

**SELDA TASDEMIR AFSAR**

Hacettepe University, TURKEY

**ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT AND DETERMINANTS OF THE  
COMMITMENT IN THE CONTEXT OF CHANGING WORKING  
CONDITIONS: TURKEY EXAMPLE\*****Abstract:**

There are 3 aims of this study. These are 1) to determine whether there is a significant difference between affective, normative and continuance commitment of the academicians in foundation and state universities against the universities where they work or not, 2) to determine whether the affective, normative and continuance commitment of the academicians at foundation and state universities differs or not according to the perception of age, gender, marital status, academic title, wage, total working year in the organization, type of assignment, quality of work life and perception of protectiveness of the organization, 3) to present which variable and/or variables are more effective on the affective, normative and continuance commitment of the academicians working at foundation and state universities. The sample of the study is consisted of 570 academicians who work at foundation and state universities and are selected by using random sampling method. The data of the study was collected by using questionnaire form and Organizational Commitment Scale revised by Meyer, Allen and Smith (1993). The 't' test was applied in order to test the relationship between the type of university and organizational commitment level and the 'correlation analysis' was made in order to determine the relationship between the type of university, social-demographic characteristics, working conditions, perception of protectiveness of the organization, quality of work life and affective, normative and continuance commitment. The 'Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis' was made in order to determine the effect of quality of work life, working conditions, perception of protectiveness of the organization and socio-demographic characteristics on the affective, normative and continuance commitment and the level of this effect. It was revealed that there is not any difference between academicians working at both types of university in terms of affective, normative and continuance commitment and the affective, normative and continuance commitment of the academicians working at both foundation and state universities differs according to the age, gender, marital status, academic title, wage, total working year in the organization, type of assignment, quality of work life and perception of protectiveness of the organization. On the other hand, it was also determined that the quality of work life is the most effective variable on the affective, normative and continuance commitment of the academicians working at both foundation and state universities and there is a low but negative relationship between quality of work life and continuance commitment of the academicians working at both foundation and state universities

**Keywords:**

Affective Commitment, Normative Commitment, Continuance Commitment, Qualit of Work Life

\*This study is based on the doctoral dissertation of the author titles "Effect of Quality of Work Life on Organizational Commitment: The Quantitative Research on Academicians in State and Foundation Universities" submitted to the Graduate School of Social Sciences of Hacettepe University for the Department of Sociology.

## 1. Introduction

Universities are also organizations, which produce information to guide society, which share the information they produce, and which contributes to the development of society. Their area of work is not only to produce scientific knowledge but also to “train individuals”. In order for university organizations to function as anticipated, academicians should perform their “duties” and “responsibilities”, and even be willing to do more than their terms of reference (Kahtz and Kahn 1977). It is possible to say that not only academicians’ mental potential as well as their personal and cognitive characteristics but also social and economic opportunities provided by the organization to its academic staff, relationship in that environment, rate of response to academicians’ needs, and the feeling of commitment towards the organization play an important role for academicians to perform their role at universities.

There are two type of university structuring in Turkey: “state” and “foundation”. State universities are established and financed by the state (Higher Education Council, 2005). Foundation universities, on the other hand, are organizations established as per Article 130 of the Constitution by the foundations *with the condition of being non-profit*, under the supervision and inspection of the state, yet not directly or indirectly financed by public funds but by tuition fees paid by students, revenues of the foundation, revenues received from various service delivery, donations, and grants (Higher Education Council, 2007a; 2007b). Entire funding of state universities is covered by the state whereas foundation universities has three separate funding resources, namely contribution of the founding foundation, tuition fees, and state assistance. Foundation universities are more flexible compared to state universities in many areas such as *spending revenues* or *selecting faculty members*. All faculty members in foundation universities are employed on the basis of *Fixed Term Service Contract*. *Employment of faculty members, determination of salary levels, determination of expenses at the university level, and fund use for the purposes of overall university budget* are implemented by the Board of Trustees. On the other hand, the foundation universities generally have a policy for *performance-based fee setting*. In addition, the ratio of employing research assistants is lower than other academicians in Turkey. This shows that foundation universities are not willing enough to train faculty members or do not give priority to transfer resources to this area. Within this framework, it should be noted here that working conditions of the academicians in foundation universities are quite different particularly the forms of employment of the faculty members.

It is an important matter of debate what kind of impact that working conditions of the academicians, their perception of organizational protectiveness and employees’

demographics have on their organizational commitment in these two such different organizational structures. In the light of this, the study has three goals: 1) to determine whether there is a significant difference between affective commitment, normative commitment and continuance commitment of the academicians in the foundation universities and state universities against the universities, 2) to determine whether the affective, normative and continuance commitment of the academicians at foundation and state universities differs or not according to the perception of age, gender, marital status, academic title, salary, total working year in the organization, years in current position, type of employment, work arrangement type (full time, part time, etc.), overtime, quality of work life and perceived organizational protectiveness, 3) to present which variable and/or variables are more effective on the affective, normative and continuance commitment of the academicians working at foundation and state universities.

## **2. Organizational Commitment**

Organizational commitment was defined, for the first time, in 1956 by Whyte as follows: "...white collar employees in large organizations live their lives dominated by the company life and their commitment. A man of organization not only works for the organization, but he also commits himself to the organization, and feels as if he belongs to it" (Whyte, 1956:143). After Whyte, starting with Porter, many researchers studied organizational commitment namely Mowday, Steers, Becker, Allen, and Meyer. These studies made it an important subject in the area of organizational studies because the term 'organizational commitment' explained the employees' efficiency at workplace as well as their intention and behavior for quitting work particularly since 1960's.

Organizational commitment provides information about the level of commitment that the employees feel towards their organizations. Therefore there are several studies revealing that organizational commitment has a positive impact on the organizational performance and efficiency of the employees which will accordingly lead to the efficiency of the organization, that the personnel with higher organizational commitment are more efficient and productive compared to those with a lower level of organizational commitment (Nadler et al. 1980; Chisholm 1983; Mirvis and Lawler III 1984; Martel and Dupuis 2006), and that the organizational commitment minimizes unwanted behaviors such as being late, non-attendance or quitting while improving the products or services at the same time (Mowday et al. 1982; Steers 1977; Meyer and Allen 1997; Meyer et al. 1993; Mathiue and Zajac 1990; Chan and Wyatt 2007; Rethinam and Maimunah 2008; Uyguç and Çımrın 2004). Employees

with higher organizational commitment will desire to perform better, and will try to do their jobs better involving their 'self'.

Multiple definitions of organizational commitment are found in the literature. Organizational commitment was defined as a type of "commitment resulting from his recognition of the cost or lost side bets associated with the discontinuance of his efforts or activities in the organization as well as of other values such as time, position and money he's gained during his employment" by Becker (1960); as "a partisan, affective attachment to the goals and values of the organization for its own sake, apart from its purely instrumental worth" by Buchanan (1974); as a state of "acceptance of the goals and values of an organization, a strong belief and a strict adherence to these goals and values, an enthusiasm to work voluntarily and willingly for the benefit of the organization, and a strong wish and desire to continue to be a committed member of that organization" by Porter et al. (1974); "a belief in and acceptance of the organization's goals and values, a willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization, and a strong desire to maintain organizational membership" by Mowday et al. (1979:226), as a "coherence and harmony of the goals sought by the organization and its employees" by Mowday et al. (1982:20); as "the totality of internalized normative pressures to act in a way that meets organizational goals and interests" by Wiener (1982:421); as "the degree of an employee's psychological attachment towards the organization as well as compliance and internalization of organizational perspective and that organization's characteristics" by O'Reilly and Chatman (1986:493); as "combined force of a person's commitment and unity of identity with an organization" by Leong et al. (1996:1345-1361); as "degree of the union of forces of a person with the organization he works for as well as of his feeling himself an integrated part of that organization" by Schermerhorn et al. (1994:144), and as "the state of spending time in the organization, coming to work regularly, spending full day by working, protecting the existence of the organization, and sharing the organizational objectives" by Meyer and Allen (1997:3).

*Meyer and Allen (1991; 1997) proposed a three-component model of organizational commitment including affective commitment, continuance commitment and normative commitment.* Affective commitment refers to an emotional attachment, identification, and involvement that an employee has with its organization where he is happy to be a member of that organization. Employees with high affective commitment stay in the organization "because they want to", and are willing to make great effort for the interests of the organization. Therefore, affective commitment is the only type of commitment wished to be inspired in an organization. Continuance commitment is the willingness to remain in an organization because of potential extra costs or few job alternatives in case one resigns from the organization. Individuals with high continuance commitment consider it as a requirement to

stay in the organization so as to prevent from financial and/or other losses. Additionally, employees with continuance commitment remain a member of the organization “because of circumstances” mostly due to fewer job alternatives perceived, and show a minimum level of performance required to be a member of that organization, which makes the continuance commitment an unwanted type of commitment by organizations. Normative commitment is the commitment that a person has out of his feeling of obligation to his workplace with a feeling of moral obligation. A person with high normative commitment remains a member of the organization because they feel working for that organization is his duty and staying with or showing commitment to his organization is “the right thing to do”, based on the socialization processes leading to personal values or occurrence of staying in the organization. In other words, normative commitment is related to a person’s personal loyalty norms and values, and thus influenced by their social and cultural characteristics.

#### **4. Antecedents of Organizational Commitment**

The studies conducted on the antecedents of organizational commitment have revealed that employees’ commitment-related behaviors towards their organization is closely related to personal characteristics such as age, gender, marital status and level of education (Steers 1977; Angle and Perry 1981; Mathieu and Zajac 1990; Allen and Meyer 1990; Meyer and Allen 1997), to work-related conditions such as job security, income level, career opportunities, total years in the organization, years in the current position and cadre (Steers 1977; Mathieu and Zajac 1990; Lok and Crawford 2001; Cohen 1993; Meyer and Allen 1997; Yousef 1998), to job satisfaction (Steers 1977; Mathieu and Zajac 1990; Mottaz 1987; Lok and Crawford 2001), to quality of work-life (Lee et al. 2007; Sirgy, et al. 2001; Efraty and Sirgy 1990; Efraty et al. 1991; Roehling et al. 2001; Sirgy et al. 2008; Fields and Thacker 1992), and perceived organizational support (Eisenberger et al. 1990; Shore and Wayne 1993; Ortiz 2010; Rhoades and Eisenberger 2002; Ozdevecioglu 2003; Behson 2002; Meyer et al. 2002).

##### **4.1 Demographic Characteristics and Organizational Commitment**

Different results have been achieved from studies conducted to reveal whether there is a difference in levels of organizational commitment based on gender. In their meta-analysis, Mathieu and Zajac (1990) have found out that organizational commitment varies, if little, according to gender, and level of organization commitment of women is higher than of men. Another study has resulted that women are more committed to their organizations, compared to men, because they do not like changing their jobs and organizations (Angle and Perry 1981). On the contrary, a study by Aven et al. (1993) have claimed that women more focus on their domestic roles and the organization they work is generally of secondary importance, and

thus women are generally less committed to their organizations compared to men. Another study conducted on the basis of Meyer and Allen's classification of organizational commitment (Suliman and Iles 2000) has found out that there is no relationship between gender and affective commitment whereas there is a weak yet positive link between gender and normative commitment, and there is a negative relationship between gender and continuance commitment.

Another demographic variable whose relationship to organizational commitment has been examined is age. The literature shows that there is a linear relationship between organizational commitment and age, and the older the employee, the higher the level of organizational commitment; the literature also emphasizes that the age variable is one of the most important indicators of organizational commitment (Cohen 1993; Meyer and Allen 1984; Becker 1960; Buchanan 1974; Steers 1977; Mathieu and Zajac 1990; Angle and Perry 1981; Lok and Crawford 2001; Meyer et al. 1993, Sikorska-Simmons 2005). Meyer and Allen (1984), on the other hand, have claimed that there is a positive relationship between age and affective commitment but there is no positive relationship between age and continuance commitment.

Studies examining the relationship between organizational commitment and marital status have found out that married employees show more commitment to the organization compared to single employees (Aranya and Jacobson 1975; Mathieu and Zajac 1990; Benkhoff 1997; Sikorska-Simmons 2005). Married employees have more domestic responsibility compared to single employees, and more likely to feel obligated to respond to the needs of their families. Therefore, married employees should have a regular job and job security since they do not want turn to their investments, and risk unemployment.

#### **4.2 Working Conditions and Organizational Commitment**

For the purposes of this study, *academic title, salary, years in organization, years in current position, type of employment, manner of work and overtime* are included under the title of **working conditions**. *Years in organization* is one of those variables most studied in terms of its relationship with organizational commitment. This variable is also related to time like the age variable. There are findings that as the years in organization increase, the organizational commitment increases since person's benefits from the organization will increase as well (Mathieu and Zajac 1990; Lok and Crawford 2001; Cohen 1993; Obeng and Ugboro 2003; Benkhoff 1997). A person, who works in the same organization for many years, will make an evaluation of his investments if he thinks about resigning, and if he is going to be included in a new organization this evaluation will include the opportunities provided by that new organization. As a result of these calculations, if the person finds that he is going to lose the

outcomes of his investments when he resigns, he may increase his continuance commitment to the existing organization.

According to Meyer and Allen (1997), when service years in an organization are prolonged, employee's affective commitment to that organization increases. In parallel to the years spent in the organization, Allen and Meyer (1990) have also put forward that there is a significant difference between new employees' organizational commitment at the time of orientation and after six months. As employees' work time increases within the socialization process, level of organizational commitment also changes in a positive or negative manner. In another study based on Meyer and Allen's classification (Suliman and Iles 2000: 415-416), it has been found out that there is a significant relationship between employees' age and years in the organization, and their continuance and normative commitment to the organization.

Despite the fact that years in organization is in a positive relationship with organizational commitment, some studies have revealed that there is a negative relationship between years in the same position and organizational commitment (Mathieu and Zajac 1990; Yalçın and İplik 2005), and even that as working years in the same position increases, affective and normative commitment of an employee decreases (Obeng and Ugboro 2003).

Another variable examined in terms of its relationship with organizational commitment is *salary*. There are findings in the literature pointing out that a high level of salary can bring a high level of organizational commitment (Steers 1977; Yüceler 2009). An employee with high salary may consider himself as more valuable and important. Regardless of the type of organization, be it a non-profit private organization or a state institution, all tasks are performed in return for a certain amount of fee. Therefore, it has been stated that there is linear relationship between employees' salary and their organizational commitment. Yüceler's (2009) study on academicians' organizational commitment has resulted in that there is a linear relationship between academicians' salary and their organizational commitment, and even that the most important factor decreasing the level of organizational commitment for academicians is low level of wages.

Another variable examined in terms of employees' organizational commitment is *the type of employment* that is whether a person is a permanent staff or employed on contract basis. The type of employment provides important information about the job security in that organization because a permanent staff has job security whereas contracted employees do not. This comes to the foreground as a vital element that influences organizational commitment of employees. Karahan's study (2008) has shown that nurses with temporary contracts do not feel adequately committed to their organizations compared to those nurses

with permanent contracts. As Feather and Rauter (2004) has put forward, this is explained in that permanent staff feel more secure compared to contracted employees.

### **4.3 Quality of Work-life and Organizational Commitment**

The idea of quality of work-life has started to take root gradually within the special context of working conditions of industrialized societies towards the end of 1950's, and to focus on humanization of dimensions of work as well as improvement of working conditions for workers concentrating on the quality of the relationship between employees and working environment in the beginning of 1960's. 1960's was a period when the work-life was full of negativities, owing to Taylorist and Fordist influences, such as "objectivization of labor", "deskilling", "dehumanization", "dehuman conditions" and "alienation" (Hannif et al. 2008; Davis and Cherns 1975; Martel and Dupuis 2006; Rose et al. 2006). Such conditions as job dissatisfaction, work alienation, depraved work environment and conditions, and wage inequality, which are results of the struggle between employees and employers, as well as global crises and political, social and economic changes require enterprises to try new and innovative methods. The only subject of these changes is "human beings", in other words "employees". Within the context of this subject, "how to make work-life and employees more qualified" and "how to increase productivity and efficiency of the employees" have become an important problem particularly for developed countries. Thus, they have started to develop new programs where employees are actively involved and work safety and health issues are well-considered. Activities have been conducted to provide better working conditions for the employees so as to make organization's life longer and to improve productivity and efficiency.

Although there is no single generally acknowledged definition of the quality of work life, researchers are of the same opinion that the quality of work-life is related to employees' 'welfare'. The concept of quality of work-life is a comprehensive term that includes work ethics and several facets of working conditions, measures for working conditions, employees' satisfaction, and efficiency in production. There are several definitions as to the quality of work life: "the quality of the relationship between employees and the total working environment, with human dimensions added to the usual technical and economic considerations" (Davis 1983); "satisfaction with wages, hours and working conditions, describing the "basic elements of a good quality of work life" as; safe work environment, equitable wages, equal employment opportunities and opportunities for advancement" (Mirvis and Lawler 1984); "favorable working environment that supports and promotes satisfaction by providing employees with rewards, job security and career growth opportunities" (Lau, Wong, Chan and Law 2001); "generic concept that covers a person's feelings about every dimension of work, and a way of thinking about people, work and organization that involves a concern for employee well-being and



organizational effectiveness” (Cummings and Worley 1997); “employee Satisfaction with a variety of needs through resources, activities, and outcomes stemming from participation in the workplace” (Sirgy et al. 2001). For the purposes of this study, based on Sirgy et al.’s definition (2001), the quality of work-life is defined as “not only employees’ opinions, attitudes and expectations about their job but also interpretation of all conditions and satisfaction of employees’ needs by the employees as well as their perception of this satisfaction and conditions”.

On the other hand, a review of the literature on the quality of work-life shows that there are many different conceptual categories about the quality of work-life. These different conceptual categories are listed as the structure and organization of work, equal and fair wages, non-wage revenues, working environment and conditions, career and promotion opportunities, safe physical environment, personal development / lifelong learning opportunities, participation in decision making, working years, job / employment security, relationship with employer or manager or other colleagues at the work place, efficiency in decisions made, variety of tasks, ability to use skills, and management and organization of tasks (Walton 1975; Scobel, 1975; Boisvert 1977; Wurf 1982; Chisholm 1983; Shamir and Salomon 1985; Yousuf 1995; Wyatt and Wah 2001; Rose et al 2006; Havlovic 1991).

Improving the quality of work-life serves to the aim of improving the efficiency of employees, and thus of improving the efficiency, profit and savings of the organization. Improving employees’ efficiency gets through improving working conditions as well as employees’ integrating themselves with the organization. Several studies reveal that the quality of work-life do influence employees’ organizational behaviors such as organizational identity, job satisfaction and work performance, particularly the fact that the quality of work-life has a significant impact on organizational commitment, has been found out in many studies (Fields and Thacker 1992; Efraty and Sirgy 1990; Anuradha and Pandey, 1995; Sirgy et al. 2001; Lee et al. 2007; Koonmee and Virakul 2007; Huang et al. 2007; Roehling et al. 2001; Sirgy et al. 2008). Stating that “Responding to the needs of an employee results in a powerful sense of belonging by the employee towards his organization”, Rhoades and Eisenberger (2002) emphasize the quality of work life, which occurs as a result of responding to various needs of employees, is one of the most important antecedents of organizational commitment.

Kotze (2005) states that quality of work-life has two objectives: “to humanize the workplace and to improve the quality of job experience of employees”, and “to improve productiveness and efficiency of the organization”. Thus, the quality of work-life is both a response to the needs of employees as well as organizational needs, and a method or a series of measures to improve the conditions of working. A productive employee is a person

who is efficient, who is devoted to his work and his organization, and who has ideal characteristics for an employee. Employees with lower quality of work-life are people who lack motivation for work, fail to show good performance at work, are not committed to their employers and organizations, are generally late for work, and also who frequently change their jobs (Efraty et al. 2000). Departing from the idea that the more committed the employees are to the organization the stronger an organization gets, the organizations attach importance to prevent their employees resign from the organization, to have their employees strongly commit themselves to organizational goals and objectives, to have them show considerable effort, and to ensure a unity among their employees and the organization itself so as to sustain their efficiency, reputation and prestige in society. Therefore, the organizations are supposed to increase the quality of work-life of their employees.

According to Sirgy et al. (2001), the quality of work-life is ensured upon satisfaction of seven needs namely health and safety needs, economic and family needs, social needs, esteem needs, actualization needs, knowledge needs, and aesthetic needs. The quality of work-life determined upon satisfaction of these needs with several dimensions shows a spillover effect, and becomes a critical factor and determinant in an employee's quality of work-life as well as his job satisfaction, other areas of life and general life satisfaction. The higher an employee's quality of work-life, the more positive his feelings about the organization he works for. It is assumed that if a person is feeling positive about the organization he works for, this positive emotion results in organizational commitment (Sirgy vd. 2001).

#### **4.4 Perception of Organizational Protectiveness and Organizational Commitment**

Another factor acknowledged to be an important antecedent of organizational commitment is "organizational support" (Eisenberger et al. 1990; Shore and Wayne 1993; Ortiz 2010; Rhoades and Eisenberger 2002; Ozdevecioglu 2003; Behson 2002; Meyer et al. 2002). Organizational support is defined as "the extent to which the organization values its employees' contribution and cares about their wellbeing" (Eisenberger et al. 1986:501), as "the extent to which an organization is aware of its employees' contribution to the organization, and gives importance to their welfare" (Martin 1995:89), and as "the extent to which employees of an organization feel themselves secure, and feel the support of their organization" (Ozdevecioglu, 2003:116).

Eisenberger et al. (1986) explain organizations' perception of commitment to their employees through the concept of "perceived organizational support". Thus, they state that individuals working for several organizations develop an understanding whether or not their organizations support them, and this needs to be defined with the concept of "perceived

organizational support". In their meta-analysis, Rhoades and Eisenberger (2002:701) have classified the elements of organizational support under various titles: *supervisor support, fairness, organizational rewards and sufficient job conditions* (payment, promotion, job security, autonomy, role stressors). Existence of such elements makes an employee feel the support of his organization.

Eisenberger et al. (1986) explains the state of perceived organizational support being one of the most important factors of organizational commitment with *Social Exchange Theory*. The core of social exchange theory is *reciprocity*. Reciprocity requires one to respond positively to favorable treatment from another (Eisenberger et al. 1997:812). Applied to organizational relations, the norm of reciprocity states that an employee is in need of responding positively to his organization when he believes his organization supports him (Eisenberger et al. 2001). The employee, who feels the support of his organization all the time, will also feel obliged to give a positive response to the organization, will develop his affective commitment to the organization, will acknowledge the organizations' goals as his own personal goals (Eisenberger et al. 1990; Rhoades and Eisenberger 2002), will be more committed to his work, and will never think of resigning. As a result of this behavior, the employee will show the performance expected from him, and work for efficiency and success of his organization.

For the purposes of this study, perceived organizational protectiveness covers the organizational support, and means a state where the organization "protects its employees", "trusts its employees" in every decision made and every action taken, makes its employees feel that "they are valuable for the organization", that "the organization always have their back, support and protect them", and also "the organization commit to its employees". This feeling, as put forward by Eisenberger et al. (1990) for organizational support, is the employee's belief, his perception. Therefore, it is possible to say that perception about organizational protectiveness is relative, and varies from person to person. In this study, the perceived organizational protectiveness is measured by the question "*Do you think your university treats you defensive, protective and possessive in all cases?*".

#### **4.5 Organizational Structure and Organizational Commitment**

Another variable examined for its relationship with organizational commitment is the type of organization (private vs. public). Public institutions and for-profit private organizations differ from each other both in terms of their organizational cultural structure and of ownership structures as well as reasons for their foundation. "Employees in the public sector part from the private sector employees since they work on behalf of the state and they receive shares

from state revenues” (Ongen 1999:57). First of all, the owner of public institutions is the State; these organizations are generally non-profit, and administered within written rules and regulations. On the other hand, the owners of for-profit private organizations are either foundations or person or persons; the main goal of these organizations is making profit, and they have unwritten rules and behavior controls in addition to written rules and regulations. As part of these differences, it is possible to say that both organizations have their own working conditions, organizational culture and organizational socialization processes. Goulet and Frank (2002) have stated that it expected from the employees working for public organizations to be more committed towards their organizations than those working for for-profit private organizations since public organizations have more job security compared to for-profit private organizations, and that the literature has revealed the same results as well. Nevertheless, Goulet and Frank’s study (2002), on the contrary to the literature, has resulted in that organizational commitment of employees working for for-profit private organizations is higher than of those working for public organizations. Yousef (1998) has stated that job security in an organization will increase the perceived organizational support of the employees, and thus to increase the level of organizational commitment. Sıgır (2007), on the other hand, in his study where he has examined the affective, normative and continuance commitment of the employees in public and private institutions, has pointed out that public employees in Turkey have high level of continuance commitment while private sector employees have higher affective and normative commitment.

## 5. Research framework and hypotheses

The study aims to reveal, in a comparative manner, the relationship between the organizational commitment and the quality of work life, academic title, salary, years in organization, years in current position, type of employment, work arrangement type, overtime, and perceived organizational protectiveness through academicians working for state and foundation universities. The study claims that not only the quality of work-life but other variables as well have an impact on three dimensions of organizational commitment (namely affective, normative and continuance commitment) for the academicians working for state and foundation universities, with the most influential variable being the quality of work life.

The study has first tested whether the academicians working for state and foundation universities differ in terms of affective, normative and continuance commitment, and then examined to see which variable has the highest impact on the affective, normative and continuance commitment. Hypotheses tested in this research are as follows:

**Hypothesis 1:** Normative and continuance commitment level of the academicians working for foundation universities is higher than of the academicians working for state universities.

**Hypothesis 2:** Affective commitment level of the academicians working for foundation universities is lower than of the academicians working for state universities.

**Hypothesis 3a.** Quality of work-life of the foundation universities has a positive impact on affective and normative commitment, and this impact is stronger than that of working conditions, perceived organizational protectiveness, and demographics.

**Hypothesis 3b.** Quality of work-life of the state universities has a positive impact on affective and normative commitment, and this impact is stronger than that of working conditions, perceived organizational protectiveness, and demographics.

**Hypothesis 4a.** Quality of work-life of the foundation universities has a negative impact on continuance commitment, and this impact is stronger than that of working conditions, perceived organizational protectiveness, and demographics.

**Hypothesis 4b.** Quality of work-life of the state universities has a negative impact on continuance commitment, and this impact is stronger than that of working conditions, perceived organizational protectiveness, and demographics.

## 6 Methodology

### 6.1 Sampling

As mentioned above, working conditions and opportunities for the academicians working for state and foundation universities in Turkey are quite different. In the light of these differences, two different organizational structures have been selected for the purposes of this study because it has been considered that there are different factors influencing the organizational commitment of the academicians working for these two types of higher education organizations. In the study, two strata have been established among the universities in Ankara being public and foundation universities. The state universities are Gazi University and Hacettepe University, and the foundation universities are Başkent University and Bilkent University. Sampling included all the academicians of these four universities; at the levels of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, teaching assistants and research assistants working in the faculties of Science, Letters, Education, Engineering, and Economics.

It has been decided to use a web-based survey as the data collection method during the planning process. Nevertheless, one of the state universities did not allow the use of a web-based survey and no response was received from one of the foundation universities, so the researcher delivered and collected printed surveys at these two universities.

The total number of academicians working in the faculties of Science, Letters, Education, Engineering, and Economics of Gazi, Hacettepe, Başkent and Bilkent universities

is 3,228. The total number of questionnaires collected was 570, 342 of which are collected from the state universities and 228 from the foundation universities. Response rate for the state universities is 14.3% whereas it is 27.1% for the foundation universities. Of all respondents, 55.1% are male, a great majority (19.6%) is between 26-30 years of age, and 60.8% are married. Of the respondents, 33.6% are research assistants, 28.3% are working the same organization for 2-5 years, and 47.4% are working in the same position for 2-5 years. Of the respondents, 36.8% are paid between TL 1,501.- to TL 2,000.- monthly, 55.7% work on the basis of fixed-term contract, 94.4% are employed full-time, and 27.8% do 6-10 hours of overtime per week.

## **6.2 Measures**

### **6.2.1 Quality of Work-life**

This study makes use of the Quality of Work-life Scale (QWLS) developed by Sirgy et al. (2001) to measure the quality of work-life of the employees. The scale conceptualizes satisfaction of seven areas of need, namely (1) health and safety, (2) economic and family, (3) social needs, (4) esteem, (5) actualization, (6) knowledge, and (7) aesthetics needs. The scale consists of 16 items with regard to the satisfaction of these seven needs. The respondents were asked to respond to each item by checking a 7-point scale ranging from “strongly disagree” (value of 1) to “strongly agree” (value of 7). Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient of this scale has been calculated as 0.78 by Sirgy et al. (2001). In this study, the Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient of the scale has been calculated as 0.88. The scale has been adapted to Turkish Culture by Taşdemir-Afşar (2011).

### **6.2.2 Organizational Commitment**

In order to measure organizational commitment, this study has made use of Organizational Commitment Scale- OCS developed by Meyer and Allen (1991), and used after revision by Meyer, Allen and Smith (1993). The scale is comprised of three different dimensions of commitment namely affective commitment, continuance commitment, and normative commitment. The scale has included a total of 18 questions to measure affective commitment, continuance commitment, and normative commitment. There are six questions for each dimension. This is a five point Likert scale (“Strongly Disagree”, “Disagree”, “Neutral”, “Agree”, and “Strongly Agree”). Alpha values found by Meyer, Allen and Smith have been 0.82 for affective commitment, 0.74 for continuance commitment, and 0.83 for normative commitment. In this study, Cronbach Alpha value for affective commitment has been found to be 0.89, for continuance commitment 0.79, and for normative commitment 0.80.

Additionally, a separate questionnaire comprised of 14 questions has been applied to learn about demographics of the respondents (age, sex and marital status), their working conditions (academic title, monthly salary, years in organization, years in current position, type of employment method of working, and overtime), and their perception about organizational protectiveness.

## **7 Results**

T test has been used to test the difference between academicians' affective, continuance and normative commitment as of university type. Correlation Analysis has been used to see relationship between affective, normative, continuance commitment and type of university, demographic characteristics, working conditions, perception about organisational protectiveness and quality of work life. "Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis" has been used to see the impact of the quality of work life, working conditions, perceived organizational protectiveness and demographics on affective, continuance and normative commitment, as well as the level of this impact.

### **7.1 Difference Between Academicians Working for State and Foundation Universities in Terms of Affective, Normative and Continuance Commitment**

Table 1 gives a comparative summary of affective, normative and continuance commitment of the academicians working for state and foundation universities. A review of this table will show that level of affective commitment ( $t$  value = 0.834  $p$ = 0.405 > 0.05) and of continuance commitment ( $t$  value = 1.898  $p$ = 0.058 > 0.05) of the academicians working for foundation universities is lower than of the academicians working for state universities, yet this difference is not significant. Similarly, it has been found out that normative commitment of the academicians working for foundation universities is stronger than of the academicians working for state universities, yet this difference is not significant ( $t$  value = -0.053  $p$ = 0.957 > 0.05). Based on these findings, Hypothesis 1 and Hypothesis 2 within the framework of this study are not verified.

**Table 1: Difference Between Academicians Working for State and Foundation Universities in Terms of Affective, Normative and Continuance Commitment**

<b>Type of University – Affective Commitment</b>			
	<b>Mean (St.Dev.)</b>	<b>t</b>	<b>p</b>
State University	20.23 (5.64)		
Foundation University	19.82 (5.73)	0.834	0.405
<b>Type of University – Normative Commitment</b>			
	<b>Mean (St.Dev.)</b>	<b>t</b>	<b>p</b>
State University	17.52 (5.24)		
Foundation University	17.54 (4.92)	-0.053	0.957
<b>Type of University – Continuance Commitment</b>			
	<b>Mean (St.Dev.)</b>	<b>t</b>	<b>p</b>
State University	17.77 (4.99)		
Foundation University	16.95 (5.14)	1.898	0.058

## **7.2 Relationship between Affective, Normative, Continuance Commitment and Type of University, Demographic Characteristics, Working Conditions, Perception about Organisational Protectiveness and Quality of Work Life**

Table 2 shows the relationship between affective commitment and demographics (age, gender and marital status), working conditions (academic title, salary, total number of years in the organisation, total number of years at the position, type of employment, work arrangement and overtime), the perception about organisational protectiveness, and the quality of work life.



**Table 2 : Relationship between Affective commitment and Type of University, Demographic Characteristics, Working Conditions, Perception about Organisational Protectiveness and Quality of Work Life**

State University												
Correlation	Sex		Age		Marital Status		Academic Title		Years in Organization		Years in Current Position	
Affective Commitment	r	p	r	p	r	p	r	p	r	p	r	p
		,047	,390	,118*	,029	-,010	,851	,177**	,001	,126*	,020	,057
Correlation	Salary		Type of Employment		Work Arrangement		Overtime		Organizational Protectiveness		QWL	
Affective Commitment	r	p	r	p	r	p	R	p	r	p	r	p
		,168**	,002	-,152**	,005	-,020	,715	,025	,642	-,337**	,000	,624**
Foundation University												
Correlation	Sex		Age		Marital Status		Academic Title		Years in Organization		Years in Current Position	
Affective Commitment	r	p	r	p	r	p	r	p	r	p	r	p
		-,007	,915	,293**	,000	-,131*	,048	,288**	,000	,218**	,001	,268**
Correlation	Salary		Type of Employment		Work Arrangement		Overtime		Organizational Protectiveness		QWL	
Affective Commitment	r	p	r	p	r	P	r	p	r	p	r	p
		,245**	,000	-,220**	,001	-,056	,400	,110	,097	-,265**	,000	,663**

\*p<0,05 , \*\*p<0,01, \*\*\*p<0,001

The table gives that there was a positive meaningful correlation between age and affective commitment and the affective commitment increases as the age of academicians increases at state universities. It was found that there was a positive meaningful correlation between academic title, working period at universities, monthly wage and affective commitment but there was a negative meaningful correlation between affective commitment and assignment type at state universities. That is to say, the affective commitment increases as the academic title degree, working period

and rate of monthly wage of academicians increase. On the other hand, the emotional commitment level of the contractual academicians is lower than the permanent staff.

There is a positive correlation between gender and affective commitment but there is a negative meaningful correlation between marital status and affective commitment at foundation universities. In other words, the affective commitment level of men is lower than the affective commitment level than women and the affective commitment level of single academicians is lower than the affective commitment level of the married academicians.

It was seen that there was a positive and meaningful correlation between affective commitment and academic title, working period, working in the existing position and monthly wage, however, there was a negative but meaningful correlation between affective commitment and assignment type at foundation universities and the correlation levels are higher at foundation universities than the state universities. Again, the affective commitment increases as the academic title degree, working period, working in the existing position and monthly wage increase. The affective commitment level of the contractual academicians is lower than the permanent staff as at the state universities.

It was set forth that there was a meaningful correlation between perception of protectiveness of university and affective commitment at both university types and the level of correlation at state university was higher than the level of correlation at foundation university. That is to say, the emotional commitment level of academicians, who think that the organization is protective, is higher than the academicians who think that the organization is not protective.

It was found that there was a positive and meaningful correlation between affective commitment and quality of work life of academicians working at both universities and it was also determined that the quality of work life had the highest level of correlation with the affective commitment among all other variables.

Table 3 gives the results of correlation analysis **between normative commitment** demographics (age, gender and marital status), working conditions (academic title, salary, total number of years in the organisation, total number of years at the position,

type of employment, work arrangement and overtime), the perception about organisational protectiveness, and the quality of work life.

**Table 3: Relationship between Normative Commitment and Type of University, Demographic Characteristics, Working Conditions, Perception about Organisational Protectiveness and Quality of Work Life**

State University												
Correlation	Sex		Age		Marital Status		Academic Title		Years in Organization		Years in Current Position	
Normative Commitment	r	p	r	p	r	p	R	p	r	p	r	p
	-,022	,685	,082	,129	-,040	,465	,117*	,030	,093	,088	,034	,525
Correlation	Salary		Type of Employment		Work Arrangement		Overtime		Organizational Protectiveness		QWL	
Normative Commitment	r	p	r	p	r	p	R	p	r	p	r	p
	,100	,064	-,149**	,006	-,033	,538	-,010	,855	-,346**	,000	,548**	,000
Foundation University												
Correlation	Sex		Age		Marital Status		Academic Title		Years in Organization		Years in Current Position	
Normative Commitment	r	p	r	p	r	p	r	p	r	p	r	p
	,021	,750	,195**	,003	-,100	,133	,210**	,001	,151*	,023	,185**	,005
Correlation	Salary		Type of Employment		Work Arrangement		Overtime		Organizational Protectiveness		QWL	
Normative Commitment	r	p	r	p	r	p	r	p	r	p	r	p
	,136*	,040	-,130	,060	-,046	,491	,118	,076	-,327**	,000	,550**	,000

\*p<0,05 , \*\*p<0,01, \*\*\*p<0,01

Findings show that there is a positive and meaningful correlation between age and normative commitment at foundation university, that is to say, the level of normative commitment increases as the age increases. It was found that there was a meaningful correlation between only academic title and assignment type and normative commitment and the normative commitment level increases as the degree of academic title increases and the normative commitment level of contractual academicians is lower than the permanent staff at state university. There is a positive

statistical meaningful correlation between normative commitment and academic title, working period, working in the existing position and monthly wage at foundation university.

As it can be seen in the Table 3, it was determined that there was a statistical meaningful correlation between normative commitment and perception against protectiveness of the university, that is to say, the normative commitment level of academicians, who think that the organization is protective, is higher than the academicians who think that the organization is not protective at both state and foundation universities.

It was also found that there was a positive and high correlation between quality of work life and normative commitment at both universities and it was also determined that the quality of work life had the highest level of correlation with the normative commitment among all other variables. This correlation is higher at state university compared to foundation university.

Results in Table 4 show that there is no a statistical significant correlation between socio-demographic characteristics and continuance commitment at both state and foundation universities when the correlation between socio-demographic characteristics and continuance commitment of academicians is studied at both university types. It was also determined that there was a negative but significant correlation between continuance commitment and academic title and monthly wage, that is to say, the level of continuance commitment decreases as the degree of academic title and amount of wage increase at state university. On the other hand, there is a positive meaningful correlation between continuance commitment and working period and assignment type at foundation university.

**Table 4 : Relationship between Continuance Commitment and Type of University, Demographic Characteristics, Working Conditions, Perception about Organisational Protectiveness and Quality of Work Life**

State University												
Correlation	Sex		Age		Marital Status		Academic Title		Years in Organization		Years in Current Position	
Continuance Commitment	r	p	r	p	r	p	r	p	r	p	r	p
		-,077	,153	-,062	,251	,021	,702	-,124*	,022	-,037	,494	-,029
Correlation	Salary		Type of Employment		Work Arrangement		Overtime		Organizational Protectiveness		QWL	
Continuance Commitment	r	p	r	p	r	p	r	p	r	p	r	p
		-,121*	,025	,071	,188	-,017	,754	-,062	,251	,136*	,012	-,174**
Foundation University												
Correlation	Sex		Age		Marital Status		Academic Title		Years in Organization		Years in Current Position	
Continuance Commitment	r	p	r	p	r	p	r	p	r	p	r	p
		,007	,911	,011	,872	-,119	,072	-,069	,298	,160*	,015	,093
Correlation	Salary		Type of Employment		Work Arrangement		Overtime		Organizational Protectiveness		QWL	
Continuance Commitment	r	p	r	p	r	p	r	p	r	p	r	p
		-,096	,149	,179**	,007	,003	,968	-,025	,708	,083	,210	-,178**

\*p<0,05 , \*\*p<0,01, \*\*\*p<0,01

While there is a positive and meaningful correlation between continuance commitment and perception against the protectiveness of the university at state university, there is not a meaningful correlation between these two variables at foundation university. It was determined that there was a negative meaningful correlation between quality of work life and continuance commitment at both university types. That is to say, the continuance commitment level decreases as the quality of work life increases.

### 7.3 Impact of the Quality of Work Life, Working Conditions, Perceived Organizational Protectiveness and Demographics on Affective Commitment as of University Type

Table 5 shows the impact of the quality of work life, working conditions, perceived organizational protectiveness and demographics of the academicians working for state and foundation universities on their affective commitment towards their organizations. Step 1 reveals the impact of the quality of work-life on affective commitment. Statistical findings as a result of Step 1 show that the quality of work-life has a positive impact on affective commitment for both institution types. According to this impact, it is expected to have a higher level of affective commitment as the quality of work-life increases. The quality of work-life alone explains approximately 39% of the change in affective commitment of the academicians in state universities, and 44% of the change in affective commitment of the academicians in foundation universities.

**Table 5: Impact of the Quality of Work Life, Working Conditions, Perceived Organizational Protectiveness and Demographics on Affective Commitment as of University Type**

State University - (Affective Commitment)			Foundation University - (Affective Commitment)		
	Beta	$\beta$ coefficient		Beta	$\beta$ coefficient
<b>Step 1</b>			<b>Step 1</b>		
Fixed	2.284		Fixed	-0.346	
QWL	0.234	0.624***	QWL	0.251	0.663***
<b>Step 2</b>			<b>Step 2</b>		
Fixed	4.693		Fixed	4.590	
QWL	0.232	0.619***	QWL	0.235	0.622***
Academic Title	0.409	0.114	Academic Title	0.174	0.042
Years in Organization	0.048	0.014	Years in Organization	0.085	0.018
Years in Current Position	0.049	0.010	Years in Current Position	0.562	0.125
Monthly Salary	-0.386	-0.078	Monthly Salary	-0.501	0.147
Type of Employment	0.184	0.047	Type of Employment	-1.032	0.045
Method of Work	-0.149	-0.010	Method of Work	-0.004	0.000
Overtime	0.224	0.052	Overtime	0.406	0.098
Organizational Protectiveness	-1.310	-0.129**	Organizational Protectiveness	-0.957	-0.118*
Gender	-0.432	-0.038	Gender	-1,517	-0.131*
Age	-0.307	-0.105	Age	0.187	-0.067

Marital Status	0.253	0.029	Marital Status	-0.143	0.044
	<b>Model 1</b>			<b>Model 1</b>	
R=0.624	R <sup>2</sup> =0.390	F=217.17	R=0.663	R <sup>2</sup> =0.439	F=176.948
	p<0.001			p<0.001	
	<b>Model 2</b>			<b>Model 2</b>	
R=0.647	R <sup>2</sup> =0.419	F=19.973	R=0.707	R <sup>2</sup> =0.500	F=17.89
	p>0.05			p<0.001	

\*p<0.05 , \*\*p<0.01, \*\*\*p<0.001

As seen in Table 5, Step 2 is established by adding current working conditions of the academicians (academic title, monthly salary, years in organization, years in current position, cadre, work style and overtime) as well as demographics and perceived organizational protectiveness to Step 1 (quality of work life). The results from Step 2 show that the quality of work-life in state universities explains 39% of the change in affective commitment; it explains 42% of the change in affective commitment when accompanied by working conditions, demographics and perceived organizational protectiveness. This change (R<sup>2</sup> change = 0.029, p>0.05) is not statistically significant. Considering all variables together at the same time in state universities, it is seen that the most influential variable on affective commitment is the quality of work life, and the only other variable influential on affective commitment is perceived organizational protectiveness; current working conditions and demographics do not have a meaningful impact on affective commitment.

As review of the data regarding foundation universities in Table 5, the results obtained from Step 2, by adding Step 1 (quality of work life) the working conditions, demographics and perceived organizational protectiveness, shows a significant change in R<sup>2</sup> (R<sup>2</sup> change = 0.61, p<0.01). This means that the quality of work-life in foundation universities explains 44% of the change in affective commitment; it explains approximately 50% of the change in affective commitment when accompanied by working conditions, demographics and perceived organizational protectiveness. Considering all variables together at the same time in foundation universities, perceived organizational protectiveness and age seem to have a statistically significant impact on affective commitment, yet the most influential variable on affective commitment seems to be the quality of work life. Thus, it is possible to say that the quality of work-life of the academicians working for both state and foundation universities has a positive impact on the level of affective commitment, which is higher than of working conditions, perceived organizational protectiveness and demographics, and that the affective commitment of the academicians increase as their quality of work-life improves.

### 7.3 Impact of the Quality of Work Life, Working Conditions, Perceived Organizational Protectiveness and Demographics on Normative Commitment as of University Type

Table 6 gives the results of hierarchical multiple regression analysis where the normative commitment is taken as dependent variable for both types of universities. Step 1 in Table 6 reveals the impact of the quality of work-life on normative commitment. Statistical findings from Step 1 show that the quality of work-life has a positive impact on normative commitment for both institution types. According to this impact, it is expected to have a higher level of normative commitment as the quality of work-life increases. The quality of work-life alone explains approximately 30% of the change in normative commitment of the academicians in both state and foundation universities.

**Table 6: Impact of the Quality of Work Life, Working Conditions, Perceived Organizational Protectiveness and Demographics on Normative Commitment as of University Type**

	State University - (Normative Commitment)		Foundation University - (Normative Commitment)		
	Beta	$\beta$ coefficient	Beta	$\beta$ coefficient	
<b>Step 1</b>			<b>Step 1</b>		
Fixed	2.862		Fixed	3.154	
QWL	0.191	0.548***	QWL	0.179	0.550***
<b>Step 2</b>			<b>Step 2</b>		
Fixed	10.808		Fixed	5.483	
QWL	0.188	0.540***	QWL	0.171	0.526***
Academic Title	-0.331	-0.099	Academic Title	0.408	0.115
Years in Organization	0.080	0.025	Years in Organization	0.028	0.007
Years in Current Position	-0.005	0.000	Years in Current Position	0.335	0.086
Monthly Salary	-0.308	-0.067	Monthly Salary	-0.734	-0.250*
Type of Employment	-0.432	-0.119	Type of Employment	0.209	0.011
Method of Work	-0.221	-0.016	Method of Work	0.005	0.001
Overtime	0.128	0.032	Overtime	0.458	0.069
Organizational Protectiveness	-1.614	-0.170**	Organizational Protectiveness	-1.373	-0.192**
Gender	-1.169	-0.111**	Gender	-0.704	-0.071
Age	-0.181	-0.066	Age	0.105	0.044
Marital Status	-0.280	-0.034	Marital Status	-0.163	-0.019



<b>Model 1</b>				<b>Model 1</b>		
R=,548	R <sup>2</sup> =,301	F=146,23	p<0.01	R=0.550	R <sup>2</sup> =0.303	F=98.189 p<0.001
<b>Model 2</b>				<b>Model 2</b>		
R=,596	R <sup>2</sup> =,355	F=15,102	p<0.01	R=0.618	R <sup>2</sup> =0.382	F=11.097 p<0.001

\*p<0.05 , \*\*p<0.01, \*\*\*p<0.001

The results from Step 2, which is established by adding objective conditions, demographics and perceived organizational protectiveness to Step 1 (quality of work life), show that the quality of work-life in state universities explains approximately 30% of the change in normative commitment; it explains around 36% of the change in normative commitment when accompanied by objective conditions, demographics and perceived organizational protectiveness. This change ( $R^2$  change = 0.054,  $p<0.01$ ) is statistically significant. Considering all variables together at the same time in state universities, it is seen that the most influential variable on normative commitment is the quality of work life, and the only other variable influential on normative commitment is perceived organizational protectiveness and gender among the demographics; current working conditions and demographics do not have a meaningful impact on normative commitment.

A review of the data regarding foundation universities in Table 6 will show that, based on the results obtained from Step 2, by adding Step 1 (quality of work life) the working conditions, demographics and perceived organizational protectiveness, there is a significant change in  $R^2$  ( $R^2$  change = 0.80,  $p<0.01$ ). This means that the quality of work-life in foundation universities explains approximately 30% of the change in normative commitment; it explains approximately 38% of the change in normative commitment when accompanied by working conditions, demographics and perceived organizational protectiveness. It is seen that the impact of those variables other than the quality of work-life on organizational commitment is stronger in the foundation universities compared to the state universities. Besides, it is found out that monthly salary variable has a significant impact on normative commitment in foundation universities, which is even the second most influential variable after the quality of work life. As in the state universities, perceived organizational protectiveness is an influential variable for normative commitment in the foundation universities. Nevertheless gender, which has a significant impact on normative commitment in the state universities, does not have a significant impact on normative commitment when it comes to the foundation universities. In the light of the above-mentioned findings, we can say that there is a positive and strong relationship between the quality of work-life and normative commitment for both types of universities, and that the quality of work-life has the strongest relationship with normative

commitment among all variables examined. Based on the data given in Table 5 and Table 6, it is possible to say that Hypothesis 3a and 3b are not verified.

#### 7.4 Impact of the Quality of Work Life, Working Conditions, Perceived Organizational Protectiveness and Demographics on Continuance Commitment as of University Type

Table 7 gives the results of hierarchical multiple regression analysis where the continuance commitment is taken as dependent variable for both types of universities. Step 1 in Table 7 reveals the impact of the quality of work-life on continuance commitment. Findings show that the quality of work-life has a lower but negative impact on continuance commitment for both institution types. According to this negative impact, it is expected to have a lower level of continuance commitment as the quality of work-life increases. The quality of work-life alone explains approximately 3% of the change in continuance commitment of the academicians in both state and foundation universities.

**Table 7: Impact of the Quality of Work Life, Working Conditions, Perceived Organizational Protectiveness and Demographics on Continuance Commitment as of University Type**

	State University - (Continuance Commitment)		Foundation University - (Continuance Commitment)		
	Beta	$\beta$ coefficient	Beta	$\beta$ coefficient	
<b>Step 1</b>			<b>Step 1</b>		
Fixed	22.206		Fixed	21.809	
QWL	-0,058	-0.174**	QWL	-0.060	-0.178**
<b>Step 2</b>			<b>Step 2</b>		
Fixed	22.685		Fixed	13.392	
QWL	-0.037	-0.113*	QWL	-0.040	-0.119*
Academic Title	-1.016	-0.320	Academic Title	-0.232	-0.063
Years in Organization	0.252	0.084	Years in Organization	1.079	0.262**
Years in Current Position	-0.187	-0.041	Years in Current Position	0.130	0.032
Monthly Salary	0.109	0.025	Monthly Salary	-0.501	-0.164
Type of Employment	-0.376	-0.109	Type of Employment	2.959	0.143*
Method of Work	-0.346	-0.027	Method of Work	-0.074	-0.015
Overtime	-0.189	-0.050	Overtime	-0.187	-0.050
Organizational	0.883	0.098	Organizational	0.458	0.061

Protectiveness			Protectiveness		
Gender	-0.524	-0.053	Gender	0.449	0.043
Age	0.300	0.115	Age	0.058	0.023
Marital Status	-,045		Marital Status	-0.937	-0.103
<b>Model 1</b>			<b>Model 1</b>		
R=,174	R <sup>2</sup> =,030	F=10,655	p<0.01	R=0.178	R <sup>2</sup> =0.030
			F=7.372		
			p<0.01		
<b>Model 2</b>			<b>Model 2</b>		
R=,245	R <sup>2</sup> =,060	F=1,754	p>0.05	R=0.362	R <sup>2</sup> =0.131
			F=2.699		
			p<0.05		

\*p<0.05 , \*\*p<0.01, \*\*\*p<0.001

The results from Step 2, which is established by adding working conditions, demographics and perceived organizational protectiveness to Step 1 (quality of work life), show that the quality of work-life in state universities explains approximately 3% of the change in continuance commitment; it explains around 6% of the change in continuance commitment when accompanied by working conditions, demographics and perceived organizational protectiveness. This little change ( $R^2$  change = 0.03,  $p>0.05$ ) is not statistically significant. Considering all variables together at the same time in state universities, it is seen that the most influential variable on continuance commitment is the quality of work-life, and the perceived organizational protectiveness, current working conditions and demographics do not have a meaningful impact on continuance commitment.

A review of the data regarding foundation universities in Table 7 will show that, based on the results obtained from Step 2, by adding Step 1 (quality of work life) the working conditions, demographics and perceived organizational protectiveness, there is a significant change in  $R^2$  ( $R^2$  change = 0.99,  $p<0.01$ ). This means that the quality of work-life in foundation universities explains approximately 3% of the change in continuance commitment; it explains approximately 13% of the change in continuance commitment when accompanied by working conditions, demographics and perceived organizational protectiveness. It is seen that the impact of those variables other than the quality of work-life on continuance commitment is stronger in the foundation universities compared to the state universities. Besides, it is found out that years in the organization and type of employment have a significant impact on continuance commitment in foundation universities, and the strongest variable in terms of impact is the years in organization.

An examination of the data on the relationship between the quality of work-life and continuance commitment has shown that there is a low but negative relationship between the quality of work-life and continuance commitment of the academicians working for both public

and foundation universities. In the light of above-mentioned findings, the hypothesis that the quality of work-life has a negative impact on continuance commitment, and which is stronger than that of working conditions, perceived organizational protectiveness, and demographics has been verified for state universities (Hypothesis 4b) but falsified for foundation universities (Hypothesis 4a).

## 8. Discussion

This study has aimed to reveal the impact of the quality of work life, working conditions, perceived organizational protectiveness and demographics of the academicians working for state and foundation universities in Turkey on affective, normative and continuance commitment. The study has examined whether there is a significant difference between affective, normative and continuance commitment of the academicians working for state and foundation universities, and resulted in that there is no significant difference between the academicians working for state and foundation universities in terms of affective, normative and continuance commitment. This result is not consistent with Siğrı's study (2007), concluding that the level of affective and normative commitment of private sector employees in Turkey is higher than that of public sector employees. It has been stated that there are huge differences between and among the public and private sector organizations in Turkey in terms of working conditions, therefore a higher level of continuance commitment by the public employees is an anticipated result, and the study has also led to the finding that the level of continuance commitment of the public employees is higher than the private sector employees as anticipated. Nonetheless, this study has not resulted in an information consistent with this anticipation and finding, and concluded that the level of affective, normative and continuance commitment of the academicians working for both public and foundation universities is close. On the other hand, that there is no significant difference between the continuance commitment of the academicians working for state and foundation universities may be attributed to the characteristics of Wasti's *communitarian culture*. Wasti (2000b) states that employees in Turkey may feel a sense of continuance commitment to their organizations because they do not like change, and points out that this opinion of his may be related to a cultural dimension as defined by Hofstede as *uncertainty avoidance index*. In societies with a high level of uncertainty avoidance, individuals do not take kindly to change, they prefer certainty in their lives, and they avoid taking risks. In view of the fact that Turkey has the 16<sup>th</sup> place out of 53 countries in terms of uncertainty avoidance in Hofstede's study, which means Turkish society relatively avoids from uncertainty, Wasti thinks the continuance commitment may be explained as such (Wasti, 2000b; 206).

The most influential variable on the level of affective commitment of the academicians working for the state universities has found out to be the quality of work life, followed by the perceived organizational protectiveness. Meyer & Allen (1990) have developed the affective commitment dimension departing from Mowday et al.'s (1982) organizational commitment principles: "a) "acceptance of the goals and values of an organization, a strong belief and a strict adherence to these goals and values, b) an enthusiasm to work voluntarily and willingly for the benefit of the organization, and c) a strong wish and desire to continue to be a committed member of that organization". This study has revealed that the quality of work-life is most effective on affective commitment, which is consistent with previous studies conducted on the relationship between the quality of work-life and organizational commitment (Lee et al. 2007; Homburg and Stock 2004; Efraty and Sirgy 1990; Sirgy et al. 2001; Fields and Thacker 1992; Koonmee and Virakul 2007; Lawler and Lei 2007; Roehling et al. 2001; Sirgy et al. 2008). On the other hand, perceived organizational protectiveness at state universities is also a factor increasing the affective commitment. Studies conducted by Meyer & Allen (1990; 1997) have found out that antecedents of affective commitment are personal characteristics (demographics such as age, gender, working time and education and personal trends such as need for success and autonomy), organizational structure and work behaviors / perception. The study has also added perceived organizational protectiveness and gender to the quality of work-life as variables, which have an impact on the academicians' affective commitment in foundation universities.

Just as in affective commitment, the two most influential variables on normative commitment of the academicians working for state universities are *the quality of work-life* and *perceived organizational protectiveness*. When it comes to foundation universities, the most influential variables on normative commitment of the academicians are, respectively, *the quality of work life*, *monthly salary*, and *perceived organizational protectiveness*. The only variable having a significant impact on continuance development, even if it is negative, in state universities is the quality of work life. Thus, continuance commitment decreases as the quality of work-life increases. When we think that the *shortage of alternatives* as put forward by Meyer and Allen as one of the conditions for occurrence of continuance commitment, it will not be wrong to say that as the academic titles of those academicians working for state universities in Turkey improve, job alternatives will increase accordingly. This negative relationship between the quality of work-life and continuance commitment, even though it is considered negative, employees tend to stay in the organization due to shortage of job alternatives and possible financial and other losses they are going to encounter when they resign; thus, that continuance commitment decreases as the quality of work-life increases is a

positive outcome for the organizations in terms of increasing affective and normative commitment.

Regarding foundation universities, it has been found out that the strongest positive relationship with continuance commitment is of *years in the organization*, and the continuance commitment increases as working years in the current organization increases. This finding is quite consistent with the literature (Mathieu & Zajac 1990; Meyer et al. 1993; Lok and Crawford 2001; Meyer et al. 2002; Simsek and Aslan 2007). Meyer et al. (1993) has pointed out a positive relationship between the total years in the organization with all commitment dimensions, and again revealed that continuance commitment has a positive relationship with the total number of years in the organization (Meyer et al. 2002). This means that total years spent in an organization, as well as efforts and investments made for that organization, make a person feel obliged to stay in that organization, meaning an increase in continuance commitment.

As hypothesized in this study, the quality of work-life has been the most influential factor on affective and normative commitment of the academicians working for both state and foundation universities. This finding is consistent with other studies that have revealed the relationship between quality of work-life and organizational commitment (Lee et al. 2007; Homburg and Stock 2004; Efraty and Sirgy 1990; Sirgy et al. 2001; Fields and Thacker 1992; Koonmee and Virakul 2007; Lawler and Lei 2007; Roehling et al. 2001; Sirgy et al. 2008). Quality of work-life being the most important antecedent of organizational commitment is meaningful only when the quality of work-life is conceptualized as response to satisfaction of employees' needs by the organization. This outcome of the study is consistent with the concept that the quality of work-life expands and has a positive impact on the organizational commitment of the employees as well, as theorized by Sirgy et al. (2001) on the basis of Maslow's hierarchy of needs and expansion theory. An employee with higher quality of work-life will unavoidably have a positive attitude toward his organization, which will result in organizational commitment behavior.

Another important outcome of this study has been that the participants' perception about organizational protectiveness influences affective and normative commitment. The relationship between perceived organizational protectiveness and affective / normative commitment can be explained within the framework of social exchange theory based on reciprocity. According to the social exchange theory, exchange does not necessarily require an economic reciprocity. The reciprocity may be in the form of attitude or behavior. According to the social exchange theory, a person that feels he is treated kind will give a positive response to this treatment reciprocally. Thus an employee, who feels that his organization is

protective, defensive and possessive to himself, will increase his affective commitment and behave in compliance with his organization's goals and interests. There is reciprocity here: the employee who feels commitment and loyalty to his organization because of the positive treatment will continue to stay in the organization. As can be seen from the outcomes, the second most important variable on affective and normative commitment of academicians for both types of universities is perceived organizational protectiveness.

There are several limitations of this study. First of all, the study covers a limited segment of the academicians working for state and foundation universities in Ankara. Therefore, in order for the findings of this study be generalized to all academicians working in state and foundation universities, similar studies should be conducted in different state and foundation universities in various cities. It is also recommended to conduct the study for different sectors, different cities and different areas of work to cover a larger sample so as to assess the findings in a more comprehensive manner.

Besides, it is also recommended to conduct future studies to see whether organizational commitment or professional or career commitment is important in terms of "academia" organization, which type of commitment is more preferred, which type of commitment is shown by the academicians, and the impact of quality of work-life on these types of commitment.

## References

- Allen, N.J. & Meyer, J.P. (1990). The Measurement and Antecedents of Affective, Continuance and Normative Commitment to the Organization. *Journal of Occupational & Organizational Psychology*, 63 (1), 18-38.
- Angle, H. L. & Perry, J. L. (1981). An Empirical Assessment of Organizational Commitment and Organizational Effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 26, 1-14.
- Anuradha, S. & Pandey, P.N. (1995). Organizational Commitment and QWL: Perception of Indian Managers. *Abbigyan*, Summer, 39-77.
- Aranya, N. & Jacobson, D. (1975). An Empirical Study of Theories of Organizational and Occupational Commitment. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 97, 15-22.
- Aven, F., Parker, B. & Glen M. Mc E. (1993). Gender and Attitudinal Commitment to Organizations: A Meta-Analysis, *Journal of Business Research*, 26 (1), 63-73.
- Becker H. (1960). Notes on the Concept of Commitment. *American Journal of Sociology*, 66:32-42.

- Behson, S.J. (2002). Which dominates? The Relative Importance of Work-Family Organizational Support and General Organizational Context on Employee Outcomes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 61, 53–71.
- Benkhoff, B. (1997). Disentangling organizational Commitment. *Personnel Review*, 26(1/2), 114-131.
- Boisvert, M. P. (1977). The Quality of Working Life: An Analysis. *Human Relations*, 30 (2), 155-160.
- Buchanan, B. II. (1974). Building organizational commitment: The socialization of managers in work organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 19 (4), 533-546.
- Chan, K. W. & Wyatt, T. A. (2007). Quality of Work Life: A Study of Employees in Shanghai, China. *Asia Pacific Business Review*, 13 (4), 501-517.
- Chisholm R. F. (1983). Quality Of Working Life: Critical Issue for the 80's. *Public Productivity Review*, 7 (1), 10-25.
- Cohen, A. (1993). Age and Tenure in Relation to Organizational Commitment: A Meta-Analysis. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 14 (2): 143–159.
- Davis, L. E., & Cherns, A. B. (1975) *The quality of working life: Problems, Prospects, and the State of the Art* (Vol. 1). New York: The Free Press.
- Efraty, D. & Sirgy, M. J. (1990). The Effects of Quality of Working Life (QWL) on Employee Behavioral Responses. *Social Indicators Research*, 22(1), 31-47.
- Efraty, D., Sirgy, M. J. & Claiborne C. B. (1991). The Effects of Personal Alienation on Organizational Identification: A Quality-of-Work-Life Model. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 6 (1), 57-78.
- Efraty, D., Sirgy, M. J. & Siegel P. (2000). The job/life satisfaction relationship among Professional accountants: psychological determinants and demographic differences. E. Diener and D. Rahtz. (Ed). *Advances in Quality of Life Theory and Research* (pp. 129-157). Klumer Academic Publishers, Social Indicators Research Series, Volume, 4.
- Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S. & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived Organizational Support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71 (3), 500-507.
- Eisenberger, R., Fasolo, P. & Lamastro V. D. (1990). Perceived Organizational Support and Employee Diligence, Commitment, and Innovation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75 (1), 51-59.
- Eisenberger, R. Cummings, J., Armeli, S. & Lynch P. D. (1997). Perceived Organizational Support, Discretionary Treatment and Job Satisfaction, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82 (5), 812-820.
- Eisenberger, R., Stephen A., Rexwinkel B., Lynch P. D. & Rhoades, L. (2001). Reciprocation of Perceived Organizational Support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 42–51.
- Feather, N.T., & Rauter, K.A. (2004). Organizational citizenship behaviors in relation to job status, job insecurity, organizational commitment and identification, job satisfaction and work values. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 77, 81-94.
- Fields, M. W. & Thacker J. (1992). Influence of Quality of Work Life on Company and Union Commitment. *Academy of Management Journal*, 35(2), 439-450.



- Goulet, L.R. & Frank, M. L. (2002). An Examination of Organizational Commitment across Three Sectors: Public, Non-profit, and For-profit. *Public Personnel Management*. 31(2), <http://sysu.schoolblog.cn/apple/UpFile/200606300915433340.pdf> Accessed 15 June 2009.
- Gündoğan, T. (2009). *Örgütsel Bağlılık: Türkiye Cumhuriyet Merkez Bankası Uygulaması*. Uzmanlık Yeterlilik Tezi, Türkiye Cumhuriyet Merkez Bankası: Ankara.
- Hannif Z., Burgess, J. & Connell J. (2008). Call Centres and the Quality of Work Life: Towards a Research Agenda. *Journal of Industrial Relations*, 50(2), 271–284.
- Havlovic, S. J. (1991). Quality of work life and human resource outcomes. *Industrial Relations*. 30 (3), 469-479.
- Huang, T.C., Lawler, J. & Lei C.Y. (2007). The Effects of Quality of Work Life on Commitment and Turnover Intention. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 2007, 35 (6), 735-750.
- Kahtz, D. & Kahn, R. L. (1977). *Örgütlerin Toplumsal Psikolojisi (The Social Psychology of Organizations)* (Çev. Halil Can & Yavuz Bayar), Ankara: Türkiye & Orta Doğu Amme İdaresi Enstitüsü Yayınları (Institute of Public Administration for Turkey and Middle East).
- Karahan, A. (2008). Çalışma Ortamındaki Statü Farklılıklarının Örgütsel Bağlılığa Etkisi (Effects of Statute Differences in Working Area on Organizational Commitment). *Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi (Journal of Social Science)*, X, 3:232-246.
- Koonmee, K. & Virakul, B. (2007). Ethics, Quality of Work life, and Employee job-related outcomes: A survey of HR and Marketing managers in Thai business. Presented at The 2007 ISQOLS Conference (From QOL Concepts to QOL Performance Measures), December 6-9, 2007, San Diego Marriott Mission Valley, San Diego, California.
- Kotze, M. (2005). The Nature and Development of the Construct Quality of Work Life. *Acta Academia*, 37(2), 96-122.
- Lee D.J., Singhapakdi A. & Sirgy, M. J. (2007). Further Validation of a Need-based Quality of Work Life (QWL) Measure: Evidence From Marketing Practitioners. *Applied Research Quality of Life*, 2, 273-287.
- Leong, C.S., Furnham, A. & Cooper, C.L. (1996). The Moderating Effect of Organizational Commitment on the Occupational Stress Outcome Relationship. *Human Relations*, 49 (10), 1345-1361.
- Lok, P., & Crawford, J. (2001). Antecedents of organizational Commitment and the mediating role of job satisfaction. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 16, 594–613.
- Martel, J. P. & Dupuis, G. (2006). Quality Of Work Life: Theoretical and Methodological Problems, And Presentation Of A New Model And Measuring Instrument. *Social Indicators Research*, 77, 333–368.
- Martin, R. (1995). The roles of organizational support and justice during a layoff. *Academy of Management Journal*, 89-93.
- 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. (1984). Testing the Side Bet Theory of Organizational Commitment: Some Methodological Considerations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 69, 372-378.

- Meyer, J. P. & Allen N. J. (1991). A Three-Component Conceptualization of Organizational Commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1(1), 61-89
- Meyer, J. P., Allen N. J. & Smith, C.A. (1993). Commitment to Organizations and Occupations: Extension and Test of a Three Component Conceptualization. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78 (4), 538-551.
- Meyer, J. P. and Allen N. J. (1997). *Commitment in the Workplace Theory, Research and Application*, Sage Publications.
- Meyer, J.P., Stanley, D. J., Herscovitch, L., & Topolnytsky, L. (2002). Affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization: A metaanalysis of antecedents, correlates, and consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 61, 20-52.
- Mottaz C. J. (1987). An Analysis Of The Relationship Between Work Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 28 (4), 541-558.
- Mowday, R. T., Steers, R. M. & Porter, L. W. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 14, 224-227.
- Mowday, R. T., Porter, L. W. & Steers, R. M. (1982). *Employee-Organization Linkages: The Psychology of Commitment, Absenteeism, and Turnover*, New York: Academic Press.
- Mirvis, P. H. & Lawler, E. E. (1984). Accounting For the Quality of Work Life. *Journal of Occupational Behavior*, 5, 197-212.
- Nadler, D. A. & Lawler, E. E. (1983). Quality of work life: Perspectives and directions. *Organizational Dynamics*, 11(3), 20-30.
- Obeng, K. & Ugboro, I., (2003). Organizational commitment among public transit employees: An Assessment Study. *Journal of The Transportation Research Forum*, 57(2), 83-98.
- O'Reilly, C. & Chatman, J. (1986). Organizational Commitment and Psychological Attachment: The Effects of Compliance, Identification and Internalization on Prosocial Behaviour. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(3), 492-499.
- Ortiz, D. C. (2010). *Organizational Commitment & Its Antecedents: Empirical Evidence From a Developing Country*. [http://www.swdsi.org/swdsi2010/SW2010\\_Preceedings/papers/PA157.pdf](http://www.swdsi.org/swdsi2010/SW2010_Preceedings/papers/PA157.pdf) Accessed 14 May 2010.
- Öngen, T. (1999). Toplumsal Sınıflar, Sınıf Mücadelesi & Kamu Çalışanları, <http://e-kutuphan.egitimsen.org.tr/pdf/1643.pdf> Accessed 14 May 2010.
- Özdevecioğlu, M. (2003). Algılanan Örgütsel Destek İle Örgütsel Bağlılık Arasındaki İlişkilerin Belirlenmesine Yönelik Bir Araştırma. *Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi İ.İ.B.F.Dergisi*, 18 (2) 113 -130.
- Porter, L.W., Steers, R.M., Mowday, R.T. & Boulian, P.V. (1974). Organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover among psychiatric technicians. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 59, 603-609.
- Rethinam G. S. & Maimunah I. (2008). Constructs of Quality of Work Life: A Perspective of Information and Technology Professionals. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 7(1), 58-70.

- Rhoades, L. & Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived Organizational Support: A Review of the Literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87 (4), 698–714.
- Roehling P.V., Roehling, M.V. & Moen P. (2001). The relationship between work-life policies and practices and employment loyalty: A life course perspective. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues*, 22, 141–170.
- Rose, R. C., Beh, L. Uli J. & Idris. K. (2006). Quality Of Work Life: Implications of Career Dimensions. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 2 (2), 61-67.
- Schermerhorn, J. R., Hunt, J. G. & R. N. Osborn. (1994). *Managing Organization Behavior*. New York: John Willey & Sons.
- Scobel, D. N. (1975). Doing away with the factory blues. *Harvard Business Review*, 53, Nov-Dec., 132-142.
- Shamir, B. & Salomon, I. (1985). Work at Home and Quality of Working Life. *The Academy of Management Review*, 10 (3), 455-464
- Shore, L. M. & Wayne S. J. (1993). Commitment and Employee Behavior: Comparison of Affective Commitment and Continuance Commitment With Perceived Organizational Support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78 (5), 774-780.
- Sıgır, Ü. (2007). İş Görenlerin Örgütsel Bağlılıklarının Meyer & Allen Tipolojisiyle Analizi: Kamu & Özel Sektörde Karşılaştırmalı Bir Araştırma (An Analysis of Organizational Commitment Using Meyer And Allen's Typology: A Comparative Study on Public and Private Sector Employees). *Anadolu Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi (Anadolu University Journal of Social Sciences)*, 7(2), 261-278.
- Sikorka-Simmons, E. (2005). Predictors of Organizational Commitment Among Staff in Assisted Living. *The Gerontologist*, 45(2), 196-205.
- Sirgy, M. J., Efraty, D., Siegel, P. & Lee, D. J. (2001). A New Measure of Quality of Work Life (QWL) Based on Need Satisfaction and Spillover Theories. *Social Indicators Research*, 55, 241-302.
- Sirgy, M. J., Reilly, N., Wu J. & Efraty, D. (2008). A Work-Life Identity Model of Well-Being: Towards a Research Agenda Linking Quality-of-Work-Life (QWL) Programs with Quality of Life (QOL). *Applied Research in Quality of Life*, 3(3), 181-202.
- Steers, R. M. (1977). Antecedents and Outcomes of Organizational Commitment. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 22 (1), 46-56.
- Suliman, A & Iles, P. (2000). Is continuance commitment beneficial to organizations? commitment-performance relationship: a new look, *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 15 (5), 407-426.
- Tasdemir Afsar, Selda. (2011). *Effect of Quality of Work Life on Organizational Commitment Level: The Quantitative Research on Academicians in State and Foundation Universities* (Unpublished PhD thesis). Hacettepe University, Ankara, Turkey
- Uyguç, N. & Çımrın, D. (2004) DEÜ Araştırma & Uygulama Hastanesi Merkez Laboratuvarı Çalışanlarının Örgüte Bağlılıklarını & İşten Ayrılma Niyetlerini Etkileyen Faktörler. *D.E.Ü.İ.B.F. Dergisi*, 19 (1), 91–99.
- Walton, R.E. (1975). Criteria for Quality of Working Life. L.E. Davis and A.B. Cherns (Ed.), *The Quality of Working Life* (pp.93-97), Free Press, New York.

- Wiener, Y. (1982). Commitment in Organizations: A Normative View. *Academy of Management Review*, 7(3), 418-428.
- Whyte, W. (1956). *The Organization Man*. NY: Garden City, Doubleday Anchor Books.
- Wurf J. (1982). Labor's View of Quality of Working Life Programs. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 1 (2), 131-137.
- Yalçın, A. & İplik, F. N. (2005). Beş Yıldızlı Otellerde Çalışanların Demografik Özellikleri İle Örgütsel Bağlılıkları Arasındaki İlişkiyi Belirlemeye Yönelik Bir Araştırma: Adana İli Örneği. *Çukurova Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 4 (1), 395-412.
- Yousef, D. A (1998). Satisfaction with job security as a predictor of organizational commitment and job performance in a multicultural environment. *International Journal of Manpower*. 19 (3), 184 -194.
- Yükseköğretim Kurulu. (2005) *Vakıf Yükseköğretim Kurumları Yönetmeliği*, YÖK: Ankara. <http://www.yok.gov.tr/content/view/490/183/lang,tr/> Accessed 6 July 2010.
- Yükseköğretim Kurulu. (2007a). *Türkiye'nin Yükseköğretim Stratejisi*. YÖK: Ankara. [http://www.yok.gov.tr/component/option,com\\_docman/task,doc\\_download/gid,78/Itemid,215/lang,t](http://www.yok.gov.tr/component/option,com_docman/task,doc_download/gid,78/Itemid,215/lang,t) Accessed 6 July 2010.
- Yükseköğretim Kurulu. (2007b). *Vakıf Üniversiteleri Raporu*. YÖK: Ankara. [http://www.univder.org/vakif\\_rap.pdf](http://www.univder.org/vakif_rap.pdf) Accessed 6 July 2010.
- Yüceler, A. (2009). Örgütsel Bağlılık & Örgüt İklimi İlişkisi: Teorik & Uygulamalı Bir Çalışma (The Relationship Between Organizational Commitment and Organizational Climate: A Theoretical and Practical Study). *Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi (Selcuk University Journal of Graduate School of Social Sciences )*, 22, 445-458.

**Acknowledgement** I would like to thank Mr. Murat Afşar for his useful critiques of this research work, professional guidance and constructive recommendations.