which teachers can be provided by facilitating a work environment which will influence their work and commitment towards the organization and the profession. Also, it may be helpful to take the improvement initiatives regarding this relationship and to promote organizational commitment among the teachers of educational institutions so that the teachers feel attached and obliged to their job and organization.

REFERENCES

- Abdulla, M. H. A., & Shaw, J. D. (1999). Personal Factors and organizational commitment: Main and interactive effects in the United Arab. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, *11*, 77-93.
- Adenguga, R. A., Adenuga, F.T., & Ayodele, K. O. (2013). Organizational Commitment and Turnover Intention among Private Universities' Employees in Ogun State, Nigeria. *Open Journal of Education*, *1*(2), 31-36.
- Chalofsky, N., & Krishna, V. (2009). Meaningfulness, Commitment, and Engagement: The Intersection of a deeper Level Intrinsic Motivation. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, *11*, 189–203.
- Demerouti, E., & Bakker, A. B. (2008). The Oldenburg Burnout Inventory: A good alternative to measure burnout and engagement. In J. R. B. Halbesleben (Ed.), *Handbook of stress and burnout in health care*. Hauppauge, NY: Nova Science.
- Durna, U., & Eren, V., (2005). The examination of organizational commitment in connection with three components of commitment. *The Doğuş University Journal*, *6*(2), 210-219.
- Ellis C. M., & Sorensen A. (2007). Assessing Employee Engagement: The Key to Improving Productivity. *Perspectives*, *15*(1).
- Leiter, M. P., & Harvie, P. (1997). Correspondence of supervisor and subordinate perspectives during major organizational change. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *2* (4), 343-52.

- Leiter, M. P., & Harvie, P. (1998). Conditions for staff acceptance of organizational change: burnout as a mediating construct. *Anxiety, Stress and Coping: An International Journal*, 11 (1), 1-25.
- Leiter, M. P., & Laschinger, H. S. (2008). *Civility, respect, and engagement at work: Improving collegial relationships among hospital employees*. Presentation at National Center for Organizational Development, Veterans Hospital System, Boston, MA (November).
- Lyndsay, K. F., & Johanna, H. B. (2011). Happiness, work engagement and organizational commitment of support staff at a tertiary education institution in South Africa. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology/SA Tydskrif vir Bedryfsielkunde*, 37(1).
- 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.
- Mauno, S., Pykko, M., & Hakanen, J. (2005). The prevalence and antecedents of work engagement in three different organizations. *Psykologia*, 40 (3), 16-30.
- Mauno, S., Kinnunen, U., & Ruokolainen, M. (2007). Job demands and resources as antecedents of work engagement: a longitudinal study. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 70(1), 149-71.
- Meyer, J. P., Allen, N. J., & Gellatly, I. R. (1990). Affective and continuance commitment to the organization: Evaluation of measures and analysis of concurrent and time-lagged relations. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75, 710–720.
- Meyer, J.P. & Allen, N.J. (1991), A Three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1, 61-89.
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N, J. (1997). *Commitment in the workplace: Theory, Research and Application*. California: Sage Publications.
- Morrow, P. (1993): *The Theory and Measurement of Work Commitment, CT: JAL*, Greenwich.
- Mowday; R. T. Steers, R. M., & Porter, L. W (1979). The Measurement of Organizational Commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 14, 224-227.
- Porter, L., Steers, R., Mowday, R. & Boulian, P. (1974). Organizational commitment, job satisfaction and turnover among psychiatric technicians. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 59, 603-609.
- Rich, B. L., Lepine, J.A., & Crawford, E. R. (2010). Job engagement: antecedents and effects on job performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 53 (3): 617–635.
- Salami, S.O. (2008). Demographic and Psychological factors predicting Organizational Commitment among Industrial workers, *Anthropologist*, 10 (1), 31-38.
- Singh, S. P., & Mehta, M. (2013). Achievement Motivation Emotional Intelligence and Job Satisfaction Predicting Organizational Commitment among University Teachers. *IFRSA Business Review*, 4(3).
- Sukanlaya Sawang (2011). Is there an inverted U-shaped relationship between job demands and work engagement: The moderating role of social support? *International Journal of Manpower*, 33 (2), 178-186.
- Swaminathan, J., & Ananth, A. (2009). Impact of demographic factors on employee engagement: a study with reference to Vasan publications private limited, Chennai. Online at <http://mpira.uni-muenchen.de/39768/>

Yavuz, M (2010). The effect of teachers' perception of organizational justice and culture on organizational commitment. *African Journal of Business Management*, 4(5), 695-701.