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The construct of self-efficacy has received increasing attention in the applied psychological literature (Gist & Mitchell, 1992). Albert Bandura (1986, 1994) who pioneered the research viewed self-efficacy as “people’s judgments of their capabilities to organize and execute course of action required to attain designated types of performances. It is concerned not with the skills one has but with the judgments of what one can do with whatever skills one possesses.” Self-efficacy is also a measure of an employee’s confidence in his or her abilities to marshal personal resources and deploy an appropriate response strategy to address job situations (Schaubroeck & Merritt, 1997). Thus, individuals with higher levels of self-efficacy are less likely to experience work overload when faced with higher job demands. Self-efficacy perceptions, in concert with self-regulatory behaviors, influence the goals people set, strategies people choose, effort people expend, and perseverance people display (Bandura, 1991). Thus, successful performance requires that a person possesses both the appropriate skills and abilities and strong feelings of efficacy.

It is a point of common observation that strong sense of efficacy enhances human accomplishment and personal well-being in many ways. People with high assurance in their capabilities approach difficult tasks as challenges to be mastered rather than as threats to be avoided. Such an efficacious outlook fosters intrinsic interest and deep engrossment in activities. They set for themselves challenging goals and maintain strong commitment to them. They heighten and sustain their efforts in the face of failure. They quickly recover their sense of efficacy.
after failure or setbacks. They attribute failure to insufficient efforts or deficient knowledge and skills which are acquirable. They approach threatening situations with assurance that they can exercise control over them. Such an efficacious outlook produces personal accomplishments, reduces stress and lowers vulnerability to depression (Bandura, 1994). Confidence in their abilities makes these employees believe they can control job situations and handle them well, which ultimately results in increased confidence, reduced vulnerability perceptions, and ultimately lower perceived stress (Schaubroeck, Xie, & Lam, 2000).

Although, a strong sense of efficacy in socially valued pursuits is conducive to human attainment and well being, yet it is an unmixed blessing. The impact of personal efficacy on the nature and quality of life depends, of course, on the purposes to which it is put. To be instanced, the lives of innovators and social reformers driven by unshakable efficacy are not easy ones. They are often the objects of derision, condemnation, and persecution, even though societies eventually benefit from their persevering efforts. As Bandura (1994) asserted many people who gain recognition and fame shape their lives by overcoming seemingly insurmountable obstacles only to be catapulted to new social realities over which they have lesser control. Indeed, the annals of the famed and the infamous are strewn with individuals who were both architects and victims of their destinies.

The construct of self-efficacy flows from social cognitive theory fathered by Albert Bandura which has been hailed as the theory heard ‘round the world’. Social cognitive theory is based on model of triadic reciprocal causation, emphasizes the interplay
between behavior, environmental influences, and personal subjective factors including cognition to explain human psycho-social functioning (Wood & Bandura, 1989). The role of cognition—that aspect of our mental life involving conscious thought processes (including such key elements as reasoning, problem-solving, decision-making and evaluative judgments)—is given special emphasis within this conceptual framework. In a description of social cognitive theory, Bandura (1991) argues for the existence of central cognitive self-regulation processes which mediate experience and behavior. Bandura suggests that much of human behavior is regulated by forethought, allowing people to behave in a proactive fashion and engaged in goal setting, thus channeling motivation. He considers this capacity of self-directed capabilities which are in a state of constant interplay with environmental influences. It is from such self-reflective and self-reactive capabilities that self-efficacy beliefs are thought to emerge.

Self-efficacy beliefs are considered to be the outcome of a process of weighing, integrating, and evaluating information about one’s capabilities, and which, in turn, regulate the choices people make and the amount of effort they apply to a given task (Gist, 1987). Self-efficacy judgments vary over time on the basis of new information and experience (Gist & Mitchell, 1992). Thus, self-efficacy is a dynamic concept. Self-efficacy beliefs are also associated primarily with specific task conditions, even though, there is considered to be a degree of generalization of self-efficacy beliefs across related task situations and of a person’s general sense of efficacious. A survey by Gist (1987) led him to the identification of three dimensions of self-efficacy, these are: Magnitude, Strength, and Generality. Magnitude refers to the level
of task difficulty a person believes he or she can attain; strength refers to the degree of conviction that a given level of task performance is attainable; and generality refers to the extent to which a given self-efficacy judgment applies across different situations. Magnitude and strength of self-efficacy judgments are the basis of most measurements of self-efficacy.

The development of people's beliefs concerning their efficacy is attributed to four sources of influence by merit (Bandura, 1988). The most effective way of creating a strong sense of efficacy is through mastery experiences. They provide the most authentic evidence of whether one can muster whatever it takes to succeed (Bandura, 1982; Biran & Wilson, 1981; Gist, 1989). Successes build a robust belief in one's personal efficacy. Failures undermine it, especially if failures occur before a sense of efficacy is firmly established. Developing a sense of efficacy through mastery experiences is not a matter of adopting ready-made habits. Rather, it involves acquiring the cognitive, behavioral, and self-regulatory tools for creating and executing appropriate course of action to manage ever-changing life circumstances. If people experience only easy successes they come to expect quick results and are easily discouraged by failure. A resilient sense of efficacy requires experience in overcoming obstacles through perseverant effort. Some difficulties and setbacks in human pursuits serve a useful purpose, in that, success usually requires sustained efforts. After people become convinced that they have what it takes to succeed, they persevere in the face of adversity and quickly rebound from setbacks. By sticking it out through tough times, they emerge stronger from adversity.
The second influential way of creating and strengthening efficacy beliefs is through the vicarious experiences provided by social models. Seeing people similar to themselves succeed by sustained efforts raises observers beliefs that they, too, possess the capabilities to master comparable activities to succeed (Bandura, 1986; Schunk, 1987). By the same token, observing others fail despite high effort lowers observer’s judgments of their own efficacy and undermines their level of motivation (Brown, Jones & Leigh, 2005). The impact of modeling on perceived self-efficacy is strongly influenced by perceived similarities to the models. The greater the assumed similarity, the more persuasive are the models’ successes and failures. If people see the models as very different from themselves, their beliefs of personal efficacy are not much influenced by the models’ behavior and the result it produces. Modeling influences do more than provide a social standard against which to judge one’s own capabilities. People seek proficient models which possess the competencies to which they aspire. Through their behavior and expressed ways of thinking, competent models transmit knowledge and teach observers effective skills and strategies for managing environmental demands. Acquisition of better means raises perceived self-efficacy.

Social persuasion is a third way of strengthening people’s beliefs that they have what it takes to succeed. People who are persuaded verbally that they possess the capabilities to master given activities are likely to mobilize greater effort and sustain it than if they harbor self-doubts and dwell on personal deficiencies when problems arise (Litt, 1988; Schunk, 1989). To the extent that persuasive boosts in perceived self-efficacy lead people to try hard enough to succeed, they promote development of skills and
a sense of personal efficacy. It is more difficult to instill high beliefs of personal efficacy by social persuasion alone than to undermine them. Unrealistic boosts in efficacy are quickly disconfirmed by disappointing results of one’s efforts. But people who have been persuaded that they lack capabilities tend to avoid challenging activities that cultivate potentialities and give up quickly in the face of difficulties. By constricting activities and undermining motivation, disbelief in one’s capabilities creates its own behavioral validation. Successful efficacy builders do more than convey positive appraisals. In addition to raising people’s beliefs in their capabilities, they structure situations for them in ways that bring success and avoid placing people in situations prematurely where they are likely to fail often. They encourage individuals to measure success in terms of self-improvement rather than by triumphs over others.

People also rely partly on their physiological and emotional states in judging their capabilities. They interpret their stress reactions and tension as signs of vulnerability to poor performance. In activities involving strength and stamina, people judge their fatigue, aches and pains as signs of physical inability (Ewart, 1992). Mood also affects people’s judgments of their personal efficacy. Positive mood enhances perceived self-efficacy; despondent mood diminishes it (Kavanagh & Bower, 1985). The fourth way of modifying self-beliefs of efficacy is to reduce people’s stress reactions and alter their negative emotional proclivities, and correct misinterpretations of their physical states. It is not the sheer intensity of emotional and physical reactions that is important but rather how they are perceived and interpreted. People who have a high sense of efficacy are likely to view their state of affective arousal as an energizing facilitator of
performance, whereas those who are beset by self-doubts regard their arousal as a debilitation. Physiological indicators of efficacy play an especially influential role in health functioning and in athletic and other physical activities.

Each of these four major sources of self-efficacy beliefs has particular significance when considering applications in organizational work environments. Mastery experiences refer to the strengthening of self-efficacy beliefs as a result of task accomplishment. This source is associated with the influence of behavior on self-efficacy beliefs. It is suggested that a resilient sense of efficacy is developed when a person is able to overcome challenging situation.

Vicarious experience or modeling is primarily associated with environmental influences. In organizations, the desire to imitate superior performers or supervisors may be strong in some individuals. Certainly, the taking of roles and the imitation of models’ behaviour illustrate the subtle influences of social learning (Vecchio & Appelbaum, 1995). The impact in organizational settings of this source of self-efficacy has implications both in everyday uncontrolled situations where one person observes another doing the same task as part of normal flow of work, and with respect to training activities where modeling can be applied systematically as a learning methodology.

The objective of social or verbal persuasion (an environmental influence) is to convey to the persons faced with the task of utilizing their ability to succeed is, not to create unrealistically high expectations which may well affect the
persons negatively if they fail at their task. Social or verbal persuasion is used on a widespread, adhoc basis as a normal form of encouragement; however, the strategic use of this technique within a skill development setting can result in greater task-directed effort which is particularly useful in the early stages of skill development.

Earlier researches suggest that effects of self-efficacy beliefs on cognitive processes take a variety of forms e.g., Locke and Latham (1990) viewed that much human behaviour, being purposive, is regulated by forethought embodying valued goals. Personal goal setting is influenced by self-appraisal of capabilities. The stronger the perceived self-efficacy, the higher the goal challenges people set for themselves and firmer is their commitment to them. Many courses of action are initially organized in thought. People’s beliefs in their efficacy, shape the types of anticipatory scenarios they construct and rehearse. Those who have a high sense of efficacy, visualize success scenarios that provide positive guides and supports for performance. Those who doubt their efficacy visualize failure scenarios and dwell on the many things that can go wrong. It is difficult to achieve much while fighting self-doubt. A major function of thought is to enable people to predict events and to develop ways to control those that affect their lives. Such problem-solving skills require effective cognitive processing of information that contains many complexities ambiguities and uncertainties. It requires a strong sense of efficacy to remain task-oriented in the face of pressing situational demands, failures and setbacks that have significant repercussions. Indeed, when people are faced with the tasks of managing difficult environmental demands under taxing circumstances, those who
are beset by self-doubts about their efficacy become more and more erratic in their analytic thinking, lower their aspirations and the quality of their performance deteriorates. In contrast, those who maintain a resilient sense of efficacy set themselves challenging goals and use good analytic thinking which pays off in performance accomplishments (Wood & Bandura, 1989).

Self-beliefs of efficacy play a key role in the self-regulation of motivation. Most human motivation is cognitively generated. People motivate themselves and guide their actions anticipative by the exercise of fore thought. They form beliefs about what they can do. They anticipate likely out-comes of prospective actions. They set goals for themselves and plan course of action designed to realize valued futures. There are three different forms of cognitive motivators around which different theories have been built. They include causal attributions, outcome expectancies, and cognized goals. The corresponding theories are: attribution theory, expectancy value theory, and goal theory, respectively. Self-efficacy beliefs operate in each of these types of cognitive motivation.

There are clear indications that self-efficacy beliefs influence causal attributions (Grove, 1993; McAuley, 1991). People who regard themselves as highly efficacious attribute their failures to insufficient effort, whereas those who regard themselves as inefficacious attribute their failures to low ability. Causal attributions affect motivation, performance and affective reactions mainly through beliefs of self-efficacy (Chwalisz, Altmier, & Russell, 1992). In expectancy-value theory, motivation is regulated by the expectation that a given course of behaviour will produce certain outcomes and the value placed on those outcomes. But people act on their beliefs about what they can do,
as well as on their beliefs about the likely outcomes of performance. The motivating influence of outcome expectancies is thus partly governed by self-beliefs of efficacy. There are countless attractive options people do not pursue because they judge they lack the capabilities for them. The productiveness of expectancy-value theory is enhanced by including the influence of perceived self-efficacy (de Vries, Dijkstra, & Kuhlman, 1988; Dzewaltowski, Noble, & Shaw, 1990; Schwarzer, 1992).

Goal-setting is acknowledged today as a respected and useful motivation theory. Within an organizational context, goal setting is the process of improving individual or group job performance with stated objectives, deadlines, or quality standards (Pritchard et al., 1988). Management By Objectives (MBO) is a specific application of goal setting that advocates participative and measurable objectives. There is substantial support for the proposition that specific goals increase performance and that difficult goals when accepted, result in higher performance than do the easy goals. Further, the capacity to exercise self-influence by goal challenges and evaluative reaction to one’s own attainments provides a major cognitive mechanism of motivation. A large body of evidence shows that explicit, challenging goals enhance and sustain motivation (Locke & Latham, 1990). Goals operate largely through self-influence processes rather than regulate motivation and action directly. Motivation based on goal-setting involves a cognitive comparison process. By making self-satisfaction conditional on matching adopted goals, people give direction to their behaviour and create incentives to persist in their efforts by discontent with substandard performances. According to goal-setting theory, assigned goals affect
performance indirectly through their effects on self set goals and self-efficacy (Locke, 1991).

Moreover, people's beliefs in their capabilities affect how much stress and depression they experience in threatening or difficult situations, as well as their level of motivation. Perceived self-efficacy to exercise control over stressors plays a central role in anxiety arousal (Bandura, 1991). People who believe they can exercise control over threats do not conjure up disturbing thought patterns. But those who believe they cannot manage threats, experience high anxiety arousal. They dwell on their coping deficiencies. They view many aspects of their environment as fraught with danger. They magnify the severity of possible threats and worry about things that rarely happen. Through such inefficacious thinking they distress themselves and impair their level of functioning (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984; Meichenbauym, 1977). Perceived self-efficacy coping regulates avoidance behaviour as well as anxiety arousal. The stronger the sense of self-efficacy the bolder people is in taking on taxing and threatening activities.

The deliberations so far have centered on efficacy-activated processes that enable people to generate beneficial environments and to exercise some control over those they encounter day in and day out. People are partly the product of their environment. Therefore, beliefs of personal efficacy can shape people's lives which in turn influence the types of activities and environments people choose. People avoid activities and situations they believe, exceed their coping capabilities. But they readily undertake challenging activities and select situations they judge themselves capable of handling. By the choices they make, people cultivate
different competencies, interests and social networks that determine life courses. Any factor that influences choice behaviour can profoundly affect the direction of personal development. This is because the social influences operating in selected environments continue to promote certain competencies, values, and interests long after the efficacy decisional determinant has rendered its inaugural effect.

Self-efficacious individuals are more likely to believe that they are in control of the “opportunity structures” that organizational systems provide: “Those who have a firm belief in their efficacy, through ingenuity and perseverance, figure out ways to exercise some measure of control over social systems containing limited opportunities and many constraints” (Bandura, 1997a). This suggests that self-efficacious sales people are inclined to believe that they can obtain from their organization the necessary resources to adequately handle ever-increasing job demands. Researchers have long argued that stress does not result from the source of the pressure but mostly from the individual’s perception of the pressure (Cox, 1978). As Payne (1988) notes, “It is well known that even people in the same jobs, working in the same physical environment, do not see their environment as having the same level of stress”. Bandura (1997) shows that self-efficacy plays a critical role in stress perceptions because it operates as a cognitive and affective regulator of anxiety arousal. Self-efficacious individuals are less likely to be affected by stress because they have greater cognitive control over potential threats and perturbing intrusive thoughts (Bandura, 1997b). Also, they are able to cope with stress because they exercise greater affective control by means of self-relaxation, calming self-talking, and engagement in discretionary
recreational activities (Bandura, 1997). Salespeople with high levels of self-efficacy often achieve a higher performance because they are able to cope with task related obstacles and are able to handle demanding situations that occur during their interactions with customers (Ahearne, Mathieu, & Rapp, 2005). Because self-efficacy enhances a salesperson’s ability to exercise control over the situation, it can help him or her better manage work overload (Bandura, 1991). Dixon, Susan and Schertzer’s (2005) study supports this assertion by showing that salespeople with higher levels of self-efficacy are more likely to accept responsibility for failure and tend to attribute it to temporary and controllable causes such as lack of effort or use of an incorrect selling strategy. Mulki’s (2008) study provides evidence that higher levels of self-efficacy can significantly reduce role stress and work overload perceptions and investigates the effect of work overload and self-efficacy on important job outcomes - capability rewards and pay satisfaction. Randhawa (2004) results also showed significant positive correlation between job specific self-efficacy and work performance. This signifies that higher the job specific self-efficacy, higher will be work performance of employees.

Self-efficacy is the central mechanism of self-regulation: “People’s beliefs in their efficacy influence the choices they make, their aspirations, how much effort they mobilize in a given endeavor, how long they persevere in the face of difficulties and setbacks, whether their thought patterns are self-hindering or self-aiding, the amount of stress they experience in coping with taxing environmental demands, and their vulnerability to depression” (Bandura, 1991). Dixon, Susan and Schertzer (2005), sales research views self-efficacy as a critical variable that can influence salespeople’s perceptions and responses to challenges
and negative situations in the job. People with higher self-efficacy believe in their ability to handle their work well (Sujan, Weitz, & Kumar, 1994) and are more likely to become successful in their careers. Self-efficacy enhances employees’ willingness to exert effort and master a challenge and, thus, plays an important role in increasing work effectiveness, job satisfaction, and productivity.

In sum, the successful, the venturesome, the sociable, the non-anxious, the non-depressed, the social reformers, and the innovators take an optimistic view of their personal capabilities to exercise influence over events that affect their lives. If not unrealistically exaggerated, such self-beliefs foster positive well-being and human accomplishments (Bandura, 1994; Schaubroeck, Lam, & Xie, 2000).

WORK COMMITMENT

During 21st century, work organizations are going through major changes, and the employment relationship is becoming less stable. Career patterns are changing, and there is some talk of the end of traditional organizational careers (Cappelli, 1999). Neumark (2001) surveyed that organizational loyalty is reported to be in decline as turnover rates increase, average job tenure falls, and employees go “job shopping”. Commitment refers to an employee’s willingness to work positively in an organization and his continuance to work for it (Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1982). Buchanan (1974) defines commitment as one’s dedication of himself to the purposes and the values of an organization and one’s role; apart from a different instructional value, it is a feeling of commitment of the organization for its own good. Balay (2000)
defines this term as one's own investments in an organization and inclining to attitudes resulting in social qualities.

Work Commitment is a central concept in organizational behaviour (Morrow, 1993). Work commitment has been referred to as “a person's belief in and acceptance of the value of his/her chosen career or line of work, and a willingness to maintain membership in that occupation” (Vandenberg & Scarpello, 1994). It is generally accepted that work commitment has two components: organizational commitment and occupational/career commitment. Organizational commitment refers to employees' attachment to the organization, and occupational/career commitment denotes an individual’s degree of identification with his/her job/occupation (O'Driscoll & Randall, 1999). The present study utilizes both the conceptualizations of work commitment - organizational and occupational.

Hall, Scheider and Nygren (1970) define organizational commitment as the “process by which the goals of the organizations and those of the individual become increasingly integrated and congruent”. Sheldon (1971) views organizational commitment as an attitude or an orientation towards the organizations, which links or attracts the identity of the person to the organizations. Porter, Steers, Mowday and Boulian (1974), define organizational commitment as “the strength of an individual’s identification with and involvement in a particular organization”. They characterize it by three psychological factors: desire to remain in an organization, willingness to exert considerable efforts on its behalf and belief in and acceptance of its goals and values hold. On similar lines, Salancik (1977) defines
organizational commitment as “a state of being in which an individual becomes bound by actions to beliefs that sustains activities and involvement”.

Organizational researchers pay special attention to employees’ organizational commitment based on the belief that organizations with committed employees achieve superior long-term performance (Bentein et al., 2005; Luchak & Gellatly, 2007). Organizational commitment may have several different psychological bases. For that reason, researchers have tested organizational commitment in multi-dimensional ways. Among these, the most common one that has been widely used in this field is Meyer and Allen’s (1991) classification. They classified organizational commitment into three categories and they emphasized three different themes in the definition of the term occupational commitment: affective commitment to an organization, commitment related to the possible results in case one leaves the organization, and commitment of one’s obligation of staying within an organization. They showed these three types of commitments as affective, continuance and normative. Chang (1999) argues there is a direct relationship between an individual’s attraction to the organization & his/her career /occupational commitment.

Organizational commitment, according to Morrow (1983, 1993) and others (Baruch & Hackett et al., 2001) consists of a set of different, yet interrelated, commitment constructs. It would seem that a multiple commitment approach is more appropriate and meaningful (Reicher, 1985), because (a) employees develop different forms of work commitment; (b) these distinct forms may affect work outcomes differently; and (c) of the contribution
of work commitment models towards understanding employee work outcomes.

Arguably, the prevailing conceptualization of organizational commitment is that of Meyer and Allen (1984, 1991, &1997); Allen and Meyer (1990, 1996). Meyer and Allen’s view posits three ways that individuals can be bound to organizations. Affective commitment (AC) refers to the employee’s emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in, the organization. Continuance commitment (CC) is based on a belief that leaving the organization will be costly. Normative commitment (NC) is a sense of obligation to the organization. They have been succinctly summarized as: wanting (AC), needing (CC), and being obliged (NC) to stay with the organization. So, according to Allen and Meyer (1990), the three-component model captures the affective attachment, perceived costs, and perceived obligation aspects of organizational commitment.

As identified by Mowday, Porter, and Steers (1982), affective commitment is a strong belief in and acceptance of the organizational goals and values, a willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization and a strong desire to maintain membership in the organization. In contrast, continuance commitment is the outcome of an individual’s decision to remain with an organization because of the personal time and resources already devoted to the company and because of the financial costs of changing jobs. (Commeiras & Christophe, 2001). In addition, normative commitment is defined as the totality of internalized normative pressures to act in a way which meets organizational goals and interests (Wiener, 1982). The three-component model suggests that an employee can
experience different levels of all three forms of commitment (Allen & Meyer, 1990). While each commitment component reflects a psychological state that has implications to continue or discontinue membership in the organization, the nature of these states differs. Employee's with strong affective commitment remain in the organization because they want to; those with strong continuance commitment because they need to; and those with strong normative commitment because they feel they ought to do so. Meyer & Allen (1984, 1991), Allen & Meyer (1990), Meyer, Allen, & Smith (1993) developed the affective (ACS), continuance (CCS), and normative (NCS) commitment scales to measure these components. Further, Meyer and Allen (1991) hypothesized that there might be differences in the way other variables were associated with affective, continuance, and normative commitment. This notion has received empirical support focused on a variety of settings (Bentein et al., 2005; Lok, Westwood, & Crawford, 2005).

**Affective Commitment (AC)**

Affectively committed employees are characterized as loyal, productive members of work organizations (Porter, Steers, Mowday, & Boulian, 1974) who identify with organizational goals and organizational values. AC is the affective bond an individual feels toward the work, characterized by identification and involvement with the work in the organization as well as enjoyment in being a member of the organization (Meyer & Allen, 1997; Mowday, Porter, & Steer, 1982). A high level of affective commitment is characterized by feelings of belonging, pride, and loyalty. When employees are highly committed, they tend to identify with their organization and to be actively involved in the
workplace (Allen & Meyer, 1990). Moreover, as Allen and Meyer (1996) stated, “employees with strong affective commitment remain with the organization because they want to do so”. Therefore, in this type of commitment, there is a positive interaction between the individual and the organization because of having similar values (Shore & Tetrick, 1991). Those, who stay in their organizations with a strong commitment keep their existence not only because they need the occupation but also they want it (Meyer et al., 1993).

People feel attached to their organization when the goals and values of the organization are largely consistent with their own, and when they 'buy-in' to the mission and philosophy of the organization. Affectively committed employees are more likely to exert effort on behalf of the organization as they see organization's gain as their own (Jaramillo et al., 2005). In fact, one facet of the organizational commitment questionnaire developed by Mowday (1979), addresses individuals', “willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization”. For the benefit of the organization, committed employees are willing to spend more time and higher intensity of effort on work.

**Continuance Commitment (CC)**

Continuance commitment (CC) is the extent to which a person needs to stay with the organization, due to the costs of forgoing benefits associated with an individual's investments in the organization i.e., ‘side bets’. (Allen & Meyer, 2000). According to Howard Becker’s side-bet theory, “Commitment come into being when a person by making a side-bet, links extraneous
interests with a consistent line of activity. "Continuance commitment (CC) is related to one's experience that has been given to an organization difficulty in giving it up and the cost of things in case he leaves the organization or having few or no alternatives when he leaves the organization. In addition, Meyer et al., stated that skills and education are not transferred to other organizations easily so it increases workers' commitment to their own organizations. Those who stay within their organizations with a strong continuance commitment are in their organizations just because they need it (Meyer et al., 1993).

This kind of commitment is based on the calculation of cost and benefit and is least likely to correlate positively with efforts (Meyer & Herscovitch, 2001). Among other aspects of employee behaviour, service quality and intention to participate in professional activities were proposed to be negatively related to continuance commitment (Malhotra & Mukherjee, 2003). A high continuance commitment implies that an individual stays in an organization simply because he or she has no better option. If a better opportunity presents itself, the individual would be likely to leave the organization (McNeilly & Russ, 1992). From a social exchange perspective, an individual who relates to an organization only by calculated benefits is likely to exert effort in supporting that organization (Blau, 1964). Theoretically, CC should be related to turnover and turnover intentions, but not to behavior (e.g., citizenship) beyond those required to maintain membership (Meyer & Allen, 1991, 1997). This form of commitment is less desirable to foster among employees.
Normative Commitment (NC)

Normative commitment (NC) is last introduced and least studied, it is the extent to which person is obligated to stay with work in the organization (Meyer & Allen, 1991, 1997). Normative commitment's definition has changed since its inception (Allen et al., 2003). Normative commitment was originally based on Weiner's (1982) work. It was defined as totality of the internalized normative pressures to act in a way which meets organizational goals and interests. NC later became an obligation to stay with the organization, without specific reference to social pressures about loyalty (Allen & Meyer, 1996). More recently, the obligation has subtly changed, alluding to reciprocity for a benefit (Meyer et al., 2002). Some of the definitional changes have been reflected in revisions to the NCS (Meyer & Allen, 1991; Meyer et al., 1993). Sometimes an individual may feel dissatisfied with their job, or may think that their organization is moving in the wrong direction, yet still feel obliged to be loyal and committed, and to stay with the organization. Meyer and Allen (1991) describe this sense of moral obligation as normative commitment. So, the core nature of NC is the employee's sense of obligation; here, NC is defined as the individual's bond with the organization due to an obligation on the part of the individual.

As affective commitment represents the employees' emotional attachment to and identification with the organization, the higher level of effort is consistent with their strong desire to remain part of the organization. Although employees who have normative and continuance commitment also have desire to maintain employment, the extent to which they are willing to exert would be different from those who are affectively
committed. According to Meyer and Herscovitch (2001) different forms of commitment are accompanied by different mind-sets, which in turn have differential behavioural applications. In particular, they argued that, “compared to normative and continuance commitment, affective commitment (a) correlates significantly with a wider range of outcome measures and (b) correlates more strongly with any given outcome measure.”

Out of three components, AC has received the most research attention (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Meyer et al., 2002). Ample validity evidence exists for affective commitment and affective commitment scale (ACS), with strong correlations between the ACS and the organizational commitment questionnaire (Mowday et al., 1982) and similar relationships for the ACS and OCQ with antecedents and outcomes (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Dunham, Grube, & Casteneda, 1994; Randall, Fedor, & Longnecker, 1990; Shore & Tetrick, 1991). Additionally, there is strong support for the antecedents, correlates, effects, and cross-cultural generalisability of AC (Chen & Francesco, 2003; Lee, Allen, Meyer, & Rhee, 2001; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Meyer et al., 2002; Mowday et al., 1982; Wasti, 2002).

Meyer and Allen (1991) stated that when all these three types of commitments are taken into consideration, one’s relationship with his organization can be understood better. When these commitment types increase, an individual’s desire to stay in his organization rises as well. In these circumstances, desire appears to be one’s first priority, necessity as the second priority and obligation as the third priority. According to this model, workers experience these three types of commitments in different ways. Meyer and Allen (1991) stated that each dimension can be
experienced as a result of different experiences and they claimed that each has different effects on work. Although there are a lot of factors, which influence affective commitment, Meyer and Allen (1991) concluded that the strongest and most consistent relationship could be acquired through experience. Continuance commitment increases when an individual invests in an organization or gets some from the organization because they will be lost when one leaves the organization. When there is a limitation of alternatives, this type of commitment is developed.

Normative commitment can increase when an individual feels loyal to his employer or responsible to work for the benefits that he gets from the organization (e.g., educational payments, training of skills) as a result of the desire to compensate the favors received from the institution (Meyer et al., 1993). Continuance commitment is more likely to reflect perceptions of the viability of alternatives to employment with the organization. It could be argued that personal characteristics may also play a part in this form of commitment, because people who are more driven and ambitious are more likely to examine alternative forms of employment. Normative commitment is fostered by socialization or social experiences. These might be cultural, familial and organizational (Meyer & Allen, 1991). The sense of moral obligation developed as a result of socialization interacts with perceptions of investments made by the organization. If an individual perceives that an organization has made significant investment in them, and feels obliged to reciprocate, then normative commitment is likely to be high.

One implication of the three-component model of commitment is that each form of commitment has different
antecedents e.g., affective commitment is likely to result from a combination of work experiences and perceptions of the organization, alongside personal characteristics such as personality traits. The link between personality and commitment has been established empirically (Erdheim, Wang, & Zickar, 2006), and so it seems that in a similar way to job satisfaction, some people are more predisposed than others to develop a commitment to their organization.

In general, affective organizational commitment was found to be related to wide variety of correlates. The literature (Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982; Morrow, 1993) suggested that affective commitment is related to both demographic characteristics and work experience. Affective commitment was also found to be positively related to performance (Meyer, Paunonen, Gellatly, Goflin, & Jackson, 1989). The literature also indicated positive spillover between variables representing non work domains and affective commitment (Kirchmeyer, 1992). Thus, all the correlates presented here are expected to relate to affective commitment positively. However, because the exchange approach is the main theory explaining the development of affective commitment (Mowday et al., 1982) it is expected that the effect of variables that represent work experience (job satisfaction, job tension), and are therefore an important component of other exchange process, will demonstrate a stronger relationship with affective commitment than the other correlates. Continuance commitment, which reflects the recognition of costs associated with leaving the organization, should be related to anything that increases perceived costs. Direct or indirect investments in the organization, side bets, represent such costs best, and were operationalized mainly by variables like age, education, and
tenure (Becker, 1960). Therefore, the above demographic variables and tenure are expected to demonstrate the strongest relationship with continuance commitment. Meyer et al., (1989) found a negative relationship between continuance commitment and performance based on the expectation that people who feel ‘stacked’ in an organization will not exert too much effort.

In some researches, Meyer et al. (1993), Baysal and Paksoy, (1999), Meyer et al. (2002) characterized a positive relationship between affective and normative commitment and this positive relationship can be explained with experience. Work experience (either in organization or in the occupation itself) can advance the development of continuance and feeling of responsibility for an organization or both. One view is that organizational instability is causing some employees to shift their commitment from increasingly transient work organizations to the relative stability of their occupations (Johnson, 1996; Reilly, Brett, & Stroh, 1993). A deeper knowledge of work commitment is needed to better understand the attitudes and behaviors of the modern workforce.

It seems that the three components model of work commitment have received considerable empirical support (Allen & Meyer, 1996; Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch, & Topolnytsky, 2002). The three components have shown to be related yet distinguishable from each other. The meta-analysis by Meyer et al. (2002) indicates that affective commitment develops primarily from positive work-related experiences, whereas lack of job alternatives and investments in the organization are predictive of continuance commitment. Although there is insufficient research to substantiate the proposition, normative commitment is arguably determined by early socialization experience, or the
organization investment in the employee. In terms of job related outcomes, all three forms of commitment relate negatively to withdrawal cognition’s, and turnover behavior, with affective commitment showing the strongest correlations, followed by normative commitment and then continuance commitment (Meyer et al., 2002). The implications for other job-related behaviors differ across the three forms. While affective commitment has the strongest relations with desirable work-related outcomes such as organizational citizenship behaviors, attendance and performance, continuance commitment is either negatively related or unrelated to these behaviors. Normative commitment also appears to predict positive job-outcomes, albeit less strongly than affective commitment (Meyer et al., 2002).

With respect to profiles characterized by high levels of multiple commitment forms, Meyer and Herscovitch (2001) speculated that high affective commitment accompanied by high levels of normative or in particular, continuance commitment would be worse than a pure affective commitment profile in terms predicting desirable behavior. In other words, they proposed that an obligation or a cost-avoidance mind-set would reduce the positive impact of a desire-based mind-set. However, they argued that profiles characterized by high affective commitment, irrespective of the accompanying levels of normative and/or continuance commitment, would relate more strongly to behaviors of interest than would be the pure normative or continuance commitment profiles. Regarding profiles characterized by low levels of affective commitment, they further speculated that a pure normative commitment profile would be better than a profile characterized by high levels of normative and continuance commitment or pure continuance.
commitment. Finally, the lowest likelihood of positive behavior is arguably associated with the profile characterized by low level of all three types of commitment.

To date, surprisingly little research has investigated the implications of interactions involving two or more forms of organizational commitment (e.g., Meyer & Herscovitch, 2002; Jaros, 1997). Although, the effects have been found to be weak, there is some support for the above propositions. In particular, patterns of two-by-two interactions suggest that the likelihood of desirable job outcomes is greater when affective or normative commitment is high but continuance commitment is low. In other words, continuance commitment seems attenuate the impact of affective or normative commitment. Beyond this, however, little is known about the combined influence of commitment forms. Thus the co-existence of the three forms needs to be explored further for a more complete and indeed a more realistic understanding of organizational commitment. This model retains the greatest empirical scrutiny and arguably receives the greatest support.

Consequently, a wide array of desirable behavior outcomes have been linked to work-related commitment including: employee retention, job performance, attendance, work quality, and personal sacrifice on behalf of the organization (London, 1983; Randall, Fedor & Longnecker, 1990). The importance of such research has been emphasized by Randall and Cote (1991) and Mullar, Wallace and Price (1992) who argued that we are still much in need of conceptual and empirical work in sorting out how forms of commitment are related and how they relate to work behaviour. Organizational commitment, occupational commitment, and career salience are some of the
constructs that have been investigated in the literature. These different commitment forms have been found to have modest correlations with outcome variables such as job performance and job satisfaction.

Terms occupation, profession, and career have been used somewhat interchangeably in the commitment literature. We choose to use the term occupation rather profession that both professionals and nonprofessionals can experience commitment to the work they do. The main reason for choosing occupation over career is to avoid potential confusion. Some authors use career as we use occupation (Aranya et al., 1981; Blau, 1985; Morrow & Wirth, 1989; Morrow, 1993). Several others, however, define career as a series of jobs, vocational choices, and other work-related activities over the individual's life time (e.g., Arthur, Hall, & Lawrence, 1989, Greenbhaus, 1987), a definition that departs considerably our line of work notion. Occupational commitment means one's devotion to occupation. Occupational commitment requires three conditions: first, purpose of the occupation, secondly, belief in the values of the occupation and acceptance of them; and finally showing an effort to survive in his occupation and membership with his occupation (Morrow & Wirth, 1989).

Commitment to one's occupation is conceptualized here as a psychological link between a person and his or her occupation that is based on an affective reaction to that occupation. A person with strong occupational commitment will more strongly identify with, and experience more positive feelings about the occupation than one with weak occupational commitment. Present researcher view of occupational commitment is consistent with that of several researchers. Of particular note is the work done by
Blau (1985a), who defined career/occupational commitment as one's attitude towards one's profession or vocation, developed a widely used measure of career commitment, and showed it to be distinct from other work attitudes such as job involvement and organizational commitment (Blau, 1985a, 1994, 2000). Also consistent with view is the Meyer et al. (1993) notion of affective commitment to the occupation. Developed in the tradition of the 1990, Meyer and Allen's (1991), affective commitment to the occupation refers to the person's desire to remain in the occupational role. Meyer et al. (1993) developed a measure of affective occupational commitment that appears to be distinct from both continuance commitment (recognition of costs of leaving the occupation) and normative commitment (obligation to the occupation) and related to several occupation-relevant behaviors. Meyer et al. (1993) generalized Meyer and Allen's (1991) 3-dimensional work commitment in the field of commitment and examined the issue in three sub-dimensions as affective, continuance and normative commitment to the work. According to this point of view, affective commitment to the work involves not only one's performance in his occupation with a great pleasure but also devotion of himself to his occupation. Continuance commitment to the work is related to one's investment to his occupation and is also related to the costs, which are very high when he leaves the organization. Normative commitment to the occupation is related to the feeling of responsibility of obligation for the job.

Meyer et al. (1993) stated that affective commitment to the occupation is related to positive experiences about the work (e.g., job satisfaction); continuance commitment to the work is related to the responsibilities about the commitment (e.g., authority or
investment) and the variances which increase them (experience, status); normative commitment is related to positive experiences as well and in general it is related to the feeling of perceived responsibility for the others. Work and organizational commitment dimensions are not entirely different from each other. They are believed to have strong relationships with normative commitment and a positive relationship was found related to either organization or occupational continuance.

Understanding the occupational commitment construct is important for several reasons. First, occupations represent a meaningful focus in the lives of many people. This has become increasingly the case as educational levels rise and work become more specialized (Burris, 1983) and as employees deal with extensive organizational change. Indeed, Carson and Bedein (1995) have suggested that coping with the uncertainty associated with changes such as mergers, acquisitions, and layoffs has caused many employees to identify their focus on, and commitment to, the aspect of their working life over which they feel they have more control, their occupation. Second, occupational commitment is important because of its potential link to retention—in terms of occupation and organizational membership. Whether the concern is society's need to retain people in particular occupations or an organization's need to maintain the optimal level of turnover (Colarelli, 1998) and third, occupational commitment is important because of its potential links to work performance. Researchers have demonstrated that the development of expertise necessary for consistent high level performance requires individuals to engage regularly in the activities for long periods of time (Ericsson & Lehmann, 1996). Thus, to the extent that it influences continued involvement in the
occupation, occupational commitment construct is important because it contributes to our understanding of how people develop, make sense of, and integrate their multiple work-related commitments, including that go beyond organizational boundaries (Meyer, Allen, & Topolnytsky, 1998; Reichers, 1985).

**PERCEIVED ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT**

Since the early 1990s, perceived organizational support (POS) has generated a great deal of interest among researchers in the fields of psychology and management (Eisenberger et al., 2004). In 2002, Rhoades and Eisenberger published a meta-analysis on the antecedents and consequences of POS based on 70 empirical papers.

Perceived organizational support is defined as "the extent to which employees perceive that their contributions are valued by their organization and firm cares about their well-being" (Eisenberger et al., 1986). POS refers to the degree to which employees perceive their employer to be concerned with their well-being and to value their contributions to the organization. Eisenberger and colleagues developed the concept of POS in an attempt to represent the employment relationship described by social exchange theory (Blau, 1964). Essentially, social exchange theory applied in the work context argues that employees are willing to exchange their effort and time for various rewards offered them by the organization (Blau, 1964). Additionally, whereas economic exchange theories (e.g., Rousseau & Parks, 1993) argue that employees are willing to exchange their work performance for pay, social exchange theory posits that employees are willing to exchange work performance for
additional factors that are less tangible (e.g., feeling valued and supported). However, inconsistent findings exist regarding the perceived organizational support-performance relationship. Specifically, while some studies have found a positive association (e.g., Eisenberger et al., 1990; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002), others have found leader-member exchange (LMX), but not POS, to be related to performance (e.g., Settoon et al., 1996; Wayne et al., 2002). Rhoades and Eisenberger (2002) appeared to have clarified the relation in their meta-analysis, finding links of POS with both in-role and extra-role behaviors to be significant and homogeneous in regard to a moderate level of effect. However, they did not consider the potential relations that exist among these outcome variables, resulting in the possibility of an incomplete model of perceived organizational support and performance.

Levinson (1965) maintains that employees tend to personify the organization for which they work. Based on the actions of executives and managers, employees tend to lend intentions to the degree to which employees feel that the organization that employs them is willing to equitably compensate them for their efforts, help them in the case of need (e.g., illness & work related problems), make their work interesting and stimulating, and provide them with adequate working conditions (Eisenberger et al., 1986). In short, employees form a general idea concerning the support provided by the organization.

The relationship between employees and their organizations has been, thus, described as an exchange relationship (Rousseau, 1995; Shore, Tetrick, & Barksdale, 1999). Eisenberger and colleagues (1986, 1990) proposed that POS is a key factor in the
social exchange between employees and their employers. POS is viewed as the perception of individuals that their employers are committed to them and value them, resulting in employees' reciprocation. That involves an increased commitment to their employers (Eisenberger et al., 1986). Thus, POS should be related to other social exchange variables such as the strength of the social and economic exchange relationships employees have with their employer (Shore, Tetrick, & Barksdale, 1999), perceptions of those obligations (Rousseau, 1995; Shore & Tetrick, 1994), as well as employee commitment (Shore & Wayne, 1993; Wayne, Shore, & Liden, 1997).

Researchers have suggested that POS underlies social exchange between employees and their employers and the psychological contracting process (Eisenberger et al., 1986; Shore & Shore, 1995). A psychological contract refers to the perceived mutual obligations between employees and his/her employer (Rousseau & McLean Parks, 1992; Shore & Tetrick, 1994), as employees form beliefs about what their organization owes to them (organizational obligations) and about what they owe to their organization (employee obligations) in return. An employee infers employer promises from organizational history, observation of policies and procedures, as well as treatment of coworker (Rousseau & Mclean Parks, 1993). Similarly, HR practices serve as the basis for employee perceptions regarding the extent to which their organization cares about and supports them (Eisenberger et al., 2001; Wayne et al., 1997; Whitener, 2001).

Rousseau and colleagues (1993) distinguished between transitional and relational content of psychological contracts.
Transactional obligations are focused around the exchange on an economic basis, and are typically finite, static, narrow, and easily observable. On the other hand, relational obligations involve both economic and socio-emotional exchange, and are typically long-term, dynamic, subjective, relationship-oriented, and based on trust (Robinson, 1996; Rousseau, 1995; Rousseau & McLean Parks, 1993; Shore & Tetrick, 1994). A process-oriented approach to examining an employment relationship focuses on the nature of the exchange (social and economic) between an individual and an organization instead of attempting to categorize psychological contract content as transitional or relational (Shore & Barksdale, 1991; Shore et al., 1999). In other words, the nature of an employee’s exchange relationship is a matter of degree in terms of social and economic characteristics, and not an exclusive typology as initially suggested by Rousseau (1989). This exchange process can be thought of as the reciprocation of employee and organizational fulfillment of perceived obligations, which may redefine the content of the psychological contract in terms of its relational and transactional characteristics. Further, POS possibly interacts with an anticipatory psychological contract (Rousseau, 1995) in defining the social exchange relationship between an employee and an organization.

POS may enable the reciprocation process involved in the exchange, that is, the fulfillment of obligations, through assuring employees that their investments into the social exchange relationship will be repaid by their employer (Eisenberger et al., 1986; Shore & Shore, 1995). Social exchange involves risk because it is often unclear when and in what form an investment or a favor will be returned (Blau, 1964). POS may provide employees with confidence that their organization is a
responsible exchange partner, therefore, enabling social exchange relationships. Research has shown that, based on the norm of reciprocity, POS is associate with obligations that employees feel towards helping their organization reach its objective (Eisenberger et al., 2001). Because obligations that employees feel towards their employer define the psychological contract (Rousseau, 1995; Shore & Tetrick, 1994), POS is expected to related or relational obligation content of the psychological contract. On the other hand, economic exchange entails independent transactions that do not involve trust and attachment contingencies associated with social exchange and relational contracts (Rousseau, 1995; Shore & Tetrick, 1994). Therefore, POS is not expected to relate to economic exchange and transactional obligations of employees and their employers.

To the extent that employees perceive their organization to be committed to them, the norm of reciprocity obligates them to live up to their promises (Settoon, et al., 1996; Shore & Wayne, 1993). In fact, research has shown that employees direct their acts of reciprocity toward the source of benefits received (McNeely & Meglino, 1994). Therefore, POS is expected to positively relate to employee fulfillment of obligations. In light of the discussed link between POS and social exchange relationships, as well as research findings showing that social exchange is associated with higher employee fulfillment of obligations (Shore et al., 1999), social exchange is expected to be positively related to employee fulfillment of obligations. On the other hand, employees who perceive their organizations as caring assume that they will eventually receive rewards that their organizations are perceived as obligated to give (Settoon, Bennett, & Liden, 1996; Shore & Shore, 1995; Wayne et al., 1997).
Further, people tend to store, recall, and fill in information based on their existing schemas (Salancik & Pfeffer, 1977) and engage in selective attention and interpretation of information regarding organizational fulfillment of perceived obligations (Robinson, 1996). Therefore, because of the assumed reciprocation, caring organizations are more likely to be perceived as living up to their promises, so POS is expected to be positively related to organizational fulfillment of obligations. Similarly, because of the discussed link between POS and social exchange relationships, as well as the argument that a psychological contract functions as a scheme for interpreting information in the work context (Shore & Tetrick, 1994) employees with social exchange relationships are expected to perceive their organizations as living up to its promises.

Although POS and organizational commitment differ from one another conceptually and empirically (Bishop et al., 2005; Eisenberger et al., 1990), these two notions are somewhat analogous. Indeed, the first concerns the commitment of the organization to employees, and the second refers to the degree to which employees are committed to the organization that employs them (Eisenberger et al., 1986). More specifically, organizational commitment is a three-dimensional concept that includes affective commitment, normative commitment and continuance commitment (Allen & Meyer, 1996; Meyer et al., 1993). Affective commitment represents the employee's attachment to and identification with an organization. Individuals with a high level of affective commitment continue to work for an organization because they want to. Normative commitment refers to the moral obligation to continue working for the organization. Employees with a high level of normative commitment believe they have the
duty and responsibility to continue working for their current employer. Finally, continuance commitment indicates the degree to which employees stay with an organization because the costs of leaving are too high. Employees who are essentially bound to their organization on the basis of continuance commitment stay in their job because they feel that what they have invested in the organization (e.g., time, energy) would be “lost” if they left their current employer or, they assess their job options outside the organization as being limited. Compared to affective and normative commitment which are positively correlated with performance and various types of productive behaviors in the workplace (e.g., extra-role, organizational citizenship behaviors, work attendance), several studies have indicated that continuance commitment is usually negatively correlated with these same variables (Allen & Meyer, 1996; Meyer et al., 1993). Consequently, from a managerial standpoint, continuance commitment is generally considered to be less desirable than affective and normative commitment.

POS is likely to influence each of these forms of organizational commitment. A meta-analysis conducted by Rhodes and Eisenberger (2002) shows that POS is strongly and positively correlated with affective commitment. To explain this relationship, Fuller et al., (2003) refer to Tyler's (1993) social identity theory, according to which individual feel recognized within an organization when their employer values their contributions to the functioning of the organization. The recognition of their work and status within the organization helps meet the employee’s socio-emotional needs, that is, their needs for esteem, approval and affiliation (Shore & Shore, 1995). Filling these needs contributes to building the employees’ social identity,
which in turn is likely to enhance their sense of belonging to and pride in the organization (Meyer & Allen, 1991). On the other hand, the relationship between POS and affective commitment can also be explained by referring to Blau’s (1964) social exchange theory, according to which the development and maintenance of all human relationships are based on an exchange of resources which are valued by the individuals who are interacting with one another. In the case of the relationship between POS and affective commitment, it would appear to be mainly the socio-emotional and symbolic aspects of this exchange that are taken into consideration (Gakovic & Tetruck, 2003; Shore et al., 2006). More specifically, behaviors related to organizational support (e.g., promotions, salary increases, training, tangible help) appear to be interpreted by employees as marks of respect and consideration on the part of their employer, which in turn appears to increase their trust in and the quality of their relationship with the latter (Chen et al., 2005; Cheung, 2000; Eisenberger et al., 1990, 2001). In other words, in order to show their gratitude to their employers, employees appear to develop a positive attitude towards the organization, increase their level of affective commitment. It should be mentioned that the studies of Rhoades et al. (2001) corroborate the idea that it is POS which influences the affective commitment and not the reverse.

While the research has been inconclusive regarding the relationship between POS and continuance commitment (Eisenberger et al., 1997, O’Driscoll & Randall, 1999), researchers have found that POS was positively associated with affective commitment (Eisenberger et al., 2001) so the same relationship can be expected in the present study. Further research has shown that POS has indirect relationships with commitment through
trust in management and employees felt obligation to help the organization reach its objectives (Eisenberger et al., 2001). As discussed earlier, trust and felt obligation for an organization’s welfare are hallmarks of social exchange (Shore et al., 1999; Shore & Tetrick, 1994). Therefore, psychological contract mechanism may link POS with affective and normative commitment; employees who perceive their organizations as caring may be more likely to engage in a social exchange relationship with their employer and invest into their employment relationship through emotional attachment to as well as a sense of obligation to remain with their organization.

**WORK OUTCOMES**

In an organizational behaviour research, work outcome is a dependent variable of interest. It is so because the goals, objectives and strategies of the organization are measured in terms of outcomes. Analysis of the antecedents of outcome behaviors has been a point of interest for all concerned – the management, planners, management scientists, and psychologists. Consequently, work outcome or performance is evaluated in same manner in all the organizations. Very small firms may not need formal systems of appraisals, but evaluation occurs nonetheless. And firms experience a growing need to standardize, retain and communicate appraisal information, they are likely to institute in the formal systems. Even though external communication remains the main focus in organizations, more and more organizations have started realizing the importance of internal communication for increased organizational performance/outcomes (Golser-Wamser, 2005). As a result of this increased focus on internal communication, institutions and
organizations now invest more and more resources in evaluating employee performance and providing opportunities for employee development. One of the main tools used in this connection is the performance appraisal.

Work outcomes or performance analysis is an important component of appraisal in organizational setting and it is reflected through various measures such as task completion, quality of work, work-efficacy, time management, decision-making etc., in a group, while at the individual level, it may be reflected through behaviors and actions as rated and evaluated by self, peers, subordinates (juniors) or superiors. Performance management involves defining performance, understanding the competencies required to do the job or various tasks associated with the job, developing the competencies, creating the motivation needed, or putting hard work or effort to do the job and getting all the support needed to do that job or series of tasks associated with that job or role. Performance analysis involves analyzing or understanding the various factors contributing to performance (positively or negatively) for a given period, and managing them to enhance performance in the subsequent period. It involves understanding first the tasks associated with the role, setting standards and measuring the achievements against these standards. It also involves identifying the competencies needed to perform each of the tasks, ascertaining the level to which each of the tasks have been performed, understanding the reasons for good and poor performance of each of the tasks, analyzing them into ability factor or competence factors, motivational factors, and organizational support factors.
Appraisal of an employee is considered as one of the most important and universal practices of work and organization. Performance appraisal is a feedback system that involves the direct evaluation of individual or work group performance by a supervisor, manager, or peers. In general, the evaluation process operates as an auditing and controlling mechanism, generating information upon which many decisions are made. A performance appraisal contains three steps: define the job, appraise performance, and provide feedback. Performance appraisals are conducted for a variety of purposes, including affirmative action, pay and promotions decisions and, human resources planning and development. The overall purpose of performance appraisal is to provide an accurate and objective measure of how well a person is performing the job. Most organizations have some kind of evaluation system that is used for performance feedback, pay administration, and, in some cases, counseling and developing employees. Thus, performance appraisal represents an important link between goal-setting processes and reward systems. On the basis of this information, decisions will be made about the employee’s future with the organization. In addition, performance evaluations are often used to validate specific selection techniques. Thus, there are two broad purposes for conducting performance appraisals. (1) administrative, for use with personal decisions such as pay increase and promotions, and (2) research, usually for validating selection instruments.

Performance appraisals may be objective or judgmental. Objective measures include quantity and quality of output, computer-aided appraisal, and data on accidents, salary, advancement, and absenteeism. Judgmental methods involve having supervisors assess their workers ability to perform the
job. These assessments are made by written narratives, merit rating techniques which means objective rating methods designed to provide an objective evaluation of work performance. It includes ratings (a performance appraisal technique in which supervisors indicate how or to what degree a worker possess each relevant job characteristic), ranking (a performance appraisal technique in which supervisors list the workers in their group in order from highest to lowest or best to worst), paired comparisons (a performance appraisal technique that compares the performance of each worker with that of every worker in the group), forced distribution (a performance appraisal technique in which supervisors rate employees according to a prescribed distribution of ratings, similar to grading on a curve), forced choice (a performance appraisal technique in which raters are presented with groups of descriptive statements and are asked to select the phrase in each group that is most descriptive or least descriptive of the worker being evaluated), behaviorally anchored rating scales (BARS) attempt to evaluate job performance in terms of specific behaviors that are important to success or failure on the job rather than in terms of general attitudes or factors such as communication skills, cooperation, or common sense. Behavioral observation scale (BOS) approach to performance appraisal; employees are evaluated in terms of critical incidents. All these techniques involve one person judging the abilities or characteristics of another. Another technique i.e., 360-degree feedback includes multiple raters, such as the appraisee, peers or co-workers, and direct reports and others having direct exposure to the employee's performance. This broader approach is used for employee development than for compensation purposes. The newer approaches actively involve appraisees in all phase of the appraisal process. The appraisee joins with superiors and staff personnel in gathering data on
performance and identifying training needs. Thus, the process of working out differences and arriving at an overall assessment is an important aspect of the appraisal process. This improves the appraisal's acceptance, the accuracy of information, and its focus on activities that are critical to the organization strategy. Performance analysis also involves identification of factors within the control of the individual, his seniors, and the organization. A good performance analysis lays the foundation for making good performance improvement plans and ensuring performance improvements. Therefore, outcomes evaluation is essential for any organizational changes and for overall organizational system.

Performance measurement is the source of many problems in appraisal because it is seen as subjective. Management by objectives (MBO) is an approach to resolve differences in perceptions and goals. It is characterized by systematic and periodic manager-subordinate meetings designed to accomplish organizational goals by joint planning of the work in a given time period, periodic reviewing of accomplishments, and mutual solving of problems that arise in the course of getting the job done. Instead of focusing on abilities or traits as in merit rating, or on job behaviors as in behaviorally anchored rating scales (BARS) and Behavior observation scale (BOS), Management by objectives (MBO) focuses on results-on how well employees accomplish specified goals. The emphasis is on what employees do rather than on what their supervisors think of them or perceive their behaviors to be. Further, MBO actively involves employees in their own evaluations. They are not simply graded or rated by others. MBO consists of two phases: goal setting and performance feedback.
The performance appraisal is based on job results, not on characteristics such as initiative or general skills. Feedback should clearly communicate progress against objectives, but more importantly serve a developmental purpose. Performance feedback allows employees to see what they are doing right, helping to build competence and can also promote engagement and involvement with the organization. Performance feedback provided to employees is likely to be a balance of positive and negative information. Evidence seems to suggest that giving feedback poorly can be less effective than giving no feedback at all. Reviews of the effects of feedback on performance indicate that there are robust findings showing that feedback can both enhance and have negative effects on performance (Kluger & DeNisi, 1996). Evaluating managerial performance may be accomplished through assessment centers or evaluation by supervisors, colleagues (peers), subordinates, or self-ratings. Combining ratings into an overall appraisal (360-degree feedback) is of particular value. Sources of rater error include the halo effect, most recent-performance error, and inadequate information error, average rating error, the rater’s cognitive processes, and role conflict. Three ways to improve performance are better training for raters, providing feedback to raters, and allowing subordinates to participate in their own ratings.

Practically, however, work outcome evaluation is very difficult for many reasons. First, the process may involve multi dimensions, that is, there are many aspects of performance that must be assessed. Second, the selection of dimensions or aspects of work outcome or performance depends on the purpose of the performance review. Third, the same type of act or behavior will not always result in the same level of performance outcomes.
Fourth, factors beyond the control of the employees being evaluated can also influence performance assessment, particularly when outcome oriented criteria, such as sales productivity and profit being used. Finally, there is a question of reliability and validity of the performance assessment. The various work outcome or performance appraisal methods suggested by Miner (1992) are: appraisal by peers, subordinates, self-appraisal, and rating by superiors, field reviews, management by objectives (MBO) appraisals etc.

The present research has taken into account three aspects of work outcomes i.e. job satisfaction, job performance and intent to stay. Satisfaction can be considered in different ways. It may be thought of as a general attitude, reflecting overall feelings about work. It may also be considered as a composite of more specific attitudes. Job Satisfaction is one of the most widely studied work-related attitudes in the fields of industrial and organizational behavior (Spector, 1997). It consists of the feelings and attitudes one has about one’s job. All aspects of a particular job, good or bad, positive and negative, are likely to contribute to the development of feelings of satisfaction or dissatisfaction. Greenberg and Baron (1997) define job satisfaction as “an individual’s cognitive, affective, and evaluative reactions towards his/her job”. Locke (1984) defined job satisfaction as “a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job or job experiences”. It refers to a person’s general feelings about there job, and more specifically the extent to which they feel positive or negative about it. It is a state where one’s needs and one’s outcomes match well. To Cranny et al. (1992), “Job satisfaction is a combination of cognitive and affective reactions to the differential perceptions of what an
employee wants to receive compared to what he or she actually receives.”

Saari and Judge (2004) suggest a model in which job satisfaction is formed from three sources: 1) Personality and dispositions, 2) job characteristics, and 3) perceptions of distributive justice. Thus, job satisfaction is an attitude formed by individuals in reference to their jobs. It results from the perception of their jobs and the degree to which there is a good fit between the individual and the organization. If organizations can successfully measure which factors influence job satisfaction, they may strengthen employee’s morale and provide positive outcomes for their organization.

There are two approaches to conceptualize job satisfaction. The first is the global approach, which considers overall job satisfaction. This way of looking at job satisfaction simply asks if the employee is satisfied overall, using a yes-no response or a single rating scale. The second is the facet approach, which considers job satisfaction to be composed of feelings and attitudes about a number of different elements, or facets, of the job. For example, overall, global satisfaction may be a composite of numerous factors: satisfaction with pay, the type of work itself, working conditions, the type of supervision, company policies, and procedures, relations with coworkers, and opportunities for promotion and advancement. In contrast, the facet approach considers each of these aspects individually.

The major determinants /causes of job satisfaction seem to derive from theoretical approaches. For most people, the major determinants of global job satisfaction derive from the intrinsic
features of the work itself. These are most commonly based on
the Hackman and Oldham (1975) core constructs of skill variety,
task identity, task significance, autonomy and feedback. Griffin
and Bateman (1986) observed positive correlations between
leader behaviors such as initiating structure and consideration
and satisfaction. So, leader behavior is also important in
satisfaction at work. It is also possible that job satisfaction causes
job perceptions. Wong et al. (1998) collected data over a two-year
period and found both that perceived job characteristics lead to
job satisfaction and vice versa.

Job satisfaction as stated above is the result of various
attitudes possessed by an employee. In a narrow sense, these
attitudes are related to the job and are concerned with such
specific factors as monetary gains (wages), job security, working
hours, working environment, opportunity for advancement
(promotions), self-growth, self-development, recognition of the
work done, fair performance appraisal, inter-personal relations in
the organization, expeditious settlement of grievances, fair
treatment by employer, and other similar items.

In brief, job satisfaction is a general attitude which is the
result of many specific attitudes in three areas, namely specific
job factors (i.e., attitude toward the organization's policies,
toward advancement opportunities, toward job content, toward
supervisors, toward financial rewards, toward working
conditions, toward co-workers), individual characteristics, and
group relationships outside the job. An attitude of an employee
can be considered as a readiness to act in one way rather than
another in connection with specific factors related to job (Blum &
Naylor, 1986).
Job satisfaction and work commitment receive significant importance in research studies. This establishes these variables as major determinants of organizational performance (Riketta, 2002) and effectiveness (Laschinger, Finegan & Shamian, 2004). Job satisfaction is particularly important to the employee because it reflects a critical work outcome: feeling of fulfillment from the job and the work setting. Because of this, organizations have implemented a number of programs and techniques in an effort to increase employees’ satisfaction and commitment. These programmes take many forms. Some change the structure of work, others alter the methods of worker compensation, and still others offer innovative fringe benefit plans and packages. Some of these techniques are changes in job structure like job rotation, job enlargement, job enrichment, changes in pay structure like skill based pay/knowledge based pay, merit pay, gain sharing, profit sharing, flexible work schedule like flextime.

For an industrial organization, information and the consequences are extremely important. By discovering attitudes or factors related to the job, a firm can correct certain bad situations and thereby improve the job satisfaction of its staff. An industrial organization can benefit materially if it knows that individual attitudes contribute to job satisfaction. For one thing, applying this knowledge will result in better selection procedures. This is a broad implication as far as job satisfaction is concerned, and even though most industrial and big business organizations feel that it is not their problem, it nevertheless, exists. It is also directly related to vocational guidance, schools and colleges, public and private employment agencies, etc. Society as a whole must face it realistically.
Performance is what people actually do and it can be observed. Performance includes all those actions that are relevant to the goals and can be measured in terms of each individual's proficiency (Campbell et al., 1993). In other words, work performance is the degree to which an individual executes his or her role with reference to certain specified standards set by the organization (Nayyar, 1994). Job Performance is so important to industrial/organizational psychology that it is often simply referred to as “the criterion” (Dalal, 2005). The traditional view restricts the performance space to what Borman and Motowildo (1997) call task performance, that is, “the effectiveness with which job incumbents perform activities that contribute to the organization's technical core either by executing its technical processes or by maintaining and servicing its technical requirements”. Although it has long been recognized that job performance is multi-dimensional (Austin & Villanova, 1992), only during last three decades the research literature has (Borman & Motowildo, 1993, 1997; Campbell, 1990; Organ & Paine, 1999) acknowledged the role of employee work behaviors that fall outside rubric of task performance. Borman and Motowildo (1997) have reasoned that such behaviors are important because they “shape the organizational, social and psychological context that serves as the catalyst for task activities and processes”. Some researchers (Rotundo & Sackett, 2002; Sackett, 2002; Visvesvaran, 2000) have suggested that there are three broad performance domains: task performance, organizational citizenship behaviour (OCB), and counterproductive work behaviour (CWB) or withdrawal.
Job satisfaction and job performance are specific instances of more general constructs of positive feelings and personal effectiveness, and these have a causal impact on each other. There are many other factors that could potentially affect the job satisfaction-performance relationship. For example, the types of jobs that people perform. In fact, evidence suggests that job satisfaction might be more strongly related to job performance for individuals in complex jobs, such as managers, scientists, and engineers, than in the more structured jobs such as accounting and sales (Judge et al., 2001). Complex jobs, because they require creativity and ingenuity, might offer more opportunity for intrinsic reinforcement, and that may strengthen the connection between satisfaction and performance, in comparison to more routine jobs, where satisfaction may be more affected by the structure or the conditions of work, or extrinsic rewards.

The assumption that people will perform better because they are happier at work is not necessarily true, and Judge, Thoresen, Bono and Patton (2001) review seven potential models: 1) Job satisfaction causes job performance. This model represents the typical implicit perspective on satisfaction and performance. 2) Job performance cause job satisfaction. Attaining high levels of performance at work is likely to result in extrinsic and intrinsic rewards, thereby fostering positive job attitudes. 3) Satisfaction and performance cause each other. A combination of effects from the first and second models gives rise to a reciprocal relationship. 4) It is possible that there is no direct link between satisfaction and performance, with any observed correlation reflecting overlap with an unmeasured variable. 5) There may be no relationship between job satisfaction and performance at all. 6) The relationship between performance and satisfaction may be moderated by another variable. If an individual is satisfied in their job, but lacks some of the skills required to perform it, he or
she is unlikely to be productive. Job knowledge, skills, abilities and characteristics may moderate the relationship between satisfaction and performance. 7) Both satisfaction and performance could be re-conceptualized to provide a better understanding of the relationship e.g., job attitudes such as satisfaction and commitment might actually reflect affectively which in turn, may be related to some, but not all aspects of job performance.

The extent to which an employee is committed to the organization is often based on an exchange relationship between employer and employee. A purely economic exchange is one in which the organization promises “a day’s work for a day’s pay.” Intention to stay mirrors the employee’s level of commitment to his organization and the willingness to remain employed (Hewitt, 2004). It refers to as the propensity to leave, intent to quit, intent to stay, behavioral commitment and attachment (Halaby, 1986; Mueller et al., 1999). Several studies have revealed that this concept whether it was called ‘intent to stay’ or ‘propensity to leave’, it was clearly the most important determinant of turnover (Tett & Meyer, 1993; Igharia & Greenhaus, 1992). According to Steel and Ovalle (1984), Carsten and Spector (1987) and Iverson (1996) intention to stay had a strong negative relationship with turnover (−.50, −.47, −.57 respectively). Dalessio, Silverman and Schuck (1986) have emphasized that more concern should be given on intention to stay rather than turnover, as whenever an employee exit, an organization has to incur the cost of recruiting and maintaining another employee. Intention to stay however is simply the converse of the turnover intention (Kim, Price, Mueller & Watson, 1996). According to Mobley (1982); Steers and Mowday (1981); Black and Stevens (1989) intention to stay is
significantly negatively correlated with turnover. Since intention to stay is referred to as employees’ willingness to stay with an organization (Tett & Meyer, 1993), it consistently demonstrates a stronger relationship with turnover than did other turnover precursors (Tett & Meyer, 1993; Igharia & Greenhaus, 1992). Employees with high levels of intent to stay are nine times less likely to leave the organization.

Social exchange theory (SET) as foundation of intention to stay was developed by Thibaut and Kelley (1959), had explained the reasons why individuals had personal relationships with others (Thibaut & Kelley, 1959). The social exchange process generally involves a series of interdependent and contingent interactions between two parties resulting in certain types of obligations that may lead to a high-quality relationship (Blau, 1964; Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005). Social exchange theory further suggests that in order for relationships to continue, both parties in the relationship must feel that they are receiving something of value. This exemplifies a phenomenon known as the norm of reciprocity. As Gouldner (1960) suggested, if one party treats the other party well, the reciprocity norm compels the rewarded party to return the favor. Dedication and loyalty is often exchanged in an organizational context. This aspect of social exchange has been described as a social exchange relationship (Cropanzano, Byrne, Bobocel, & Rupp, 2003). Within a social exchange relationship, employees offer dedication and loyalty to the organization through reduced absenteeism and turnover along with heightened performance (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Employers, in return, provide dedication and loyalty not only by offering a salary and benefits, but also by demonstrating that they value, respect, and care for the well-being of their
employees. Thus, employers and employees navigate a two-way street of social exchange, on which both parties can be mutually rewarded. Rhoades, Eisenberger and Armeli (2001) examined the interrelationship among work experiences, perceived organizational support (POS), affective commitment (AC) and employee turnover. Results suggest that favourable work conditions operate via POS to increase, which, in turn, decreases employee withdrawal behavior.

Employee turnover is crucial to be investigated since it diminishes organization effectiveness and impedes the capacity to meet its goals. Employee turnover is proven to have a general negative impact on organizational effectiveness (Mueller et al., 1992) and reduces profitability (Johnson & Chang, 2006). These negative impacts include extensive financial costs, disruption of coworkers, additional work-unit stress, reduce in quality of work-unit and diminish of ability to adapt to uncertain environments. Firth, Mellor, Moore and Loquet (2004) define employee turnover as the individual who may be thinking about quitting a job. The theory of reasoned action suggested that intention was a psychological precursor to the actual behavior act (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980). This means that an individual's intention to perform or not to perform, a behavioral act, is the immediate determinant of action. Based on this notion an individual who nurtures the thought of quitting his present profession is more likely to do so if the right condition exists, or if the adverse condition that warranted the thought of intent persists (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980).

Employees also tend to form general beliefs regarding the extent to which their supervisors value their contributions and
show concern for their well-being (Kottke & Sharafinski, 1988). Like POS, perceived supervisor support (PSS) has been shown to be negatively related to employee turnover (Eisenberger, Stinglhamber, Vandenberge, Sucharski, & Rhoades, 2002). Building upon the significant relationships between both types of perceived support and employee turnover intentions, researchers have attempted to further identify the supporting mechanisms through which support affects turnover (Maertz et al., 2007). For example, studies have shown that the effects of PSS on turnover are fully mediated through POS (Eisenberger et al., 2002; Rhoades, Eisenberger, & Armeli, 2001). Likewise, research suggests that the effects of POS on turnover are mediated through affective commitment (Rhoades et al., 2001), job satisfaction (Allen et al., 2003), and normative commitment (Maertz et al., 2007). Dawley et al., (2010) hypothesized a model and confirm that PSS is a predictor of POS and that POS is a predictor of turnover intention. By testing two additional competing and theoretically derived nested models, findings indicate that job fit partially mediates the relationship between PSS and POS, and that personal sacrifice partially mediates the relationship between POS and turnover intention.

The use of archival data to study intention to stay did not always specify why employees left their employers. Records that included only technical information about employees' exit activity did not sufficiently discriminate between voluntary and involuntary terminations (Thompson & Terpening, 1983). If termination records were unclear, the results of studies based on these records also became unclear because involuntary turnover activity was not dependent upon employer affective determinations in the same way as voluntary turnover. As
intention to stay is accepted as the single best predictor of turnover, the effort has to be made to understand the relationship between this concept to other variables (Igharia & Greenhaus, 1992).

The Problem:

Behavioral scientists have devoted considerable degree of efforts to study the relationship between organizational commitment and different motivational and behavioral outcomes in organizational settings (e.g., Bandura, 1988; Wood & Bandura, 1989). Regarding the relationship between self-efficacy and performance in organizational settings, only a few studies were conducted. They revealed that self-efficacy was related to job search (Ellis & Taylor, 1983), research productivity of university faculty members (Taylor, Locke, Lee & Gist, 1984). Even though considering their limited number, these studies did not enhance much of the understanding of the behavioral correlates of self-efficacy and work related performance. In recent years (Cohen 2003; Morrow, 1993) several forms of commitment have been proposed, measured, and tested for their relationship with other important outcomes (e.g., job performance, job satisfaction and turnover.). Work commitment, occupational commitment, and career saliency are some of the constructs that have been investigated in few studies. Moreover these different forms of commitment may have overlapping or interactive relations with work related behaviour. Therefore, major objective of the present study is to take all the notions of organizational and occupational commitments together and treat in multivariate fashion. The assumption is that the constellations of different commitment forms are more
predictive of work outcomes than the individual commitment forms.

Further researches have demonstrated an impressive positive relationship between perceived organizational support (POS) which includes organizational commitment (Eisenberger, Fasol & Davis-La Mastro, 1990; Guzzo, 1994). But less attention has been paid to the mechanisms presumed to underlie the positive relationship between POS and work-related outcomes. Eisenberger et al., (1986) proposed that POS would increase performance by conveying to employees the organization's propensity to notice and reward increased performance. Consistent with this view, POS was found positively associated with expectancies of reward for greater effort (Eisenberger et al., 1990). POS was also assumed to serve as socio-emotional resource of university faculty members. POS was assumed to meet important socio-emotional needs in the workplace such as respect, caring and approval that affects work outcomes.

As work performance is a complex phenomenon it depends upon numerous factors. Numerous research studies have been conducted in which work performance was found to be associated with a number of factors (e.g., Lord & Hohenfeld, 1978; Lawler & Porter, 1967; Vroom, 1964; Schnake, 1991).

Though numerous studies have been conducted to examine independent role of self-efficacy, work-commitment and perceived organizational support with regard to the work outcomes. But there is paucity of studies or no corresponding literature exists describing their joint contribution or merit. Given this, the proposal for present study will be an attempt to examine
the relative contribution of self-efficacy, work commitment and perceived organizational support in work outcomes among skilled workers. Thus, problem of the study can be stated as:

SELF-EFFICACY, WORK COMMITMENT AND PERCEIVED ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT AS PREDICTORS OF WORK OUTCOMES

Objectives:

1. To study the relationship between self-efficacy and work outcomes.
2. To find the relationship between components of occupational commitment and work outcomes.
3. To find the relationship between components of organizational commitment and work outcomes.
4. To examine the relationship between perceived organizational support and work outcomes.
5. To examine the role of self-efficacy, work commitment and perceived organizational support in predicting work outcomes.
6. To examine the factorial structure of the measured variables.

Hypotheses:

1. Self-efficacy is likely to correlate positively with work outcomes.
2. Different components of occupational commitment are likely to correlate differently with work outcomes.
3. Different components of organizational commitment are likely to correlate differently with work outcomes.
4. Perceived organizational support would correlate positively with work outcomes.
5. Self-efficacy, work-commitment and perceived organizational support would contribute significantly in the prediction of work outcomes.

6. There is likelihood of overlapping factors among the measured variables.