



Organizational Commitment in Universities- A Comparison in Turkey

Gokhan Koca^{1*} and Vesile Ozcifci¹

¹Muhsin Celebi Mh. No: 14-1, Aksaray University, Aksaray, Turkey.

Authors' contributions

This work was carried out in collaboration between all authors. Author GK designed the study, wrote the protocol and supervised the work. Authors GK and VO carried out all laboratories work and performed the statistical analysis. Author VO managed the analyses of the study. Author GK wrote the first draft of the manuscript. Author GK managed the literature searches and edited the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Article Information

DOI: 10.9734/BJESBS/2015/10030

Editor(s):

(1) James P. Concannon, Faculty of Education, Westminster College, Fulton, Missouri, USA.

Reviewers:

(1) Aondoaver Ucho, Department of Psychology, Benue State University, Makurdi, Nigeria.

(2) Anonymous, Olabisi Onabanjo University, Ago Iwoye, Nigeria.

(3) Isara Tongsamai, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Songkhla Rajabhat University, Thailand.

(4) Anonymous, Botswana.

(5) Anonymous, National Centre of Public Administration, Greece.

(6) Cemalettin Ipek, Recep Tayyip Erdogan University, Faculty of Education, Turkey.

Complete Peer review History: <http://www.sciencedomain.org/review-history.php?id=817&id=21&aid=7103>

Original Research Article

Received 12th March 2014
Accepted 31st October 2014
Published 6th December 2014

ABSTRACT

Organizational commitment has become one of the most popular subjects of management studies in last decades. Identifying factors which affect organizational commitment is usually regarded as a fundamental step to attain success in organizations and particularly in universities. This study aims to identify and compare factors affecting the organizational commitment level of faculty members who are employed by Aksaray University (a new university in Turkey) and Çukurova University (an older University in Turkey). This is a preliminary study comparing two Turkish universities in terms of their faculty members' organizational commitment levels. A survey was carried out on 179 people from Aksaray University and 189 people from Çukurova University in the months March and April 2013. In both universities, diverse commitment patterns varying according to age, sex, position, marital status, work length and hometown have been disclosed. Further studies can deal with commitment profiles or with the relationship between attitudes and behaviors of teaching staff.

*Corresponding author: E-mail: gkoca68@hotmail.com;

Keywords: *Organizational commitment; affective commitment; continuance commitment; normative commitment.*

1. INTRODUCTION

Organizational commitment is usually regarded as one of the most indispensable phenomena of work life today. Expectations of workers and organizations convey a critical meaning for the policies of organization's future and quality of work. It is reasoned that if employees have a higher level of organizational commitment, they will be more fruitful in the organization [1].

It is envisaged that University faculty members frequently change their universities and institutes, transferring the intellectual assets of that institute consequently. Therefore universities may have difficulty in operating efficaciously if they are weak in maintaining organizational commitment of their teaching staff. Logically, determining factors that effect organizational commitment of them should be recognized as a fundamental step toward building an effectual University. In view of this rationale, this paper attempts to identify and compare the factors affecting the organizational commitment of faculty members in Aksaray University (new university) and Çukurova University (old University). Though there are numerous studies on the subject of organizational commitment; this study is expected to be the first comparing two universities in terms of faculties' organizational commitment levels. Additionally, this study is to become the first investigation conducted in these universities on such a theme. Thus, this study is distinctive and opportune for the preparing and determining the appropriate local policies. These policies can be spotted through analyzing reasons underlying faculties' preference to work in old or new universities.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Studies in organizational commitment show that demographic issues, leadership, job satisfaction and organizational justice are the factors that affect organizational commitment [2,3,4]. Survival of organizations is closely related with the reduction of turnover rates. For this purpose, various incentives are utilized by organizations such as promotion opportunities and salary increases [5,6,7].

According to Balay [8] and Çetin [5]; factors that affect the organizational commitment are;

- Age, gender, experience,
- Organizational justice, trust, job satisfaction,
- Role certainty, role conflict,
- Importance of the work, getting support,
- Participating into the decision making process, joining into the work,
- Job security,
- Marriage, the rights which have been provided after work,
- Working hours, desperation, daily routines,
- Promotion opportunities, salary and other workers,
- Leadership, other job opportunities, attention for workers.

2.1 Organizational Commitment

As studies over organizational commitment are very important for the analysis of organizational life [9], this subject is also essential for education and educational administration. Although studies about organizational commitment have been conducted since 1960s, organizational commitment has been used as a main subject in the studies since 1990s [2].

Organizational commitment is defined as the behavior of workers about the job and organizations [10]. To Reichers [11]; organizational commitment is identification of the employees with the aims of organization. In the relevant literature organizational commitment includes three elements [10,12,13,14]:

1. Strong trust and acceptance of organizational values and beliefs,
2. Giving enough energy to the organization
3. Commitment to the organization.

Meyer and Allen [2], divided this concept in three groups. These are:

2.1.1 Affective commitment

It has an emotional nature [15,16] and indicates that the emotional state of employees that encourages them to become involved in constructive activities lead them to enhance organizational values and goals [17,18]. People who have a strong affective commitment, stay at their organizations only because they really want to stay, not because of their needs [19,20,21].

2.1.2 Continuance commitment

It includes the extent of financial incentives available to individuals, for example, money, positive working conditions and promotions [12,22,23]. In this type of commitment, as a consequence of the fear of being laid off, fired or losing fringe benefits, employees identify themselves with their organizations and are involved in organizational activities [24,25,26].

2.1.3 Normative commitment

It consists of the extent to which workers gain psychological rewards that come from socialization experiences in the organization [27,28]. It refers to the ethical consideration in a social context that forces employees to remain within the organization [29,30,31]. In this case, motives do not include emotional attachment to the organization or fear of losing economical benefits, but rather moral obligations that force employees to identify themselves with their organizations [32,33,34].

As it is understood from what is mentioned above, if a person has an affective commitment s/he will stay with the organization because s/he really wants it. On the other hand, if a person has continuance commitment, s/he will stay with the organization because s/he needs it and if a person has a normative commitment s/he will stay with the organization because s/he feels obliged [35,36].

In the relevant literature, people who have a high organizational commitment provide more contribution for the organization [37,38]. According to Tan and Akhtar's [39] study, high levels of normative commitment result in a high level of emotional burnout. For example, in Mathieu and Zjack's study [40] organizational commitment helps to reduce the rates of quitting job. Mowaday, Lyman and Steers [12] assert that, demographic factors, job satisfaction and some social factors about working life directly affect organizational commitment. Boylu et al. [1] studied the organizational commitment of university teachers. They conducted an electronic survey and 4250 academicians from Gazi University joined that survey in the academic year 2005-2006. According to that study, academicians have a continuance commitment in their positions, and it is positively related with the working years.

2.2 Demographic Variables

In Oliver's study [41] he finds that, the difference between organizational commitment and demographic factors are weak, but the relationship between organizational commitment and rewards and value of job are strong. And also in Mathieu and Zajac's study [40] they found out that, marriage, salary, skills and leadership have a strong relationship with organizational commitment. Durna and Eren [21] conducted a survey with 322 teachers and officers working in the health sector in Niğde. According to their findings, age, gender and position in the organization have a positive impact on affective and normative commitment but they have no relationship with continuance commitment.

Kurşunoğlu, Bakay and Tanrıöğen [42] conducted a survey for their research. 353 school teachers in Izmir joined the survey; their findings couldn't display a difference between organizational commitment and seniority (length of service). These results support the findings of Williams and Hazer's [43] study. On the other hand, Allen and Meyer [44] asserts that, there is a positive relationship between working years and organizational commitment. As working years accrue, staff get more benefits (salary, promotion).

For the gender variable, male teachers are more affected by normative commitment than female teachers. But there is no consensus on gender variable in literature [29,40,45,46]. Boylu et al. [1] conducted a survey for their study. 366 faculty members in Gazi University joined the survey; their findings demonstrated that males scored higher than females in terms of affective commitment and this difference was statistically significant. To İnce and Gül [47], male staff have more commitment scores than female staff because females have more family responsibilities and they have obstacles in work. On the other hand McClurg [48] believes that, female staffs have higher commitment than male staffs. In terms of age variable, there is no relationship between normative and continuance commitment level and age but there is a significant relationship between affective commitment and age. This result also supports the Allen and Meyer's [49] findings. According to Balay [8] older staff have more commitment scores than younger staff because, they have a chance to get promotion, they don't have a chance to find new job and they have more experience in work. On the other hand, they have

some difficulties in technological innovations [50,51].

According to Özkaya, Kocakoç and Kara [52] married staffs are more sensitive to continue their job because of economic responsibilities. They conducted a survey for their investigation. 160 administrative staff joined the survey. According to their findings, married staffs have more normative commitment scores than others and it is statistically significant.

Hitherto, there has been no study comparing two universities in regard of organizational commitment in the relevant literature. This is the first study comparing faculty members of two universities in terms of organizational commitment level.

3. METHODS

Survey method is used in this study, and the survey was conducted between March and April 2013. 179 people from Aksaray University, 189 people from Çukurova University joined this survey. Before starting the study, the consent was taken from the university authorities and the participants. This study is exploratory in nature because it aims to analyze the demographic factors, which affect the commitment levels in two different universities. SPSS program was used for statistical analyses.

Research Question 1- What are the factor differences that affect the faculty members organizational commitment level in Aksaray University and Çukurova University?

3.1 Hypothesis

- H₁:** Organizational commitment levels are different among the male and female faculty members in Aksaray University and Çukurova University.
- H₂:** Age have an impact on the faculty members organizational commitment level in Aksaray University and Çukurova University.
- H₃:** Status have an impact on the faculty members organizational commitment level in Aksaray University and Çukurova University.
- H₄:** Marital Status have an impact on the faculty members organizational commitment level in Aksaray University and Çukurova University.
- H₅:** Seniority have an impact on the faculty members organizational commitment level

in Aksaray University and Çukurova University.

- H₆:** Hometown of the faculty members have an impact on the faculty members organizational commitment level in Aksaray University and Çukurova University.

3.2 Variables

- Gender (Male and female)
- Age (Peoples genetic ages when they filled the survey divided into five different groups, 25 years old and below, 26-35 years old, 36-45 years old, 46-55 years old and 55 and above.)
- Status (This variable analyzed into six different categories; research assistant, lecturer, instructor, assistant professor, associate professor and professor.
- Marital Status (This variable operationalized in three groups; married, single and divorced/separated)
- Working period
- Hometown (operationalized as people from the hometown in which the respective university is located [yes] and others [no])
- Organizational Commitment (operationalized as affective continuance and normative commitment). Allen and Mayer's survey questions, which were created in 1990, were used in this study. This survey contains total 23 questions with likert scale 1- Totally not agree.....5- Totally Agree.

3.3 Reliability of Measurement

In order to testing reliability of measurement, Cronbach Alfa scores were used in this study.

As seen in Table 1, Cronbach Alpha Scores are bigger than 0,60.

Table 1. Reliability of measurement

Measurement	University	Number	Cronbachalfa score
Affective Commitment	Aksaray	7	0.63
Continuance commitment	Çukurova		0.74
Continuance commitment	Aksaray	9	0.66
Continuance commitment	Çukurova		0.69
Continuance commitment	Aksaray	7	0.64
Continuance commitment	Çukurova		0.73

Variables were checked for the absence of multicollinearity. There were two methods available to test multicollinearity. The first method

was to check bivariate correlation coefficients between the variables. The second method was to run a collinearity diagnostic, which was available in SPSS linear regression analysis. The first method was employed in this study.

The data was also checked for (multivariate) outliers. To detect the multivariate outlier, one may regress the dependent variable on all independent variables with a request for Mahalanobis distance, which was available in SPSS linear regression analysis. A Mahalanobis distance of 15.0 and above can be considered a multivariate outlier.

3.4 Research Design

This study used a cross-sectional research design. The cross-sectional research design is the one that is most applied in the social sciences. It allows the identification of collected data measured at a single point in time on all proper variables. It also allows the researcher to identify relationships and correlation amongst numerous variables and it is also appropriate for studies on large groups of subjects [53]. These strengths made a cross sectional design suitable for this study. This study employed quantitative data collection and analysis methods.

3.5 Sampling

Although the survey aimed to collect data from all faculty members, we were able to reach 179 people in Aksaray University and 189 people in Çukurova University. Aksaray University was chosen for this study as a new university because it is the newest university in the territory. Çukurova University was chosen as an old university for this study because it is the oldest one in the territory except for the Universities in Ankara, İstanbul and İzmir. Therefore, these two universities were chosen for this study in order to make a good comparison.

Sampling size which represents the main population were calculated to the level of $e=0.1$ and $\alpha=0.1$ (%90 confidence level $Z=1.65$). Standard deviation and variance are not known therefore P x Q level accepted as 0,5x0,5 and the formula of sampling size was defined as $n=P*Q/(e/Z)^2$ [54]. To this formula for Aksaray University $n= 68$ and main population is bigger than %10 therefore $68/549 \geq 0.1$, for Çukurova University $n=68$ and main population is smaller than %10 therefore $68/1900 < 0.1$, therefore correction factor wasn't added. (Kurtuluş 1998,).

Accordingly sampling size for Aksaray University were calculated based on correction factor $549-68/549-1=0.88$; $n=0.88 \times 68=60$, for Çukurova University $n=68$.

3.6 Reliability

Reliability means that the results are reliable time after time, and that this can be explained by variables. The required data was obtained from the survey filled out by faculty members of two universities voluntarily. Surveys were mailed or handed out to all faculty members and only filled out by faculty members willing to join this study.

3.7 Validity

External validity refers to whether this study is applicable to other groups. This study has external validity to certain extent. The findings of the study can be applied to Aksaray and Çukurova Universities but it cannot be applied to the other organizations as each organization has different dynamics and characteristics. Lack of randomization was also a threat to the validity of the data collected. The information given in survey was provided on snapshot basis. Empirical validity means that the relationship and the implementation among the variables measured should be the same in the actual world. To enhance empirical validity, in this study a wide range of related variables was selected to increase the validity and compare the results. As the researcher examined the literature and looked at many dimensions of the study, it was understood that this study has content validity.

3.8 Limitations

This study is to be used only for the comparison of Aksaray University and Çukurova University.

3.9 Findings

Descriptive of the study

According to data 64 females (35.8%) and 115 males (64.8%) joined this survey from Aksaray University and 78 females (41.3%) and 111 males (58.7%) joined this survey from Çukurova University. Additionally, 33 (18.4%) research assistants, 49 (27.4%) lecturers, 7 (3.9%) instructors, 73 (40.8%) assistant professors, 12 (6.7%) associate professors and 5 (2.8%) full professors from Aksaray University and 90 (47.6%) research assistants, 17 (9%)

lecturers, 4 (2.1%) instructors, 21 (11.1%) assistant professors, 25 (13.2%) associate professors and 32 (16.9%) full professors from Çukurova University joined this study. Among those people, 133(74.3%) of them were married, while 46 (25.7%) of them were single in Aksaray University; and in Çukurova University, 111(58.7%) of the respondents were married, 73 (38.6%) of them were single and 5 (2.6%) of them were divorced/separated (Table 2).

In Table 3, while affective and continuance commitment wasn't found to vary statistically with the gender in Aksaray University but a statistically significant difference was found between normative commitment and gender and it is ($t=-1.699$, $p=0.091<0.1$). The same difference was also found to exist among Çukurova University' faculty members ($t=-1.616$, $p=0.008<0.1$). As seen in Table 3, males have higher normative commitment scores than females in both universities. According to these results, faculty members don't feel that they have to work for this organization.

As seen in Table 4, a new variable created with age variable and ANOVA test was employed. According to findings, there is a statistically significant difference between age and affective commitment ($F=3.906$, $p=0.005<0.1$). According to TUKEY test results, faculty members, whose ages are below 25 and between 46 and 55, scored higher affective commitment than others in Aksaray University. But there was no difference between continuance and normative commitments and age in Aksaray University.

A statistically significant difference was found between affective commitment and age ($F=1.997$, $p=0.097<0.1$), but no difference was found between continuance and normative commitments and age among faculty members of Çukurova University. Especially TUKEY test results displayed a high affective commitment score for faculty members who are older than 45. According to these findings, people who are below 25 years old are generally research assistants and they have some future expectations; thus, they are more idealistic.

Table 2. Descriptive of the data

Demographic Information		Aksaray University		Çukurova University	
		Number	%	Number	%
Sex	Female	64	35.8	78	41.3
	Male	115	64.2	111	58.7
Status	Research assistant	33	18.4	90	47.6
	Lecturer	49	27.4	17	9
	Instructor	7	3.9	4	2.1
	Assistant professor	73	4.8	21	11.1
	Associate professor	12	6.7	25	13.2
	Professor	5	2.8	32	16.9
Age	25 and below 25	8	4.5	17	9
	26-35	74	41.3	99	52.4
	36-45	80	44.7	40	21.2
	46-55	14	7.8	26	13.8
	55 and above 55	3	1.7	7	3.7
Marital status	Married	133	74.3	111	58.7
	Single	46	25.7	73	38.6
	Divorced/separated	0	0	5	2.6
Working years	Below 5 years	117	65.4	84	44.4
	6-10	20	11.2	25	13.2
	11-15	23	12.8	37	19.6
	16-20	10	5.6	21	11.1
	21-25	9	5	22	11.6
Hometown	Yes	46	25.7	97	51.3
	No	133	74.3	92	48.7

Table 3. Comparison between affective, continuance, normative commitment and sex

	University	Sex	N	Mean	Standard deviation	T	P
Affective commitment	Aksaray	Female	64	3.275	0.465	0.430	0.668
		Male	115	3.239	0.547		
	Çukurova	Female	78	3.584	0.465	-0.258	0.797
		Male	111	3.606	0.642		
Continuance commitment	Aksaray	Female	64	2.821	0.416	-1.537	0.126
		Male	115	2.913	0.364		
	Çukurova	Female	78	3.018	0.358	0.576	0.565
		Male	111	2.982	0.473		
Normative commitment	Aksaray	Female	64	2.721	0.317	-1.699	0.091
		Male	115	2.831	0.461		
	Çukurova	Female	78	2.764	0.317	-1.616	0.008
		Male	111	2.861	0.460		

Table 4. Comparison between affective, continuance, normative commitment and age

Organizational commitment types		Age	N	Mean	Standard deviation	F	p
Affective commitment	Aksaray	Below 25	8	3.661	0.458	3.906	0.005
		26-35	74	3.228	0.469		
		36-45	80	3.134	0.519		
		46-55	14	3.561	0.536		
		56 and +	3	3.095	0.787		
	Çukurova	Below 25	17	3.420	0.609	1.997	0.097
		26-35	99	3.529	0.605		
		36-45	40	3.682	0.487		
		46-55	26	3.758	0.483		
		56 and +	7	3.898	0.658		
Continuance commitment	Aksaray	Below 25	8	2.944	0.385	0.909	0.460
		26-35	74	2.836	0.425		
		36-45	80	2.894	0.341		
		46-55	14	3.024	0.296		
		56 and +	3	2.741	0.788		
	Çukurova	Below 25	17	3.045	0.432	1.030	0.393
		26-35	99	3.006	0.420		
		36-45	40	3.061	0.472		
		46-55	26	2.872	0.394		
		56 and +	7	2.857	0.388		
Normative commitment	Aksaray	Below 25	8	2.714	0.545	0.323	0.862
		26-35	74	2.770	0.395		
		36-45	80	2.800	0.447		
		46-55	14	2.878	0.316		
		56 and +	3	2.905	0.359		
	Çukurova	Below 25	17	2.908	0.404	0.274	0.895
		26-35	99	2.804	0.408		
		36-45	40	2.839	0.419		
		46-55	26	2.813	0.307		
		56 and +	7	2.776	0.718		

Because of this, they have high continuance commitment scores. People who are between 46-55 years old are generally Associated Professors and Professors.

As seen in Table 5; there was a statistically significant difference between continuance commitment and status in Aksaray University ($F=2.005$, $p=0.08<0.1$). According to TUKEY test

there was a different understanding between Professors and Research Assistants. But there was no difference between affective and normative commitments and status.

As seen in Table 5; there was a statistically significant difference between affective commitment ($F=3.322$, $p=0.007<0.1$), continuance commitment ($F=2.112$, $p=0.066<0.1$), normative commitment ($F=1.994$, $p=0.082<0.1$) and status in Çukurova University. TUKEY test results demonstrated the highest affective, continuance and normative commitment scores for full professors.

There is no difference between affective/continuance commitment and marital status but there was a statistically significant difference between normative commitment and marital status in Aksaray University ($t=2.123$, $p=0.035<0.1$). (Table 6).

As seen in Table 7, there is a significant difference between normative commitment and marital status in Çukurova University ($F=3.733$, $p=0.026<0.1$). According to TUKEY test results, married faculty members have more affective commitment scores than single ones therefore the difference exist.

Table 5. Comparison between faculty members' commitment level and status

Commitment types		Status	N	Mean	Standard deviation	F	p
Affective commitment	Aksaray	Research assistant	33	3.242	0.567	1.159	0.331
		Lecturer	49	3.297	0.558		
		Instructor	7	3.653	0.386		
		Assistant professor	73	3.188	0.414		
		Associate professor	12	3.274	0.698		
		Professor	5	3.200	0.02603		
	Çukurova	Research assistant	90	3.462	0.642	3.322	0.007
		Lecturer	17	3.622	0.569		
		Instructor	4	3.357	0.143		
		Assistant professor	21	3.565	0.441		
		Associate professor	25	3.783	0.280		
		Professor	32	3.871	0.544		
Continuance commitment	Aksaray	Research assistant	33	3.037	0.257	2.005	0.08
		Lecturer	49	2.869	0.442		
		Instructor	7	2.714	0.313		
		Assistant professor	73	2.840	0.375		
		Associate professor	12	2.935	0.400		
		Professor	5	2.644	0.487		
	Çukurova	Research assistant	90	3.019	0.419	2.112	0.066
		Lecturer	17	3.072	0.385		
		Instructor	4	3.389	0.111		
		Assistant professor	21	3.074	0.509		
		Associate professor	25	2.960	0.377		
		Professor	32	2.823	0.439		
Normative commitment	Aksaray	Research assistant	33	2.823	0.497	0.640	0.669
		Lecturer	49	2.799	0.451		
		Instructor	7	2.633	0.272		
		Assistant professor	73	2.771	0.345		
		Associate professor	12	2.941	0.536		
		Professor	5	2.686	0.396		
	Çukurova	Research assistant	90	2.826	0.389	1.994	0.082
		Lecturer	17	2.748	0.322		
		Instructor	4	2.964	0.071		
		Assistant professor	21	2.939	0.466		
		Associate professor	25	2.937	0.367		
		Professor	32	2.661	0.478		

A new variable was created by dividing working years variable into 5 groups. There was no difference with working years and any organizational commitment type among Aksaray University faculty members. On the other hand, there was a statistically significant difference with working years and affective commitment among Çukurova University faculty members ($F=3.826$, $p=0.005<0.1$). According to TUKEY test results, the difference existed for 6-10 and 21-25 of working years. 21-25 years workers had bigger affective commitment scores than 6-10 years workers, but there was no difference with

continuance and normative commitment (see Table 8).

As seen in Table 9 among the Aksaray University faculty members there was a difference between hometown variable and affective commitment and it was statistically significant ($t=1.987$, $p=0.048<0.1$), but there was no difference between continuance and normative commitment. Among the Çukurova University's faculty members there was no difference between any organizational commitment level and hometown.

Table 6. Comparison between organizational commitment level and marital status among faculty members of Aksaray University

Commitment level	Marital status	N	Mean	Standard deviation	T	P
Affective commitment	Married	133	3.265	0.505	0.575	0.566
	Single	46	3.214	0.558		
Continuance commitment	Married	133	2.879	0.392	0.029	0.977
	Single	46	2.882	0.365		
Normative commitment	Married	133	2.830	0.418	2.123	0.035
	Single	46	2.680	0.399		

Table 7. Comparison between organizational commitment level and marital status among faculty members of Çukurova University

Commitment level	Marital status	N	Mean	Standard deviation	F	P
Affective commitment	Married	111	3.664	0.552	1.861	0.158
	Single	73	3.505	0.607		
	Divorced/Separated	5	3.457	0.433		
Continuance commitment	Married	111	2.961	0.423	1.026	0.360
	Single	73	3.053	0.435		
	Divorced/Separated	5	2.978	0.454		
Normative commitment	Married	111	2.754	0.439	3.733	0.026
	Single	73	2.919	0.345		
	Divorced/Separated	5	2.857	0.349		

Table 8. Comparison between commitment types and working years

Commitment types	University	Working years	N	Mean	Standard deviation	F	P
Affective commitment	Aksaray	Less than 5 years	117	3.246	0.493	0.453	0.770
		6-10	20	3.214	0.599		
		11-15	23	3.236	0.461		
		16-20	10	3.243	0.599		
		21-25	9	3.476	0.735		
	Çukurova	Less than 5 years	84	3.468	0.579	3.826	0.005
		6-10	25	3.611	0.639		
		11-15	37	3.559	0.521		
		16-20	21	3.891	0.355		
		21-25	22	3.857	0.589		
Continuance commitment	Aksaray	Less than 5 years	117	2.856	0.414	1.303	0.271
		6-10	20	3.000	0.320		
		11-15	23	2.836	0.373		

Commitment types	University	Working years	N	Mean	Standard deviation	F	P
	Çukurova	16-20	10	3.067	0.223	1.353	0.252
		21-25	9	2.839	0.148		
		Less than 5 years	84	2.991	0.423		
		6-10	25	3.040	0.469		
		11-15	37	3.102	0.394		
		16-20	21	2.852	0.421		
		21-25	22	2.934	0.457		
Normative commitment	Aksaray	Less than 5 years	117	2.758	0.397	1.286	0,277
		6-10	20	2.750	0.385		
		11-15	23	2.863	0.482		
		16-20	10	2.886	0.379		
	Çukurova	21-25	9	3.032	0.570	0.551	0.699
		Less than 5 years	84	2.823	0.394		
		6-10	25	2.811	0.361		
		11-15	37	2.876	0.366		
		16-20	21	2.837	0.485		
		21-25	22	2.714	0.514		

Table 9. Comparison between commitment types and hometown

	University	Hometown	N	Mean	Standard deviation	T	P
Affective Commitment	Aksaray	Yes	46	3.382	0.533	1.987	0.048
		No	133	3.207	0.507		
	Çukurova	Yes	97	3.580	0.565	-0.413	0.680
		No	92	3.615	0.587		
Continuance Commitment	Aksaray	Yes	46	2.884	0.405	0.079	0.937
		No	133	2.879	0.379		
	Çukurova	Yes	97	3.003	0.433	0.209	0.834
		No	92	2.990	0.426		
Normative Commitment	Aksaray	Yes	46	2.773	0.489	-0.346	0.730
		No	133	2.798	0.392		
	Çukurova	Yes	97	2.856	0.405	1.202	0.231
		No	92	2.784	0.413		

4. CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

In order to be efficient, organizations have to find some methods to improve their members' motivations and commitments. This paper examines the faculty members' organizational (affective, continuance and normative) commitment level differences regarding the demographic characteristics of them for Aksaray University and Çukurova University. A statistically significant difference between age and affective commitment existed whereas there was no difference between continuance and normative commitments and age in Aksaray University. On the other hand, there was a statistically significant difference between affective commitment and age, while there was no difference between continuance and

normative commitments and age for the faculty members of Çukurova University. Especially faculty members', whose ages are below 25 and between 46 and 55, affective commitment scores were higher than others in Aksaray University. Exclusively, faculty members older than 55 scored highest, in terms of affective commitment, in Çukurova University.

In relevant literature; there are many studies exhibiting a meaningful difference between organizational commitment and age [40,45]. Angle and Perry assert that as the employees' age rise, their chance of finding an alternative job diminish and they also don't have a chance to get extra education opportunities [45]. Therefore, their organizational commitment scores increase. According to the results, there is a difference

between affective commitment and age, but there is no difference between continuance/normative commitment and age.

There is no difference between affective, continuance commitment and sex among Aksaray University' faculty members but there is a difference between normative commitment and sex, and it is statistically significant. The same difference also exists among the faculty members of Çukurova University. Males appear to have higher normative commitment scores than females in both universities. This result supports Kurşunoğlu et al. findings [42].

There is a statistically significant negative difference between continuance commitment and status, but no difference was found between affective/normative commitment and status in Aksaray University. While research assistants' scores emerge as the highest, the lowest scores belong to full Professors. As seen in Table 6, there is also a statically significant difference between affective commitment, continuance commitment, normative commitment and status among faculty members of Çukurova University.

Research assistants have the highest continuance commitment scores in contrast to full Professors who possess the lowest scores. High costs of quitting and seeking alternative job opportunities for research assistants can be viewed for these results. These findings support the outcomes of Boylu and his collaborators' study [1]. It is opined that associate professors have higher affective commitment scores because of their career expectations and Professors have higher affective commitment scores because of their flexible working conditions.

Professors' affective commitment scores are the highest ones in Çukurova University. According to these results, it can be said that, Professors who work for Çukurova University have an emotional bond with the University and they feel themselves as a part of their University. Moreover especially instructors consider that there are some difficulties quitting the job and finding a new job. According to these outcomes it can be inferred that instructors reckon that they have to stay in their organizations because of their future concerns.

In view of marital status, a statistically significant difference was found for normative commitment, but no difference for affective and continuance

commitment was detected in Aksaray University. The highest normative commitment scores were from married faculties. The same pattern can be observed in Çukurova University. These results support Özkaya et al. findings [50]. Married personnel reflect that, they have to stay within the organization because of their economic responsibilities.

No difference was traced between working years and organizational commitment type among faculty members Aksaray University. This result also supports the findings of Williams and Hazer's [43] and Kurşunoğlu et al. [42] studies. On the other hand, among Çukurova University academicians there is a meaningful difference between working years and affective commitment. This result supports the findings of Allen and Mayer [48]. They asserted that employees' chance to receive benefits (salary, promotion etc.) soars as working years increase.

There is a meaningful difference between affective commitment and faculty members' hometown, whereas there is no difference between continuance/normative commitment and faculty members' hometown in Aksaray University. Due to social and family concerns academicians whose hometown is Aksaray are expected to feel as a part of the organization. Findings of this study show that there is no difference with hometown variable and any organizational commitment type in Çukurova University. It can be asserted that coming from Adana (hometown of the University) has no effect on the feelings of belonging to the organization.

According to the findings, the most effective sources of organizational commitment level of faculty members are observed as future worries, carrier expectations and family. Generally, academicians from new universities prefer to work in big cities because of their abilities, on the other hand the ones in an old university try to change their university on account of career expectations. Identifying factors which effect faculties' organizational commitment level is particularly important for devising resourceful policy directions and practices. Additionally this study helps further new studies on this particular subject. This study compared organizational commitment level of faculty members in old and new universities, and it is supposed that these findings are to be deemed valuable by newly established universities.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

1. Boylu Y, Pelit E. ve Güçer E. Akademisyenlerin örgütsel bağlılık düzeyleri üzerine bir araştırma, Finans Politik & Ekonomik Yorumlar. 2007; 44(511):55-73.
2. Meyer JP, Allen NJ. Commitment in the Workplace: Theory, Research and Application. Thousands Oaks; 1997. CA: Sage.
3. Lok P, Crawford J. The Relationship between Commitment and Organizational Culture, Subculture, Leadership Style and Job Satisfaction in Organizational Change and Development. The Leadership & Organization Development Journal. 1999;20(7):365-374.
4. İşcan ÖF, Sayın U. Örgütsel Adalet, İş Tatmini ve Örgütsel Güven Arasındaki İlişki, Atatürk Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi, Cilt: 24, Sayı: 2010;4:195.
5. Çetin MÖ. Örgüt Kültürü ve Örgütsel Bağlılık, Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım; 2004.
6. Loke CF. Leadership behaviours: Effects on Job Satisfaction, Productivity and Organizational Commitment. Journal of Nurse Management. 2001;9(4):191-204.
7. Morris JH, Sherman D. Generalizability of an Organizational Commitment Model, Academy of Management Journal. 1981;24 (3):512-526.
8. Balay R. Yönetici ve Öğretmenlerde Örgütsel Bağlılık, Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım; 2000.
9. Dick G, Metcalfe B. Managerial Factors and Organisational Commitment – A Comparative Study of Police Officers and Civilian Staff, International Journal of Public Sector Management. 2001;14(2):111-129.
10. Kacmar KM, Carlson DS, Bymer RA. Antecedents and Consequences of Organizational Commitment: A Comparison of Two Scales. Educational and Psychological Measurement. 1999;59:976-994.
11. Reichers AE. A Review and Conceptualization of Organizational Commitment. Academy of Management Review. 1985;10:465-479.
12. Mowday RT, Lyman WP, Steers RM. Employee Organization Linkages: The Psychology of Commitment, Absenteeism, and Turnover. New York: Academic Press; 1982.
13. Ugurlu CT. İlköğretim Okulu, Öğretmenlerinin Örgütsel Bağlılık Düzeylerine Göre Yöneticilerin Etik Liderlik ve Örgütsel Adalet Davranışlarının Etkisi, (Yayımlanmamış Doktora Tezi), İnönü Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Malatya; 2009.
14. Bateman Thomas S, Stephen Strasser A. Longitudinal Analysis of the Antecedents of Organizational Commitment, Academy of Management Journal. 1984;27(1): 95-112.
15. Malhotra A, Majchrzak A, ve Rosen B. Leading virtual teams. Academy of Management Perspective. February. 2007;60-70.
16. Karahan A. Hastanelerde Liderlik ve Örgütsel Bağlılık Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi, Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi. 2008;10(1):145-162.
17. Tutar H. Erzurum'da Devlet ve Özel Hastanelerde Çalışan Sağlık Personelinin İşlem Adaleti, İş Tatmini ve Duygusal Bağlılık Durumlarının İncelenmesi, Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi, İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi. 2007;12;(3):97-120.
18. Hellman C, Mc Millan WL. Newcomer socialization and affective commitment, The Journal of Social Psychology. 1994;134(2):26-27.
19. Herscovitch L, Meyer JP. Commitment to Organizational Change: Extension of a three-component model. Journal of Applied Psychology. 2002;87(3):474-487.
20. Balcı A. Örgütsel Sosyalleşme Kuramı Strateji ve Taktikler, Ankara: Pegem A Yayıncılık; 2003.
21. Durna U, Eren V. Üç Bağlılık Unsuru Ekseninde Örgütsel Bağlılık. Doguş Üniversitesi Dergisi. 2005;6(2):210-219.
22. Poyraz K, Algılanan İş Güvenliğinin, İş Tatmini, Örgütsel Bağlılık ve İşten Ayrılma Niyeti Üzerindeki Etkilerinin İncelenmesi, Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi. 2008;(C.13, S.2 s):143-164.
23. Jenkins M, Thomlinson RP. Organizational commitment and job satisfaction as predictors of employee turnover intentions, Management Research News. 1992;15(10):18-22.

24. Bayram L. Yonetimde Yeni Bir Paradigma: Orgutsel Bağlılık", Sayıştay Dergisi, Ekim-Aralık. 2005;59:125-139. Ankara.
25. Tatlah IA, Sameed M, Ali Z. Leadership Behavior and Organizational Commitment: An Empirical Study of Educational Professionals, International Journal of Academic Research. 2012;3:2. March 2011.
26. David MAM. Factors Affecting the Organizational and Occupational Commitment of Lay Teachers of the RVM Schools in the Philippines, Doctoral Thesis. University of the Philippines; 1990.
27. Dick G, Metcalfe B. Managerial Factors and Organisational Commitment – A Comparative Study of Police Officers and Civilian Staff, International Journal of Public Sector Management. 2001;14(2):111-129.
28. Harrison JK, Hubbard R. Antecedents to organizational commitment among Mexican employees of a US firm in Mexico, The Journal of Social Psychology. 1998;138(5):609-623.
29. Dunham RB, Grube JA, Castaneda MB. Organizational Commitment: the Utility of an Integrative Definition. Journal of Applied Psychology. 1994;79(3):370-380.
30. Vroom VH. Work And Motivation, John Wiley and Sons Inc; 1967.
31. Gürpınar G. An emprical study of relationship among organizational justice, organizational commitment, leader-member exchange, and turnover intention (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi), Yeditepe Üniversitesi Graduate Institute of Social Sciences, İstanbul; 2006.
32. Allen NJ, Meyer JP. Affective, ontinuanace and Normative Commitment ot the Organization: An Examination of Construct Validity. Journal of Vocational Behaviour. 1996;49(3):252–276
33. Skarlicki DP, Folger R. Retaliation in the workplace: The roles of distributive, procedural and interaction justice, Journal of Applied Psychology. 1997;82:434-443.
34. Cropanzano R, Paddock J, Rupp DE, Bagger J, Baldwin A. How Regulatory Focus Impacts The Process-By-Outcome Interaction For Perceived Fairness And Emotions, Organizational Behavior And Human Decision Processes. 2008;105:36-51.
35. Bolat OI, Bolat T. Otel İşletmelerinde Orgutsel Bağlılık ve Orgutsel Vatandaslık Davranisi İlişkisi. Balıkesir Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi. 2008;11(19):75-94
36. İşcan ÖF, Sayın U. Ogütsel Adalet, İs Tatmini ve Orgutsel Guven Arasındaki İlişki", Atatürk Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi. 2010;24(4):2010 195.
37. Blau GJ. The Measurement and Prediction of Career Commitment, Journal of Occupational Psychology. 1985;58(4):277–288.
38. Ozturk P. An empirical study of relationship between organizational justice and organizational commitment in health care companies in İstanbul, (Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi), Marmara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul; 2008.
39. Tan DSK, Akhtar S. Organizational commitment and experienced burnout: Anexploratory studyfrom a Chinese cultural perspective. The International Journal of Organizational Analysis. 1998;6(4):310-333.
40. Mathieu JE, veZajac DM. A Review and Meta-Analysis of the Antecedents, Correlates and Consequences of Organizational Commitment. Psychological Bulletin. 1990;108(2):171-194.
41. Oliver N. Work Rewards, Work Values and Organizational Commitment in An Employee-owned Firm: Evidence From the U.K.. Human Relations. 1990;43(6):513-526.
42. Kursunoglu A, Bakay E, Tanriogen A; İlkogretim Okulu Öğretmenlerinin Orgutsel Bağlılık Düzeyleri. Pamukkale Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, Sayı 28, Temmuz. 2010;101-115.
43. Williams LJ, Hazer TJ. Antecedents and Consequences of Satisfaction and Commitment in Turnover Models: A Reanalysis Using Latent Variable Structural Equation Methods. Journal of Applied Psychology. 1986;22(1):219-31.
44. Allen NJ, Meyer JP. Organizational Commitment: Evidence of Career Stage Effects, Journal of Business Research. 1993;26:49-61.
45. Angle HL, ve Perry JL. An Empirical Assessment of Organizational Commitment and Organizational Effectiveness, Administrative Science Quarterly. 1981;26:1-14.
46. Williams LJ, Anderson SE. Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment as

- Predictors of Organizational Citizenship and in-role of Behaviours. Journal of Management. 1991;17(3):601-617.
47. Ince M, Gul H. Yonetimde Yeni Bir Paradigma: Örgütsel Bağlılık. Cizgi Kitabevi Yayınları; 2005.
48. Mcclurg LN. Organizational commitment in the temporary-help service Industry. Journal of Applied Management Studies. 1999;8(1):5-26.
49. Allen NJ, Meyer JP. The Measurement and Antecedents of Affective, Continuance and Normative Commitment to Organizations. Journal of Occupational Psychology. 1990;63;1-18.
50. Cakınberk A, Demirel ET. Örgütsel Bağlılığın Belirleyicisi Olarak Liderlik: Sağlık Çalışanları Örneği, Selçuk Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi. 2010;24.
51. Ozkaya MO, Kocakoc ID, Kara E. Yöneticilerin Örgütsel Bağlılıkları ve Demografik Özellikleri Arasındaki İlişkileri İncelemeye Yönelik Bir Alan Çalışması, Yönetim ve Ekonomi. 2006;13:2.
52. Decotiis TA, Summers TP. A path analysis of a model of the Antecedents and Consequences of Organizational Commitment. Human Relations. 1987; 40(7):445-470.
53. Nachmisa CF, Nachmias D. Research Method in the Social Science. Worth Publishers; 2008.
54. Kurtulus K, Pazarlama Araştırmaları İU. İşletme Fakültesi No: 274, İstanbul; 1998.

© 2015 Koca and Ozciftci; This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Peer-review history:

The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:

<http://www.sciencedomain.org/review-history.php?iid=817&id=21&aid=7103>