

# Quality of Work Life, Self-Efficacy, and Job Satisfaction as Predictors of Organizational Commitment Among University Teachers

–Mohd. Ahamar Khan\*, Shah Mohd. Khan\*\*

## ABSTRACT

*This study examined quality of work life (QWL), self-efficacy (SE), and job satisfaction (JS) as predictors of organizational commitment (OC) among university teachers. A representative sample of 300 teaching staff using stratified random sampling was selected. Keeping in view nature and objectives of the present research, zero order correlation and OLS multiple linear regression analyses (model with the best-fit predictor) was carried out. Correlation analyses indicated that QWL, SE, and JS were positively and significantly correlated with OC. Multiple linear regression analyses showed that overall QWL, SE, and JS passed on the criteria to predict the OC. The goodness of fit of the model (R<sup>2</sup> change) was determined to predict the OC. The coefficient of determination was 23%, 6%, 1%, for overall QWL, SE, and JS respectively and altogether 30% variance was explained in OC. Further, effect size for each significant predictor was estimated and passed on the criteria of requisite value. Implication and suggestion for future research discussed.*

**Keywords:** *Quality of Work Life, Self-efficacy, Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment*

## INTRODUCTION

Numerous studies suggested the hiring and retaining highly committed employees is a key part of human resource management strategy (Gong, Law, Chang, & Xin, 2009; Kehoe & Wright, 2013). It has been a significant

---

\* Research Scholar, Department of Psychology, Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh, Uttar Pradesh, India. Email: mohdahamarkhan@gmail.com

\*\* Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh, Uttar Pradesh, India. Email: khandrsm@gmail.com

indicative of desirable outcomes such as job performance (Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch, & Topolnytsky, 2002), organizational citizenship behavior (Meyer et al., 2002), and turnover (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Meyer et al., 2002). According to Givens (2008), for developing organizational commitment among employees; managers should try to develop motivation of their employees to do something, and develop the awareness that they do have the ability to achieve the goals. Therefore, the present study is an empirical effort to study the correlates and predictors of organizational commitment (OC) in quality of work life (QWL), self-efficacy (SE) and job satisfaction (JS) among university teachers.

### Quality of Work Life

Quality of work life can be assessed through the feelings of employees which develop towards their jobs, colleagues, and company, which ignite a chain effect leading to an eventual growth of the organization and profitability (Heskett, Sasser, & Schlesinger, 1997). Employees who get the proper salary, recognition and career development, given the autonomy and training, will feel that their contribution is valued. This feeling will increase their positive perception of the organization which will in turn affect JS, improve performance and enhance the QWL (Allen, Shore, & Griffith, 2003; Eisenberger, Stinglhamber, Vandenberghe, Sucharski, & Rhoades, 2002).

### Self-Efficacy

Bandura has made the major contribution in the development of self-efficacy concept in different areas of human behavior. At one point, Bandura (1986) highlighted the concept of SE more broadly and it defined as “people’s judgments of their capabilities to organize and execute courses of action required to attain designated types of performances” (p. 91). Lunenburg (2011) considered three key managerial and organizational implications of SE in the workplace such as: selection and promotion decisions, training and development, and goal setting and performance.

### Job Satisfaction

Historically, the concept of job satisfaction was for the first time introduced by Hoppock in 1935. He reviewed numerous literature related with JS and suggested that JS is a combination of psychological, physiological and

environmental circumstances that causes a person truthfully to say, I am satisfied with my job. According to Porter, Lawler, and Hackman (1975), JS is a feeling about a job that is determined by the difference between all those things a person feels he should receive from his job and all those things he actually does received.

## **ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT**

Organizational commitment considered as the relative strength of an individual's identification with and involvement in a particular organization (Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1979). Meyer and Allen (1997) develop the tri-dimensional model to conceptualize OC in three different dimensions, namely; affective, continuance and normative commitments. Affective commitment refers to the employee's emotional attachment, identification, and involvement in the organization. Continuance commitment refers to the awareness of the costs associated with leaving the organization. Normative commitment refers to the feeling of obligation to continue employment.

## **REVIEW OF LITERATURE**

### **Quality of Work Life and Organizational Commitment**

Parvar, Allameh, and Ansari (2013) found the significant and positive direct effect of a safe and healthy environment, constitutionalism, social relevance and overall QWL on OC. Gupta (2014) reported the significant positive relationship between QWL and OC of manufacturing sector employees. Khan (2015) found that QWL emerged as significant predictors of OC among clerical staff in academic setting. In a cross-sectional survey, Omugo, Onuoha, and Akhigbe (2016) found the positive association between QWL and OC.

### **Self-Efficacy and Organizational Commitment**

Akhtar, Ghayas, and Adil (2013) found that SE was positively and significantly correlated with optimism as well as OC, while significant relationship was not found between optimism and OC. Further, SE alone emerged as significant predictor of OC. Law and Guo (2016) reported the significant positive association of SE with JS and OC. Agarwal and Mishra (2016) found the significant positive relationship between SE and

OC and SE emerged as significant predictor of OC. Khan (2017) found that the teachers' experience moderate the relationship between their SE and OC.

### **Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment**

Several meta-analyses have concluded that there is high correlation between the JS and OC (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Meyer et al., 2002). Loui (1995) reported that the commitment in public organization was significantly correlated with the trust for organization, job involvement and JS. Khan and Mishra (2002) made an attempt to estimate the canonical correlation between needs satisfaction and OC among rail engine drivers of Indian Railways. They found that needs of social attachment and esteem were significantly related with affective and normative commitment. Further, the canonical correlation between five need (Set-I) of need satisfaction and three sub-components (Set-II) of OC was also found to be significant. Warsi, Hsu and Chen (2012) observed that those university faculty members who achieved higher OC score while they held higher degree of the JS. Nifadkar and Dongre (2014) revealed the significant positive correlation of JS and age with OC. Ismail and Abd Razak (2016) found that JS, intrinsic satisfaction and extrinsic satisfaction were significantly related with OC.

The review of literature articulates to the fact that the present piece of work has never been studied in India and abroad undertaking the population of university teachers. By taking this study, it will provide the definite role of quality of work life, self-efficacy and job satisfaction in relation to the organizational commitment of teachers, especially working in higher academic institutions. Researchers assume that the findings of present study shall also help to policy makers to implement proper intervention to uphold the commitment of teachers.

### **OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY**

On the basis of literature review, the following objectives were identified for the present study.

- To ascertain the relationship between QWL and OC.
- To ascertain the relationship between SE and OC.
- To ascertain the relationship between JS and OC.
- To identify critical predictors of OC in QWL, SE and JS.

## Hypotheses

Ha1: There will be positive relationship between QWL and OC.

Ha2: There will be positive relationship between SE and OC.

Ha3: There will be positive relationship between JS and OC.

Ha4: The regression coefficient for predicting QWL, SE and JS through OC will be other than zero.

## RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

### Participants

A representative sample of teachers was selected ensuring the quality and characteristics of the target population. In the present study, faculty members teaching in an Indian Central University (Aligarh Muslim University) were the target population. Based on the criterion developed by Carvalho (1984) a sample size of 200 respondents was sufficient for the present study. To ensure the true variance and minimizing the error variance, systematic and random errors; the sample size of the present study was 300 teachers (150 male and 150 female) selected from different faculties using stratified random sampling. In stratified random sampling, the strata were formed based on teachers' working strength of the faculty. In the sample, the mean age of the teachers was 45.28 years ( $SD = 10.01$ ) with 26 years as minimum and 64 years as the maximum. The mean teaching-experience of the teachers was 16.51 years ( $SD = 10.33$ ) with 2 years as a minimum and 35 years as the maximum. In terms of educational qualification, they were 90 Post Graduates and 210 Ph.D. In academic rank they were 134 Assistant Professors, 89 Associate Professors and 77 Professors.

### Measures

The description of the measures used in the present study is discussed in the following paragraphs.

### Quality of Work Life Scale

Quality of Work Life Scale developed and standardized by Ansari, Khan, and Khan (2016) on the target sample was used in this study. The scale comprises with 33 items. The minimum and maximum score of the scale

ranges from 33 to 165. Cronbach's alpha of the scale was found to be 0.92 which confirms an excellent reliability of the scale (George & Mallery, 2003). Intra dimension reliabilities were verifying and ranges from 0.46 to 0.88. Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) was carried out and eight factors emerged in the analysis and named as citizenship behavior & recognition at work, confidence in management, working conditions, and opportunity for growth & development, work relations, organizational climate, belongingness and organizational transparency. The percent of variance accounted by factors varies from 3.10% to 29.54%. In summing up, all eight factors explained 57.71% of the total variance. Further, Inter-factorial correlations found to be significant ( $p < 0.001$ ).

### **General Self-Efficacy Scale**

This scale was developed by Schwarzer and Jerusalem (1995). Initially, the scale was developed in German with 20 items but later on it was translated in English and reduced 10 items. This scale contained in four point response categories. The minimum and maximum score of the scale ranges from 10 to 40. Higher the score higher is the self-efficacy and vice-versa. The reliability coefficient of the scale was ranging from 0.76 to 0.90. The reliability of the scale was verified on the target sample, and Cronbach's alpha was found to be 0.71 which confirms an acceptable reliability of the scale (George & Mallery, 2003).

### **Job Satisfaction Scale**

Job Satisfaction Scale developed by Singh (1990) was used. The scale comprises with 20 items. The minimum and maximum score of the scale ranges from 20 to 100. The standardized Cronbach's alpha was 0.96. The psychometric properties of the scale were re-visited on the target sample. The Cronbach's alpha was found to be 0.91 and confirms an excellent reliability of the scale (George & Mallery, 2003).

### **Organizational Commitment Scale**

Organizational commitment scale developed by Shah and Ansari (2000) was used. This scale composed of three components which are; affective, continuance and normative commitment. It was comprised of 15 items and

each component includes five items. The minimum and maximum score of the scale ranges from 15 to 105. The reliability coefficient of the scale was 0.80 and the congruent validity 0.76. The psychometric properties of the scale were re-visited on the target sample. The Cronbach's alpha was found to be 0.88 and confirms the good reliability of the scale (George & Mallery, 2003).

### Data Collection Procedure

Teachers were contacted individually. They were explained about the utility of the study and requested with due respect to extend their cooperation for success of the study. Great care was taken to address any misunderstanding about the purpose of the study, and they were told that it would be used only for research. They were requested to discuss when they feel any doubt in understanding and resultant response of the items, but don't leave any item un-attempted. They were assured of the confidentiality that their identity would not be disclosed at any stage.

### Data Analysis and Interpretation

Keeping in view the objectives and hypotheses of the present research, statistical analyses and discussion have been carried out in two stages. At the first stage, the Pearson Correlation Analysis (Zero order) was calculated in order to determine the relationship of proposed variables. At the second stage, Multiple Linear Regression Analysis was undertaken to identify the significant predictors and goodness of fit of the model. The analyses were carried out using software SPSS ver. 22.

### Pearson Correlation Analysis (Zero order)

Table 1 showed that overall QWL and its all dimensions (citizenship behaviour & recognition at work, confidence in management, working conditions, opportunity for growth & development, work relations, organizational climate, belongingness and organizational transparency), SE, and JS were positively and significantly correlated with OC. Therefore,  $H_a1$ ,  $H_a2$ , and  $H_a3$  are supported as probability to support the hypothesis was ( $p < 0.01$ ) level of significance. Findings indicated that as the level of QWL, SE, and JS of teachers increases, their commitment also increases.

**Table 1: Inter-correlations: QWL, Self-Efficacy, Job Satisfaction and OC**

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1	-											
2	.59	-										
3	.55	.47	-									
4	.56	.50	.42	-								
5	.53	.51	.45	.36	-							
6	.43	.53	.42	.41	.33	-						
7	.33	.42	.32	.38	.24	.41	-					
8	.64	.41	.47	.50	.35	.33	.27	-				
9	.89	.79	.72	.70	.66	.62	.51	.70	-			
10	.30	.36	.20	.24	.19	.22	.15	.19	.34	-		
11	.77	.64	.58	.55	.53	.53	.43	.53	.82	.33	-	
12	.42	.38	.34	.40	.29	.28	.20	.35	.48	.39	.47	-

r=0.10 (p<.05), 0.15 (p<.01), 0.19 (p<.001), one-tailed

1= Citizenship behaviour & recognition at work,, 2=Confidence in management, 3=Working conditions, 4=Opportunity for growth & development, 5=Work relations, 6=Organizational climate, 7= Belongingness, 8=Organizational transparency, 9=Overall QWL, 10=Self-efficacy, 11=Job satisfaction, 12= Organizational commitment.

## MULTIPLE LINEAR REGRESSION ANALYSIS

In the current research Multiple Linear Regression Analysis (MLRA) was used to identify significant predictors among QWL, SE and JS for OC as criterion variable. Before performing the analysis, variables were examined for fulfillment of the assumptions of multiple linear regression e.g., linearity, heteroscedasticity, multicollinearity, normality, and independence which is shown in Table 2.

**Table 2: Robustness Checks for Multiple Regression Analysis**

Test of robustness					
Linearity Residual Plots	Heteroscedasticity Breusch-Pagan Test (Range: $p < 0.05$ )	Multicollinearity Tolerance & VIF (Range: Tol – 0-1, VIF- 1-9)	Normality PP Plots	Independence Durbin – Watson (Range: $DW < 3$ )	Whether robustness verified
1	2	3	4	5	
Satisfied	$\chi^2=56.85$ , $p < 0.001$	Tol : 0.318- 0.877 VIF : 1.141- 3.143	Satisfied	2.130	All Satisfied

It can be observed from the table 2 the robustness checks for linearity, heteroscedasticity, multicollinearity, normality and independence were satisfied.

Stepwise method for selecting the predictor variables for the regression model was considered suitable, as it is probably the most commonly used method. If the variable fails to meet entry requirements (either FIN: F-to-enter or PIN: Probability of F-to-enter), the procedure terminates with no predictor variable in the equation. The effect size for significant predictor variable was computed to estimate the magnitude or size of an effect on criterion variable. Cohen's  $f^2$  is one of effect size suitable for multiple linear regression analyses was computed as suggested by Cohen (1988).

As shown in Table 3, QWL, SE and JS were considered as predictors and OC as criterion to develop a regression model. The overall QWL, SE and JS passed on the criteria and accounted for a significant amount of variance in OC,  $R^2 = 0.299$ ,  $F(1, 296) = 5.00$ ,  $p < 0.026$ . It can be inferred that overall QWL, SE and JS explained 29.9% variance in OC of teaching staff. However, overall QWL, SE and JS explained 22.7%, 6.1% and 1.1% variance respectively in OC. Therefore, *Ha4 is supported*. Finding suggests that changes in the predictors are associated with changes in the criterion variable. Further, Cohen's  $f^2$  values showed effect size magnitude is real and varying from 0.29 to 0.43 which suggested medium to large strength of association.

**Table 3: MLRA: QWL, Self-efficacy and Job satisfaction as Predictors of OC**

Predictor	$\beta$	R	R <sup>2</sup>	$\Delta R^2$	f <sup>2</sup>	F	df	p
<b>QWL, Self-efficacy &amp; Job Satisfaction (Model <math>Y = a + \beta_9 X_9 + \beta_{10} X_{10} + \beta_{11} X_{11}</math>)</b>								
X <sub>9</sub>	0.20	0.48	0.227	-	0.29	87.59	(1,298)	0.001
X <sub>10</sub>	0.95	0.54	0.288	0.061	0.40	25.17	(1,297)	0.001
X <sub>11</sub>	0.26	0.55	0.299	0.011	0.43	5.00	(1,296)	0.026
Constant	4.174							

X<sub>9</sub>= Overall QWL, X<sub>10</sub>=Self-efficacy, X<sub>11</sub>= Job Satisfaction, Y= Organizational Commitment

## CONCLUSION

The obtained results suggested that QWL, SE and JS are significantly and positively related with OC. Further, overall QWL, SE, and JS emerged as significant predictors of OC. These findings are consistent with those of previous researches which showed that QWL, SE and JS have a positive impact on employees' commitment to the organization (Agarwal & Mishra, 2016; Gupta, 2014; Khan, 2015; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Meyer et al., 2002). Thus, it can be inferred that university teachers who experienced higher level of QWL, SE, and JS showed higher level of OC to become loyal with the university in true sense. It is universally true that when an employee develops coherent sets of perception about his/her QWL; their emotional attachment, identification with involvement in institutional matters, awareness with cost of leaving the institution and obligation to stay with the institution/organization will definitely increase in all likelihood. Further, it can be understood that when teachers having high SE they develop their own ability to complete tasks and reach goals which confirms their high level of OC. Employees' high JS brings the greater job motivation, positive emotion and attitude among the employees which enables them to show a maximum effort in achieving the organizational goals. Because, satisfaction can trigger immediate emotional reactions, therefore, it can play a central role in the development of teachers' commitment. Consequently, it appears that satisfaction shapes and stabilizes OC.

## **DISCUSSION**

Theoretically from the review of literature, and analytically in this piece of research, it is confirmed that QWL, SE and JS have a significant impact on employees' OC. The surprising finding is that QWL emerged as a highly affecting factor of OC. Keeping this in mind, academic administrators need to develop, design and implement policies and practices pertaining to QWL of university teachers. If teachers experience favorable QWL then they can be successful in increasing their academic as well as research productivity. Moreover, SE and JS are the inner states of employees and can be managed and enhanced through counseling and intervention programs at regular intervals. From the study it is evident that if organizations follow the above-discussed practices, they will ultimately prepare highly committed and productive employees.

## **IMPLICATION**

The findings of the present piece of research work provide conceptual implications in understanding the relationship of QWL, SE and JS with OC. The higher academic body, university management and trainers (academic staff college) can plan interventions to uphold OC of a very important workforce. A favorable QWL environment influences employees' JS (Fatehi, Amini, Karimi, & Azizi, 2015) which in turn influences the commitment of employees (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Meyer et al., 2002). Additionally, SE influences employees' strength, cognitive process and emotional reactions which make them productive and committed employees. Therefore, there is a need to understand the studied variables from an operational perspective to uphold the commitment of teachers. The findings of this study are highly recommended for managers and policy makers, especially in the field of human resource management, to make appropriate strategies in the light of employees' QWL, SE, JS and their resulting commitment to achieve the most possible productivity.

## **SUGGESTION FOR FUTURE RESEARCH**

Research is not the end; it opens new ways for further research. Since the present study was undertaken in a sample of teachers selected

from a central university viz., Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh. Therefore, further research is needed in other central universities located in different regions of India and other universities (e.g., state universities and private universities) to validate and generalize the present findings. The dimensions of OC would be of interest. Findings also would be of interest to consider the other predictors that affect organizational commitment such as work design, leadership, organizational politics, organizational justice, trust, coworker support, perceived organizational support, psychological contract breach, psychological empowerment, and person organization fit. Future studies should incorporate longitudinal studies on OC to show how commitment may progress or change over time.

## REFERENCES

- Agarwal, S., & Mishra, P. C. (2016). Self-efficacy as predictor of organizational commitment among revenue personnel. *The International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 3(4), 44-52.
- Akhtar, S., Ghayas, S., & Adil, A. (2013). Self-efficacy and optimism as predictors of organizational commitment among bank employees. *International Journal of Research Studies in Psychology*, 2(2), 33-42.
- Allen, D., Shore, L., & Griffith, R. W. (2003). The role of perceived organizational support and supportive human resource practices in the turnover process. *Journal of Management*, 29(1), 99-118.
- Ansari, S. A., Khan, S. M., & Khan, M. A. (2016). *Quality of Work Life Scale (QWLS)*. Agra: Agra Psychological Research Cell.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Carvalho, J. (1984). Archival application of mathematical sampling techniques. *Records Management Quarterly*, 18, 60-63.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Earlbaum Associates.
- Eisenberger, R., Stinglhamber, F., Vandenberghe, C., Sucharski, I. L., & Rhoades, L. (2002). Perceived organizational support and employee retention. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(3), 565-573.
- Fatehi, B., Amini, I., Karimi, A., & Azizi, B. (2015). Impact of quality of work life on job satisfaction. *Research Journal of Sport Sciences*, 3(1), 15-22.
- George, D., & Mallery, P. (2003). *SPSS for windows step by step: A simple guide and reference* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

- Givens, J. R. (2008). Transformational leadership: The impact on organizational and personal outcomes. *Emerging Leadership Journals, 1*(1), 4-24.
- Gong, Y., Law, K. S., Chang, S., & Xin, K. R. (2009). Human resources management and firm performance: The differential role of managerial affective and continuance commitment. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94*, 263-75.
- Gupta, B. (2014). A study of impact of quality of work life on organizational commitment in manufacturing sector. *Pacific Business Review International, 7*(3), 27-32.
- Heskett, J., Sasser, W. E., & Schlesinger, L. (1997). *The service profit chain: How leading companies link profit and growth to loyalty, satisfaction, and value*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Hoppock, R. (1935). *Job satisfaction*. New York, NY: Harper & Bros.
- Ismail, A., & Abd Razak, M. R. (2016). Effect of job satisfaction on organizational commitment. *Management & Marketing, 14*(1), 25-40.
- Kehoe, R. R., & Wright, P. M. (2013). The impact of high-performance human resource practices on employees' attitudes and behaviors. *Journal of Management, 39*, 366-391.
- Khan, M. A. (2015). Influence of quality of work life on organizational commitment among clerical-staff. *Asia Pacific Journal of Research, 1*(25), 106-113.
- Khan, M. A. (2017). The moderation effect of teaching-experience on the relationship between self-efficacy and organizational commitment. *International Journal of Research in Management, Economics and Commerce, 7*(12), 45-49.
- Khan, S. M., & Mishra, P. C. (2002). Need satisfaction and organizational commitment-Canonical correlation analysis. *Journal of Community Guidance and Research, 19*(2), 199-208.
- Law, F. M., & Guo, G. J. (2016). Correlation of hope and self-efficacy with job satisfaction, job stress, and organizational commitment for correctional officers in the Taiwan prison system. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 60*(11), 1257-1277.
- Loui, K. (1995). Understanding employee commitment in the public organization: A study of the juvenile detention center. *International Journal of Public Administration, 18*(8), 1269-1295.
- Lunenburg, F. C. (2011). Self-efficacy in the workplace: Implications for motivation and performance. *International Journal of Management, Business, and Administration, 14*(1), 1-6.

- 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.
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1997). *Commitment in the workplace: Theory, research and application*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Meyer, J. P., Stanley, D. J., Herscovitch, L., & Topolnytsky, L. (2002). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: A meta-analysis of antecedents, correlates, and consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 61, 20-52.
- Mowday, R. T., Steers, R. M., & Porter, L. W. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 14, 224-247.
- Nifadkar, R. S., & Dongre, A. P. (2014). To study the impact of job satisfaction and demographic factors on organizational commitment among girls' college, Pune, India. *Journal of Business Management & Social Sciences Research*, 3(1), 1-8.
- Omugo, O. H., Onuoha, B. C., & Akhigbe, J. O. (2016). Quality of work-life and organizational commitment in public sector organizations in Rivers State. *International Journal of Novel Research in Humanity and Social Sciences*, 3(3), 35-44.
- Parvar, M. R. F., Allameh, S. M., & Ansari, R. (2013). Effect of quality of work life on organizational commitment by SEM (case study: OICO company). *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 3(10), 135-144.
- Porter, L. W., Lawler, E. E., & Hackman, J. R. (1975). *Behavior in organizations*. New York, NY: McGraw Hill.
- Schwarzer, R., & Jerusalem, M. (1995). Generalized Self-Efficacy Scale. In J. Weinman, S. Wright, & M. Johnston, *Measures in health psychology: A user's portfolio. Causal and control beliefs* (pp. 35-37). Windsor, UK: NFER-NELSON.
- Shah, S. A., & Ansari, S. A. (2000). Influence of HRD activities and perceived upward mobility on employees' organizational commitment and QWL. Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh: PhD Thesis.
- Singh, S. (1990). *Organizational stress and executive behaviour*. New Delhi: Shri Ram Centre for Industrial Relations and Human Resources.
- Warsi, S., Fatima, N., & Sahibzada, S. A. (2009). Study on relationship between organizational commitment and its determinants among private sector employees of Pakistan. *International Review of Business Research Papers*, 5(3), 399- 410.