



Journal of Scientific Research & Reports
3(9): 1176-1189, 2014; Article no. JSRR.2014.9.005

SCIECEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org



An Empirical Study on Comparing the Organizational Commitment of Employees across Four Sector Organizations in China

Chunxiu Wang^{1*} and Meilin Meng^{1*}

¹School of Management, Yunnan University of Nationalities, Kunming, Yunnan, China.

Authors' contributions

This work was carried out in collaboration between all authors. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Original Research Article

Received 29th October 2013
Accepted 23rd March 2014
Published 28th March 2014

ABSTRACT

Aims: Organizational commitment (OC) is one of employees' attitudes toward their organizations. The study aims at comparing the organizational commitment level of employees across four sector organizations to explore whether OC is influenced by organizational characteristics (type) or not.

Study Design: A questionnaire survey-based ANOVA research design was used.

Place and Duration of Study: Four sector organizations in Kunming, capital of Yunnan province, China, between August, 2012 to September, 2013.

Methodology: In this research, we have used a three-dimensional scale of OC. Taking governmental institutions, public service agencies, state-owned enterprises and private enterprises in Kunming as the sample, data was collected from 453 employees distributed in 16 organizations across four different sectors. SPSS will be used to compare the means on organizational commitment across four sectors

Results: F values of AC, CC, NC, OC, are larger than $F_{0.01}(3,449)=4.61$. And all the corresponding probability values are 0.000 less than 0.01. Therefore, the hypothesis H_0 : the mean of each OC variable from four different sector organizations has no significant difference, has been rejected while the hypothesis H_1 : the mean of AC, CC, NC, OC in the four sector organizations has a significant difference, has been accepted.

Conclusion: There is a significant difference on OC level or three dimensions (AC, NC or CC) level across four sector organizations. And they vary with organizational

*Corresponding author: E-mail: chunxiuw@163.com;

characteristics. Both AC and CC of employees in governmental institution are found to be higher than those of the other three sectors of organizations while NC of state-owned enterprises' employees was found to be highest among these four organizations. Whatever organization it is, its continuance commitment was found to be the lowest among the three commitment dimensions. The total OC level of public service agencies is lowest and that of governmental institution is highest among these four sectors.

Keywords: Affective commitment; continuance commitment; normative commitment; organizational commitment; four sectors.

ABBREVIATIONS

OC: Organizational Commitment; AC: Affective Commitment; NC: Normative Commitment; CC: Continuance Commitment

1. INTRODUCTION

Organizational commitment, which OC will be used to stand for, also known as organizational loyalty or employee loyalty, is not only an important indicator to reflect the relationship between employees and their organization. It is also an important variable to predict employee participation, job involvement, job performance, absenteeism and turnover intention [1,2,3]. Therefore, to some extent, the OC level of staff can provide one company's competitive advantage. To this end, organizational commitment has been a topic which has increasingly concerned domestic and overseas scholars and practitioners.

Organizational commitment has a very significant value for employees, organizations and the whole society [2]. The higher the level of organizational commitment of employees, the more they are likely to accept the external (such as wages, benefits) and internal (such as the inner job satisfaction and good relationship between colleagues) returns, and the more they are willing to participate and be involved in their job, which also will lead to higher working happiness of employees. One company paying more attention to the commitment of the staff will be more capable to reduce or eliminate negative behaviors of members, such as lateness, absenteeism, or resignation. In addition, the higher the organizational commitment of employees, the more they would like to execute extra role behavior, such as creating, innovating and thereby enhancing the competitive advantage of the organization [4]. From a macro point of view, the whole social productivity can benefit from this [5].

With the rapid development of China's economy and society, life-style, work expectations, and values of employees, their attitudes and behavior towards the job have changed greatly, this is subtly influencing the relationship between employees and organizations. A recent investigation was about employee engagement in Chinese large and medium-sized enterprises [6]. The result shows that employee engagement in one of the enterprises is rapidly declining, and their turnover rate is up to 68%. Moderate rate is beneficial to society and organization. However, the phenomenon of the talents, who frequently give their boss the sack by resigning, surely will weaken companies' motives to invest in education and training. Some experts pointed out that the most powerful positive effect on the level of staff's organizational commitment and the extent of staff's dedication is not only attributed to personal and social factors, but to organizational factors.

Factors influencing the organizational commitment of staff will vary with the different organizational characteristics [7]. In the history of China's economic and social development, government agencies, public institutions, state-owned enterprises and private enterprises have different goals and missions, so they surely exhibit different organizational characteristics, such as different management mechanisms, organizational culture, compensation level, job stability, leadership style, role status and organizational structure. These organizational factors are becoming the key variables that are affecting the level of employees' organizational commitment. A comparative study on organizational commitment of employees in different organizational types from the United States [8] was done with (or through) observing the behavior of staff to compare the level of OC of employees. Therefore, in the critical period of China's economic and social transformation, the surveying and comparing organizational commitment level of staff from four different sector organizations not only have important practical significance for practitioners, but also provide scholars with referential basic data to do future research on organizational commitment.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW AND HYPOTHESES

2.1 Organizational Commitment

Becker [9], based on the behavior perspective of the side-bet theory, first proposed the concept of organizational commitment, which was defined as a coupling agent between employees and their actual behavior [9]. Becker thought commitment behavior of staff would happen only when they worked in an organization over a certain time. If leaving, the past *unilateral involvement* would be difficult to replace and compensate in a new organization, therefore they would have to remain in their present organization. The side-bet theory was subjected to criticism and refuted by some scholars [10,11], while some scholars affirmed and enriched it [12,13]. However, even they have turned to psychologically attitudinal perspective of organizational commitment.

Most scholars believe that *commitment* is a psychological contract between employees and organizations, which is also called attitudinal commitment [14]. So organizational commitment could be defined as the identification and involvement of individuals in specific organizations or strong agreement on the goals and values of their organization [2]. On the basis of the work of Becker [9] and other scholars [2,8,14], Meyer and Allen [18] first proposed the two-dimension model of organizational commitment[15]. One is affective commitment, which is the real affection of organizational members towards an organization. The other is continuance commitment, which is the reappearance of the side-bet theory of Becker. Later, Wiener [16] mentioned a sense of obligation of staff staying in one organization which was added by Allen and Meyer [18] as the third dimension of organizational commitment-normative commitment [16,17]. This means that employees will experience three levels (feelings) of psychological perceptions toward organizations. For example, some employees may have a strong sense of obligation or responsibility to remain in an organization, rather than be willing or eager to remain in the organization. Therefore, different OC levels in three dimensions will reflect the feelings or attitudes of the staff to one organization.

Meyer and Allen [18] held that comprehensive consideration about the three dimensions of commitment can help us fully understand the relationship between the employees and the organization. Other scholars found that there are different degrees of correlation between each dimension and commitment antecedents [16,19,20,21,22]. The level of each

commitment dimension is the result of personal experience of employees in different organizations, which will lead to the different corresponding work behavior and different job performance [18,23,24,25,26,27]. When perceptions and personal experience of the employees in one organization are consistent with their expectations and wishes, they will have stronger feeling of identification and dependence on their organization. After employees weigh the loss caused by leaving their present organization over the opportunity from a new job, they will determine the degree of their continuance commitment. Normative commitment relates to the employees' life background, working experience and social environment [28]. In addition, some foreign scholars [29,30] proposed a four-dimensional structure, and even domestic scholars, such as Ling Wenquan, Zhang Zhican Fang LiLuo [31] also proposed a five-dimensional structural model, but the three-dimensional structure of Allen and Meyer is still extensively accepted to study organizational commitment, namely affective commitment, continuous commitment and normative commitment.

2.2 Comparison between the Four Sector Organizations

The comparative study on the working attitude, working behavior, working value and job satisfaction across the four different sectors is lacking [32], but other comparative research on employees and companies is relatively abundant, including strategic management and practice [33], organizational goal and implementation path [34,35], performance measuring methods [36,37], marketing and competitive strategy, duty, behavior and performance of boards. There are three theoretical frameworks for comparing public organizations with private organizations [38], i.e. general framework, core framework, space framework. The general framework considers that public organizations and private organizations have no differences in organizational values and management functions [39,40]. The core framework recognizes that the public organizations and private organizations in the management functions are similar, but there is a fundamental difference between them [41]. Therefore, despite the core theory focuses on managers rather than line employees, but overall, it fully emphasizes the differences among individual employees. Space theory pays more attention to the organization's public and regards the organization as like a continuous fluid which is more open, more public [41].

In China, government agencies are set up in accordance with national regulations, vested with administrative powers, and take responsibility for political, economic, cultural and social management functions. Public institutions are built by governments with public welfare, providing citizens with education, health care and cultural entertainment services among others. State-owned enterprises are controlled or invested by central governments or local governments, which is a special kind of organization because governments' will and interests always interfere with its managers' decisions. Generally, state-owned enterprises have both the characteristics of profit-making entities and public institutions. As a profit-pursuing company, it takes responsibility for preservation and appreciation of state-owned assets and capitals. As one non-profit institution, it will help governments regulate and control economic development. Private enterprises are funded by individuals, which are responsible for independently building, opening, operating and developing by themselves without any fund from governments. From the above analysis, China's government agencies, public institutions, state-owned enterprises, and private enterprises were originally established with different conditions, purpose, functions, status, structure, goals and mission, where personal experience and perceptions of staff, and the relationship between staff and the organization will be different.

2.3 Research Hypothesis

Some scholars found that the OC level of staff in profit-making organization is lower than that of employees from government agencies. But Laurel R. Goulet and Margaret L. Frank [31] found that OC of staff in the profit organizations in the USA are the highest, followed by private organizations and social public organizations, while the OC of the civil servants in the government agencies is lowest. These two different results mentioned above were respectively about employees working in 1980s and 1990s. As we all know, the United States in the 1980s, slashed welfare, and began to adjust the industrial structure, so structural unemployment was very severe. Because of the depressed economy in the USA, profit –making organizations had to fire more workers. There was no job security, and its consequences were the OC of employees in profit-organizations were lower than that of other types of organizations. In the 1990s, the economy was high speed as similar to after World War II. The economic growth rate was even up to 4% while the unemployment rate decreased from 6% to 4%. As a result, the level of employees' organizational commitment also underwent a fundamental change.

Since the late 1990's, China experts have started to focus on organizational commitment. But the vast majority of research has been based on qualitative or descriptive analysis, which was limited to the business organization, and mainly focused on factors influencing the level of organizational commitment, the relationship between organizational commitment and working behavior, employee engagement, job performance, turnover intention, the formation mechanism of the organizational commitment and prediction of the level of organizational commitment. The relative literature on OC of the government departments, public institutions and state-owned enterprises, as well as private enterprises is rare. Studies on the OC of civil servant in government agencies were mainly focused on the relationship between performance and commitment, OC management mechanism and OC level investigation. Research on the public sector mainly focused on the OC level of college teachers, librarians, medical workers and nurses and the impacting factors on organizational commitment. The study on OC of employees in state-owned enterprises, mainly involved the characteristics of OC and its influence on turnover, the relationship between OC. Organizational justice, and psychological capital. Most research literature on the OC of employees in private enterprises was about what factors lowered employees' organizational commitment. Currently, only a few scholars are concerned about the difference between state-owned enterprises and private enterprises, and are limited to employees' values and job satisfaction. China experts have never taken four sector organizations together in their OC research, while other scholars have only compared the organizational commitment behaviors of employees from government departments, profit-making enterprises and non-government agencies, but not from a psychological view to compare the OC level across these four different sector organizations.

Based on reviewing and analyzing the relative literature, the following hypotheses can therefore be proposed:

- Hypothesis H₀: There is no difference on affective commitment, continuance commitment, normative commitment, and overall organizational commitment level between the above four sector organizations.
- Hypothesis H₁: There is significant difference on affective commitment, continuance commitment, normative commitment and overall organizational commitment level between the above four sector organizations.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Data Collection

In order to conveniently collect data, four sector organizations in Kunming, one city of South-western part of China and capital of Yunnan province, will be taken as this research population. Firstly using cluster sampling method, i.e. from each sector, four organizations are selected and 16 organizations or agencies (the number of its employees must be more than 50) will be drawn randomly. Then combining stratified sampling with the quota sampling method, 32 persons will be randomly selected as the examinee of the survey. The researcher personally sent out questionnaires and requested them to finish it. Between August, 2012 to October, 2012, 512 copies of the questionnaires were handed out, of which 486 questionnaires were returned, giving a recovery rate of 95%. After removing incomplete Questionnaires, 453 questionnaires were valid, giving an effective recovery rate of 88.4%.

3.2 Measurement of Variables

This study adopted a three-dimensional scale of organizational commitment [17], to measure or evaluate the OC level of employees in one organization due to their identification or devotion, living needs or obligation. The number of measurement items of the revised scale for each dimension decreased from 8 to 6. The alpha coefficients of the affective commitment, the normative commitment and the continuing commitment were respectively 0.770, 0.650, 0.690, with high reliability. Use a 7 points Likert Scale, 1 represented complete disagreements and 7 represented complete agreements.

Based on the Chinese verbal environment and cultural background, items in the three-dimensional scale must be localized and confirmatory factor analysis must be used to test the constructive validity of the scale. Because $KMO=0.860>0.6$, with a significance probability $P<0.05$ and refuses the null hypothesis of Bartlett sphericity, so the questionnaires have good constructive validity.

Because the initial scale used here was the recognized three-dimension scale, items which cannot be aggregated into a factor will be deleted via analyzing the factor in the different dimensions. In the process, the items whose common degrees and load value respectively are at 0.4 or below, those at 0.3 or below will be removed or they are difficult to be distinguished. The process repeats again and again until the items can be aggregated into a factor. After this process, the items, AC1, AC2, AC3, AC4, AC5 and AC6 can be used to explain the affective commitment variable, while the items, NC2, NC3, NC4, NC5, and NC6 can explain the normative commitment and continuance commitment will be explained by the items, CC1, CC2, CC5, and CC6. Totally, 15 items in the questionnaire has been list in the appendix 1.

3.3 Data Analysis

3.3.1 The reliability and validity analysis of the measurement

In order to ensure the high validity of the hypothesis testing, the first step is to measure the reliability and validity of the variables, i.e. to test the reliability and validity of the above remaining 15 items in questionnaire scales. Because the Cronbach's Alphas of each item or variable are higher than 0.70, the measurement of the variables have higher reliability.

Validity of the scale includes the content validity and constructive validity. The measurement scale used here is accepted by scholars, so, to some extent, its content validity can be ensured. In previous confirmatory factor analysis, the three factors of organizational commitment can explain the total variance up to 60.314%. This means the structural validity of the organizational commitment scale is very high. As a whole, the variable measurement of this study has better reliability and validity.

3.3.2 Results of SPSS

This study adopted the single-factor analysis of variance of SPSS. Firstly, it was necessary to determine whether affective commitment, continuous commitment, normative commitment and organizational commitment satisfy the normal distribution or not and whether their variance has homogeneity. Then test whether independent variable, organizational type would influence dependent variables, AC, CC, NC, and OC or not, and figure out what extent it would influence the four dependent variables. That is to say, it was necessary to test whether the difference of the four means has statistical significance or not. On this basis, the researcher then explored whether there was significant difference between organizational types on each of the dependent variables and compared the mean of each dependent variable one by one, i.e. multiple comparisons.

Testing normal distribution of each dependent variable, it shows the median of AC, CC, NC, OC, is nearly equal to the mean and the mode of them, standard deviation is significant, and the coefficients of kurtosis and Skewness is close to 0. Therefore these dependent variables are close to normal distribution.

Leven test statistic values of AC, CC, NC, OC are respectively 11.022, 9.414, 8.690, 11.214, and all the significant probability is greater than 0.050 the variance of each group in the level of $\alpha = 0.05$ have no significant difference, i.e. the variance has homogeneity. This result satisfies the prerequisite of multiple comparisons following.

Results of ANOVA indicate F (the ratio of mean square between groups and within groups) values of AC, CC, NC, OC, are larger than $F_{0.01}(3,449)=4.61$. All the corresponding probability values are 0.000 less than 0.01. Therefore, the results reject the hypothesis H_0 : the mean of each OC variable from four different sector organizations has no significant difference, while it accepts H_1 : the mean of AC, CC, NC, OC in the four sector organizations has a significant difference, and it has statistical significance.

When comparing affective commitment, the significant probabilities of LSD multiple comparison between government departments and private enterprises, state-owned enterprises, or public institutions are less than a significant level. Therefore, AC of employees between government departments and the other three sector organizations has significant differences. While the significance probability between private enterprises, state-owned enterprises and public institutions, are greater than the significance level, the AC of employees between them has no significant differences. Comparing the mean of the AC of the four sector organization, that of government departments is highest, up to 5.7057, following by 5.2492 of state-owned enterprises, 5.1072 of private enterprises and 5.1178 of public institutions, but the difference between the other three sector organizations is not very significant (see Table 1).

Similarly, comparing normative commitment, we found that there is no significant difference between the state-owned enterprises and government departments as well as between

private enterprises and government departments. Normative commitment of the state-owned enterprises is highest among them, reaching up to 5.5927, and private enterprises and government departments is close, respectively up to 5.2939 and 5.3532, while the public institutions is lowest, only 4.6414 (see Table 1).

Table 1. Results of SPSS

Dependent Variables	Mean	Independent Variables(I)	Independent Variables (J)	Sig. (I-J)
Private enterprises				
AC	5.1072	Private enterprise	State-owned enterprise	.305
			Public Institution	.938
			Government departments	.000
NC	5.2939	Private enterprise	State-owned enterprise	.030
			Public Institution	.000
			Government departments	.665
CC	4.9283	Private enterprise	State-owned enterprise	.001
			Public Institution	.104
			Government departments	.009
OC	15.3294	Private enterprise	State-owned enterprise	.015
			Public Institution	.022
			Government departments	.007
State-owned enterprises				
AC	5.2492	State-owned enterprise	Private enterprise	.305
			Public Institution	.341
			Government departments	.001
NC	5.5927	State-owned enterprise	Private enterprise	.030
			Public Institution	.000
			Government departments	.084
CC	5.4136	State-owned enterprise	Private enterprise	.001
			Public Institution	.000
			Government departments	.412
OC	16.2609	State-owned enterprise	Private enterprise	.015
			Public Institution	.000
			Government departments	.805
Public Institutions				
AC	5.1178	Public Institution	Private enterprise	.938
			State-owned enterprise	.341
			Government departments	.000
NC	4.6414	Public Institution	Private enterprise	.000
			State-owned enterprise	.000
			Government departments	.000
CC	4.7026	Public Institution	Private enterprise	.104
			State-owned enterprise	.000
			Government departments	.000
OC	14.4618	Public Institution	Private enterprise	.022
			State-owned enterprise	.000
			Government departments	.000

Table 1. Continued....

Government departments			
AC	5.7057	Government departments	Private enterprise .000 State-owned enterprise .001 Public Institution .000
NC	5.3532	Government departments	Private enterprise .665 State-owned enterprise .084 Public Institution .000
CC	5.2973	Government departments	Private enterprise .009 State-owned enterprise .412 Public Institution .000
OC	16.3562	Government departments	Private enterprise .007 State-owned enterprise .805 Public Institution .000

The mean difference is significant at the .05 level

Regarding continuance commitment, there exists significant difference between private enterprises and state-owned enterprises, also between private enterprises and government departments, between public institutions and state-owned enterprises or government departments. But the difference between private enterprises and public institutions is not significant. The continuance commitment levels of public institutions and private enterprises are 4.7026 and 4.9283 and government departments are 5.2973 and State-owned enterprises are up to 5.4136 (see Table 1).

Surprisingly, there is significant difference in the OC level between government agencies and private enterprises or public institutions. This is similar to the findings of state-owned enterprises. However, there is no significant difference between the state-owned enterprises and government departments as well as between private enterprises and public institutions. The organizational commitment level in state-owned enterprises and government departments is respectively up to 16.2609 and 16.3562, while that of private enterprises and public institutions is 15.3294 and 14.4618, relatively close in each group (see Table 1).

4. CONCLUSION

The AC of civil servants from the government organization is far higher than private enterprises, state-owned enterprises and public institutions, but there is no significant difference between the other three sectors. So more and more workers are willing to work in government departments, rather than work in the state-owned enterprises, public institutions, or private enterprises. For example, in 2009, approximately one million university graduates took part in the entry exam of enrolling national civil servants. Partly because of Chinese history and traditional culture, civil servants have a higher social status, so it is easy to get the recognition and respect from other people. Another reason is that government departments can provide workers with higher benefits and more job security (it is not easy to be fired). The third one is that, with its staff screening, selecting, employing and promoting systems improved, an employees' career development path is becoming clearer and it strengthens their faith and dependence on it. The last one is that it can help its employees take advantage of its public platform and unique public resources to achieve their ideals, such as a greater contribution to society and allowing them to realize their values of life. Therefore, staff working in the government departments have a stronger sense of security, belonging, pride, and accomplishment.

From the level of normative commitment, there are significant differences between public institutions and private enterprises, state-owned enterprises, or government departments. NC of the employees in public institutions is lowest, following by private enterprises, while that of government departments and state-owned enterprises is relatively high. This situation is similar to reality, which attributes to its defective internal administrative mechanism, centralized power, inefficiency and an overstaffed organization. Because private enterprises are always operating with poor resources and fewer staff at the management level, it is difficult to keep employees working for long time or doing some extra tasks. Instead, when the employees enter into the government departments or state-owned enterprises, with better working environment, this will influence employees' working values and professional and ethical behavior by such pre-job training as socialization process to improve employees' loyalty and responsibility towards the organization. This result is consistent with that of Lee's (2006) study on organizational socialization's impact on the normative commitment of staff, i.e. having the positive impact on NC.

Among the four sector organizations, continuance commitment of the employees in state-owned enterprises and government departments are higher than that of employees from private enterprises and public institutions. The following two causes from my own observations in private enterprises can lead to low continuance commitment. One is the pure economic and transacting relations between the owners and its employees, where its staff's involvement depends on how much the owners pay them. Therefore, when other external organizations can offer higher returns, better working conditions, and working atmosphere, this will make them a more attractive proposition to work. Secondly, private enterprises do not pay attention to the measures of humanization management. For example, they tend to ignore the needs and career development of their employees, placing too much emphasis on the interests of the enterprise. Undoubtedly, in private enterprise, the economically rational employees will not invest any effort into the company, and they can easily be compensated when they go to other organizations to get better conditions. The lower continuance commitment of the staff in public institution is mainly because most employees have a higher education degree, stronger self-determination desire and self-learning ability, and more employment opportunities, and they can quickly adapt to one new organization. Employees from government agencies and state-owned enterprises have a higher continuous commitment. With the current severe employment situation, the majority of employees are having difficulty finding a safer job, and even if they can find a new job, they will have to spend more time and effort to make up the losses, such as past harmonious working relationships, the recognition of working ways and job performance. The continuance commitment of the four sector organizations is lower than the other two dimensions. Partly because more than 50% of the examinees are generation Y, they will not be attracted only by organizational benefits or economic returns, but may be more attracted by their own future career developing prospects. Another cause is that more than 50% of examinees have worked for less than 5 years and their low input in the original organization can be easily compensated in one new company.

Between the four sector organizations, the overall organization commitment (three dimensions sum) between government departments and state-owned enterprise have no significant difference, but that of employees in government agencies is highest. This is consistent with Drucker (1990)'s conclusion. Because recently China's economy and society is transforming, and simultaneously experiencing the problems caused by the global financial crisis, people are more willing to select stability, high security and high welfare positions. However, it was interesting to note that our surprise, the overall OC of employees in the public institution is lowest, which does not accord with its so-called *most dependent*

organization. One cause is China's high-speed economy and its social development over the past 10 years, which has been leading to a higher demand for talent staff. These staff are now becoming scarce human resource. Another one is because knowledge workers in the public institutions have higher and unique needs or expectations, and they have more job opportunities in the labor market. The last one is due to a relatively low level of management in public institutions.

In this study, a sample of staff was selected only from organizations in Kunming, Yunnan Province, which is an economically underdeveloped city, where the number of employees must be more than 50. Therefore, the applicability of the research conclusions in other provinces or regions need to be further verified through future study.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work was financially supported by China's National Natural Science Foundation (71162022).

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

1. Mathieu JE, Zajac DM. Review and meta-analysis of the antecedents, correlates, and consequences of organizational commitment. *Psychological Bulletin*. 1990;108:171-194.
2. Mowday RT, Porter LW, Steers RM. *Employee-organization linkages: The psychology of commitment, absenteeism and turnover*. New York: Academic Press; 1982.
3. Wright TA, Bonett DG. The contribution of burnout to work performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. 1997;18:491-499.
4. Katz D, Kahn RL. *The social psychology of organizations*. 2nd edition. New York: John Wiley & Sons; 1978.
5. Xiuli, Gong, Shenguang Wang. New orientation of research on employees' job attitude: Organizational commitment. *Social Psychology Chinese*. 1997;3(2):9-14.
6. Yin Liu. The 2011 annual China employee engagement survey report. *Chinese Human Resources Forum*. 2012;3:4. Accessed 24 April 2012. Chinese. Available: <http://money.163.com/12/0425/11/7VUDFFMH00253G87.html>
7. Cohem A, Gattiker EU. An empirical assessment of organizational commitment using the side-bet theory approach. *Industrial Relations*. 1992;47:439-461.
8. Laurel R, Goulet, Margaret L, Frank. Organizational commitment across three sectors: public, non-profit and for-profit. *Public Personnel Management*, 2002;45(2):154-169.
9. Becker HS. Notes on the concept of commitment. *American Journal of Sociology*. 1960;66:32-42.
10. Ritzer G, Trice HM. An empirical study of Howard Becker's Side bet theory. *Sociological Forces*. 1969;47(4):475-479.
11. Aranya N, Jacobson D. An empirical study of theories of organizational and occupational commitment. *Journal of Social Psychology*. 1975;97:15-22.
12. Angle HL, Perry JL. Organizational commitment: Individual and organizational influence. *Work and Occupation*. 1983;10(2):123-146.

13. Alluto J, Hrebiniak, Alonso R. On operationalizing the concept of commitment. *Social Forces*.1973;51(4):448-454.
14. Porter LW, Steers RM, Mowday RT, Boulian P. Organizational commitment, job satisfaction and turnover among psychiatric technicians. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 1974;59:603-609.
15. Meyer JP, Allen NJ. Testing the side-bet theory of organizational commitment: Some methodological considerations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 1984;69:372-378.
16. Wiener Y. Commitment in organizations: A normative view. *Academy of Management Review*. 1982;7:418-428.
17. Allen NJ, Meyer JP. Organizational commitment: Evidence of career stage effect. *Journal of Business Research*. 1993;26:49-61.
18. Meyer JP, Allen NJ. *Commitment in the workplace: Theory, research and application*. CA: Sage Publications, Inc; 1997.
19. Lok P, Crawford J. The effect of organizational culture and leadership style on job satisfaction and organizational commitment: A cross cultural comparison. *The Journal of Management Development*. 2004;23(4):320-338.
20. Meyer JP, Stanley DJ, Herscovitch L, Topolnytsky L. Affective, continue and normative commitment to the organization: A meta-analysis of antecedents, correlates and consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*. 2002;6:20-52.
21. Park SM, Rainey HG. Antecedents, mediators and consequences of affective, normative and continuance commitment: Empirical tests of commitment effects of Federal agencies. *Review of Public Personnel administration*. 2007;27(3):197-226.
22. Shore LM, Tetrick LE. A constructive validity study of the survey of perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 1991;76:637-643.
23. Hackett RD, Bycio P, Hausdorf PA. Further assessments of Meyer and Allen's (1991) three-component model of organizational commitment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 1994;79:15-23
24. Randall DM. The consequence of organizational commitment: Methodological Investigation. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*. 1990;11:361-378.
25. Shore LM, Barksdale K. Examining degree of balance and level of obligation in the employment relationship: A social exchange approach. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*. 1998;19:731-744.
26. Wasti SA. Organizational commitment, turnover intentions and the influence of cultural values. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*. 2003;76:303-321.
27. Wasti A, Can O. Affective and normative commitment to organization, supervisor and coworkers: Do collective values matter? *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*. 2008;73:404-413.
28. Kanwaldeep K, Sandhu HS. Career stage on organizational commitment: Empirical evidence from Indian Banking Industry. *International Journal of Business and Management*. 2010;12(5):141-152.
29. Gary Blau, Kimberly Merriman, Donna Surges Tatum, Sally V Rudmann. Antecedents and consequences of basic versus career enrichment benefit satisfaction. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. 2001;22:669-681
30. David Biggs, Stephen Swailes. Relations, commitment and satisfaction in agency workers and permanent workers. *Employee Relations*. 2006;28:130-144.
31. Wenquan Ling, Zhiye Zhang, Liluo Fang. Study on structural model of Chinese employees' organizational commitment. *Journal of Management Science Chinese*. 2000;2:76-82.
32. Herman RD. *The jossey-bass handbook of nonprofit Leadership and management*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass; 1994.

33. Nutt PC, Backoff RW. Transforming public organizations with strategic management and strategic leadership. *Journal of Management*. 1993;19(2):299-347.
34. Sukel MW. Third Sector Organizations: A Needed look at the artistic-cultural organization. *Academy of Management Review*. 1978;3:348-354.
35. Kanter RM, Summers DV. Doing well while doing good: Dilemmas of performance measurement in nonprofit organizations and the need for a multiple-constituency approach. W.W. Powell Edition. New Haven: Yale University Press; 1987.
36. Unterman I, Davis R, (Eds.). *Strategic management for not-for-profit organizations*. New York: Praeger; 1984.
37. Rangan VK, Karim S, Sandberg SK. Doing better at doing good. *Harvard Business Review*. 1996;5:432-445.
38. Liou KT, Nyhan RC. Dimensions of organizational commitment in the public sector: An empirical assessment. *Public Administration Quarterly*. 1994;18: 99-118.
39. Lau A, Newman A, Broedline L. The Nature of managerial work in the public sector. *Public Administration Review*. 1980;40:513-520.
40. Murray M. Comparing public and private management: An exploratory essay. *Public Administration Review*. 1975;35:364-372.
41. Scott PG, Falcone S. Comparing public and private Organizations: An Exploratory analysis of three frameworks. *American Review of Public Administration*. 1998;28:126-1451.

APPENDIX-1

Employees responses are obtained on a 7-point Likert type scale where 1= strongly disagree and 7= strongly agree. Items denoted with (R) are reversed scored.

Affective Commitment Items:

- AC1: I would be very happy to spend the rest of my carrer with this organization.
- AC2: I enjoy discussing my organization with people outside of it.
- AC3: I really feel as if this organization's problems are my own.
- AC4: I think that I could easily become as attached to another organization as I am to this one.
- AC5: I do not feel like "part of the family" at my organization (R).
- AC6: I do not feel "emotionally attached" to this organization (R).

Normative Commitment Items:

- NC2: Even if it were to my advantage, I do not feel it would be right to leave my organization now.
- NC3: I would feel guilty if I left my organization now.
- NC4: This organization deserves my loyalty.
- NC5: I would not leave my organization right now because I have a sense of obligation to the people in it.
- NC6: I owe a great deal to this organization.

Continuance commitment items:

- CC1: I am not afraid of what might happen if I quit my job without haing anoher one lined up (R).
- CC2: It would be very hard for me to leave my organization right now even if I wanted to.
- CC5: Right now staying with my organization is a matter of necessity as much as desire.
- CC6: I feel that I have too few options to consider

© 2014 Wang and Meng; This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Peer-review history:

The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:
<http://www.sciencedomain.org/review-history.php?iid=471&id=22&aid=4145>