

A study of relationship between job satisfaction and organizational performance among employees working in Himachal Pradesh University Shimla

Varun Saini

Ph.D. Research Scholar, Department of Commerce, HP University, Summer Hill, Shimla, Himachal Pradesh, India

Abstract

This study assesses the relationship between job satisfaction and performance. After statistical analyses it has been found that this latter relationship is weak, but public agencies are underrepresented in these studies. The relationship between satisfaction and performance is actually much stronger in employees working in Himachal Pradesh University, especially when job satisfaction is broadly defined and organizational performance, rather than the outcome of individual interest. Several hypotheses have been analyzed about the factors that affect job satisfaction and employee turnover. To test the hypotheses of this cross-sectional study, data set consisting of 400 employees working in different branches, on different positions in HPU Shimla. But 376 respondents reply in required manner and others were not able to perform as per the requirement. The results of the study show that job satisfaction declined and this decline dampened what would have been a sharp increase in employee's performance. Weakening job satisfaction and employee commitment to stay in HPU Shimla strengthening organizational performance over time. Thus, results obtained confirm that satisfaction plays a strong, seminal role in the overall sustained performance of employees and it also increases their ability to retain in HPU Shimla. These findings raise important implications for HPU management.

Keywords: employees working, HPU, job, organizational

Introduction

Over the past 40 years, Himachal Pradesh University has undergone a period of radical change. This period of rapid change is well-documented and has been analyzed by the various employees working in this organization. Ironically, what is missing from this scholarly inquiry is good empirical work that takes into account the across-time dimension of the problem and focuses on the implications for government performance. At the time of establishment Himachal Govt. adopted two modes for employee recruitment, i.e. one on daily basis and other on regular basis. A daily basis employee has to complete a long period of nine years to become a regular employee. There is a huge difference exist between financial benefits for both the class of employees. So it is quite obvious that both classes have different level of satisfaction and commitment towards HP University. So it necessary to study and do reforms to remove this kind problems after a regular interval of time. This study explores the research questions described below – principally, how have the tides of reform affected university employee job satisfaction and performance, the relationship between these constructs, and employee intentions to remain in the organization?

Conventional wisdom suggests that job satisfaction is an important barometer in work organizations. But on the other hand, previous research indicates that it is not strongly related to job performance. Yet, job satisfaction may be related to other factors that affect performance, and it may be related to the overall sustained success of the organization (Rucci, Kirn & Quinn, 1998; Kim, 2005) ^[45, 25]. Both job satisfaction and performance are multi-dimensional constructs, and some of their sub-dimensions may be more strongly related than the parent constructs (Boyne, 2003; Rainey, 2003) ^[6, 42]. Such alternative specifications of the satisfaction-performance

linkage seem particularly plausible in the public sector. The present investigation is also a little effort in this direction.

Important Variables

Job Satisfaction, Commitment to Stay, and Organizational Performance

Job satisfaction is one of the most investigated concepts in the social and behavioral sciences. Various research results on this topic resolved some important and enduring questions that continue to puzzle researchers in a variety of organizations. A full blown review of literature about this concept is beyond the scope of this study, but most theoretical and empirical work differs fundamentally from organizations to organizations.

Job satisfaction is defined as “the extent to which people like (satisfaction) or dislike (dissatisfaction) their jobs” (Spector, 1997) ^[49]. This definition suggests job satisfaction is an affective reaction that individuals hold about their job. Most scholars recognize that job satisfaction is a global concept comprised of various facets such as employee satisfaction with pay, supervisor, and co-workers (Judge *et al.* 2001a; Rainey, 2003) ^[20, 42]. Kinicki *et al.* (2002) ^[26], in their meta-analytic showed that job characteristics, role states, group and organizational characteristics, and leader relations are generally considered to be antecedents of job satisfaction and motivation, while citizenship behaviors, withdrawal cognitions, withdrawal behaviors, and job performance are generally considered to be consequences of job satisfaction. This helps to clarify another long-running controversy in the literature: researchers have sometimes encountered problems in specifying causal paths and determining their true direction. These studies generally find that the relationship between job satisfaction and performance is weak (Iaffaldano and Muchinsky, 1985; Judge *et al.*, 2001b; but see Petty, McGee,

and Cavender, 1984)^[17, 21].

Although strongly related to job satisfaction, organizational commitment (OC) is a distinct concept that relates to an employee's desire to remain with an organization out of a sense of loyalty, emotional attachment, and financial need (Meyer, Allen, and Smith, 1993)^[35]. Organizational commitment can be defined as the relative strength of an individual's identification with and involvement in a particular organization (Porter and Smith, 1970). It can be characterized by at least three related factors: (1) a strong belief in and acceptance of the organization's goals and values; (2) a willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization; and (3) a strong desire to maintain membership in the organization (Mowday, Steers, and Porter, 1979). Angle and Perry (1981)^[2] identified value commitment, which reflects a commitment to support organizational goals, and commitment to stay, which reflects a desire to retain organizational membership. Related to Mowday, Steers, and Porter's third factor – a strong desire to maintain membership in the organization – and Angle and Perry's commitment to stay, this study also focuses on employees' commitment to stay in the university service. Empirical results support the importance of affective commitment in public organizations (Liou and Nyhan, 1994; Romzek, 1989; 1990)^[32, 44], but few studies have specifically focused on employees' commitment to stay in jobs.

Organizational performance is a socially, subjective, and complex constructed phenomenon that is hard to measure in the public sector (Au, 1996; Anspach, 1991)^[4, 31]. A review of the literature on organizational performance in the public sector reveals that several theoretical studies strive for comprehensiveness and importance of performance (Rainey and Steinbauer, 1999; Cohen, 1993; Wolf, 1993; Hedley, 1998 and others)^[43, 10, 51, 16]. Some studies focus on performance measurement and monitoring (Hatry and Wholey, 1992; Hatry, 1999; Kopczynski and Lombardo, 1999)^[15, 14, 27]. An increasing number of studies are trying to define and measure organizational performance in gov't. organizations. Brewer and Selden (2000)^[48] operationalized organizational performance using the theoretical dimensions of internal and external efficiency, effectiveness, and fairness. Chun and Rainey (2005)^[9] introduced four dimensions of organizational performance: managerial effectiveness, customer service orientation, productivity, and work quality. Andrews, Boyne, and Walker (2005)^[1] suggested two measures of organizational performance – customer satisfaction and a composite indicator that covers a set of six dimensions. Customer satisfaction measures the percentage of citizens satisfied with the overall service provided by their authority, and the composite indicator covers six dimensions of performance – quantity of outputs, quality of outputs, efficiency, outcomes, value for money, and consumer satisfaction with individual services. Job satisfaction is more prominent and is more strongly related to organizational performance. Previous researches show that the link between job satisfaction and individual performance is higher among senior workers in more complex jobs. Research on the determinants of satisfaction suggests that it may be sensitive to issues such as participation (+), bureaucrat bashing (-), and reforms (mixed), all of which are prominent issues in the contemporary public sector environment. Job satisfaction is positively correlated with organizational commitment, job involvement, motivation, organizational citizenship behavior, life satisfaction, mental health, and job performance. It is

negatively related to turnover, absenteeism, and perceived stress (Judge *et al.* 2001a; Kreitner and Kinicki, 2001; Spector, 1997)^[20, 28, 49]. Thus, this study assumes that job satisfaction and commitment to stay are positively related to each other. On the relationship between commitment to stay and organizational performance, research has found that highly committed employees may perform better than less committed ones (Mowday, Porter, and Dubin, 1974). Larson and Fukami (1984) also found that higher levels of organizational commitment are linked to higher levels of job performance. Especially, affective commitment correlated positively with the performance of lower-level managers in a large food service company (Meyer *et al.*, 1989)^[36]. Therefore, we assume that university employee's commitment to stay is positively related with organizational performance.

Data and Methods

The present study is an attempt to identify the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational performance among employees working in Himachal Pradesh University. Personal variables include (i) Educational qualifications (ii) Age (iii) Gender (iv) supervisory status (v) work experience. Variables of job satisfaction and organizational performance has been shown as in Table 1:-

The research questions has been raised and tested by using data collected from employees working in HPU Shimla.

Table 1

Dimensions of job satisfaction	Dimensions of organizational performance
Satisfaction with work. (1,-strongly disagree to 5- strongly agree)	Quality of coworkers and their work. (1- poor to 5- outstanding)
Pay satisfaction. (1,-strongly disagree to 5- strongly agree)	Utilizing employees' knowledge, skills, and abilities. (1,-strongly disagree to 5- strongly agree)
Satisfied with supervisor. (1,-strongly disagree to 5- strongly agree)	Quality of incoming employees. (1- poor to 5- outstanding)
Commitment to stay. (1,-strongly disagree to 5- strongly agree)	Fair promotions. (1- no extent, to 5- to a very great extent).
Recommend government employment. (1,-strongly disagree to 5- strongly agree)	Fair awards. (1- no extent, to 5- to a very great extent).
Meaningfulness of work. (1,-strongly disagree to 5- strongly agree)	Fair training. (1- no extent, to 5- to a very great extent).
Cooperation and teamwork. (1,-strongly disagree to 5- strongly agree)	
Sufficient training. (1,-strongly disagree to 5- strongly agree)	
Retaliation. (1,-strongly disagree to 5- strongly agree)	

Reliability of questionnaire

The first item, quality of coworkers and their work, and the third item, quality of incoming employees has been scaled from 1, poor, to 5, outstanding. The second item is based on a scale ranging from 1, strongly disagree, to 5, strongly agree. The last three items – fair promotions, awards and training – use a five-point-scale that ranges from 1, to no extent, to 5, to a very great extent. These items provide a broad assessment of perceived

organizational performance. The Alpha reliability coefficient of dimensions of the construct is of 0.72.

The variables “job satisfaction” and “commitment to stay” are of particular interest in this study. They appear as both independent and dependent variables in our models. Thus, study assesses university employees’ job satisfaction, pay satisfaction, and satisfaction with their supervisor. The responses ranges from 1, strongly disagree, to 5, strongly agree. We reversed the responses to obtain a measure of employees’ commitment to stay in the university. The reversed response categories are yes for staying and no for leaving. Measure of “meaningfulness of work” is a question asking respondents if the work they do (on their jobs) is meaningful to them. This item can be related to task motivation. The related concept of “recommend government employment”, “cooperation & teamwork” “sufficient training” has been rated on the responses for these items range from 1, strongly disagree, to 5, strongly agree. To measure “retaliation,” respondents were asked to making disclosures concerning health and safety dangers, unlawful behavior, and/or fraud, waste, and abuse; exercising any appeal, complaint, or grievance right, equal opportunity, or appeal rights, or refusing to obey an unlawful order. ‘Yes’ responses to these items were summed. The Cronbach’s alpha for this variable is a pleasing 0.97.

Findings

In this section, variables are tested in multivariate models constructed from the overlapping literatures on job satisfaction, commitment to stay, and organizational performance. Table 2 shows the respondents’ background characteristics – their age, education, gender, supervisory status, and work experience.

Table 2: Background of Respondents

Demographic Variables	Characteristics	Sample (N=376)
Age	Under 20	20
	20-30	110
	30-40	98
	40-50	108
	50-60	50
Education	Matric	90
	10+2	58
	Graduate	118
	Post graduate	120
	professional degree	70
Gender	Male	200
	Female	176
Supervisory status	Non-supervisor	250
	Supervisor	126
Work experience	0-10	90
	10-20	170
	20-30	98
	30-40	18

Table 3 reports the result of the multiple-regression analysis predicting job satisfaction. The adjusted multiple coefficient of determination is 0.50, meaning that the independent variables

together account for 50 percent of the variation in employees’ perceptions of job satisfaction. The results are highly significant, providing confidence at the 0.001 level.

Table 3: Predicting Job Satisfaction

Variables	Unstandardized Coefficient	Standard Error	Standardized Coefficient
Age	0.01*	0.01	0.01
Education	-.01***	0.00	-0.02
Gender	-.06***	0.01	-0.03
Supervisory Status	0.02*	0.01	0.01
Work Experience	0.00	0.00	0.00
Pay Satisfaction	0.11***	0.00	0.14
Satisfaction with Supervisor	0.13***	0.01	0.16
Commitment to Stay	0.29***	0.01	0.11
Recommend Government Employment	0.15***	0.01	0.18
Meaningfulness of Work	0.42***	0.01	0.38
Cooperation & Teamwork	0.08***	0.01	0.10
Sufficient Training	0.09***	0.01	0.10
Retaliations	-0.04***	0.01	-0.08
Constant	-0.07	0.05	
R ² = 0.50			
Adjusted R ² = 0.50			
F value = 138.71***			
N = 376			
*p = 0.05; **p = 0.01; ***p = 0.001			

The individual factors affecting employees’ job satisfaction are discussed next. Examination of the standardized coefficients reveals that “meaningfulness of work” (0.38) exerts the strongest influence on job satisfaction, followed by “recommend government employment” (0.18). This result may reflect that “satisfaction with supervisor” (0.16) exerts more influence on job satisfaction than “pay satisfaction” (0.14). Higher levels of education have a negative impact on job satisfaction, and women seem to be associated with lower levels of job satisfaction than men.

Table 4 presents the estimated coefficients and significance levels for a maximum likelihood logistic regression model predicting employees’ commitment to stay in their jobs. R² ranges from 0.16 - 0.27 – which suggests a modest explanation. All variables have a significant effect on employee’s commitment to stay, all attaining statistical significance at the 0.01 level or more. All variables except age, supervisory status have a positive influence on employees’ commitment to stay. Importantly, all three satisfaction variables, job satisfaction, pay satisfaction, and satisfaction with supervisor, show a positive and significant impact on employees’ commitment to stay.

Table 4: Model for Commitment to Stay

Variables	B	Standard Error
Age	0.16***	(0.02)
Education	-0.21***	(0.01)
Gender	0.21***	(0.04)
Supervisory Status	-0.21***	(0.05)
Work Experience	0.15***	(0.01)
Job Satisfaction	0.54***	(0.02)
Pay Satisfaction	0.19***	(0.02)
Satisfaction with Supervisor	0.13***	(0.02)
Meaningfulness of Work	0.07**	(0.02)
Cooperation & Teamwork	0.07***	(0.02)
Sufficient Training	0.05**	(0.02)
Constant	0.09	0.07
Log likelihood -9115.42 Model chi-squared 367.81***		
Correctly Predicted 84% (Four measures) 0.16 - 0.27 N = 376		
*p = 0.05; **p = 0.01; ***p = 0.001		

Table 5 reports the results of multiple-regression analysis predicting organizational performance in university employees. The adjusted multiple coefficient of determination is 0.50, meaning that the independent variables together account for approximately half of the variation in organizational performance. The equation achieves statistical significance at the 0.001 level. All coefficients show significance at the 0.001 level as well.

Table 5: Predicting Organizational Performance

Variables	Unstandardized Coefficient	Standard Error	Standardized Coefficient
Age	-0.19***	0.03	-0.05
Education	0.24***	0.02	0.09
Gender	0.60***	0.06	0.07
Supervisory Status	0.81***	0.06	0.08
Work Experience	-0.09***	0.02	-0.04
Job Satisfaction	0.69***	0.04	0.16
Pay Satisfaction	0.55***	0.02	0.15
Satisfaction with Supervisor	0.86***	0.03	0.24
Commitment to Stay	0.30***	0.08	0.03
Recommend Government Employment	0.17***	0.03	0.04
Meaningfulness of Work	0.41***	0.04	0.08
Cooperation & Teamwork	0.77***	0.03	0.20
Sufficient Training	0.74***	0.03	0.18
Constant	3.76***	0.03	
R ² = 0.50			
Adjusted R ² = 0.50			
F value = 914.68***			
N = 376			
*p = 0.05; **p = 0.01; ***p = 0.001			

Next, we examine the standardized coefficients to judge the relative importance of each factor that affects organizational performance. Examination of the standardized coefficients reveals that “satisfaction with supervisor” (0.24) has the strongest influence on organizational performance, followed by “cooperation and teamwork” (0.20). Satisfaction with supervisor is the most influential factor, compared with job satisfaction and pay satisfaction. The relationship between job

satisfaction and organizational performance is still controversial (Kim, 2005) [25], although these results provide some clarification. In this analysis, we find that “job satisfaction” (0.16) alone has a positive, significant, and considerable effect on organizational performance. “Commitment to stay” (0.03) shows the weakest positive influence on organizational performance. Unlike the job satisfaction model, “meaningfulness of work” (0.08) and “recommend government employment” (0.04) do not have large effects. Among the demographic variables, age (-0.05) and work experience (-0.04) have negative and significant effects on organizational performance.

Conclusion

This study makes several noteworthy contributions to the university management. Results of the study showed that the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational performance is weak. We hypothesized that the relationship would be stronger in the govt. organizations. Job satisfaction has a positive, significant, and considerable effect on organizational performance. Kellough and Osuna, 1995; Lewis and Park, 1989; Selden and Moynihan, 2000 [22, 30, 48], have focused on employees’ commitment and intention to stay in the university service. This study provides some evidence on the factors that influence employees’ commitment to stay, and also shows that such commitment is related to organizational performance.

Limitations of this study

1. Measure of organizational performance may be measures by using better standardized devise.
 2. Perceptual measures of organizational performance do not provide more objective measures, and such measures are not available elsewhere for the time period of interest.
 3. Acknowledge that we cannot make causal attributions with this research design. Future research should continue to build evidence and try to cement these important causal relationships.
- Future research should include both subjective and more objective measures of organizational performance, and continue to examine the relationship between them. University management would doubtless agree that employee job satisfaction and commitment to stay in the university are important goals of university management. Most would probably also agree that attaining these goals is linked to organizational performance and effectiveness. This study shows that policy-makers and university management can reverse these effects and improve university performance by nurturing employees’ job satisfaction and commitment to stay in the service. This appears to be a healthy situation for every organization.

References

1. Andrews R, Boyne GAKJ Meier LJ, O’Toole Jr, Walker RM. Representative Bureaucracy, Organizational Strategy, and Public Service Performance: An Empirical Analysis of English Local Government. *Journal of Public Administration Research & Theory*. 2005; 15(4):489-504.
2. Angle HL, Perry JL. An Empirical Assessment of Organizational Commitment and Organizational Effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*. 1981; 26:1-13.

3. Anspach RR. Everyday Methods for Assessing Organizational Effectiveness. *Social Problems*. 1991; 38:1-19.
4. Au C. Rethinking Organizational Effectiveness: Theoretical and Methodological Issues in the Study of Organizational Effectiveness for Social Welfare Organizations.” *Administration in Social Work*. 1996; 20:1-21.
5. Bollar SL. The Impact of Organizational Culture on Employee Work Attitudes, Readiness for Change, and Organizational Performance. Ph.D. dissertation, Georgia Institute of Technology. 1996.
6. Boyne GA. Sources of Public Service Improvement: A Critical Review and Research Agenda. *Journal of Public Administration Research & Theory*. 2003; 13(3):367-394.
7. Brewer GA. In the Eye of the Storm: Frontline Supervisors and Federal Agency Performance. *Journal of Public Administration Research & Theory*. 2005; 15(4):505-527.
8. Brewer GA, Selden SC. Whistle-blowers in the Federal Civil Service: New Evidence of the Public Service Ethic. *Journal of Public Administration Research & Theory* 1998; 8(3):413-439.
9. Chun YH, Rainey HG. Goal Ambiguity and Organizational Performance in U.S. Federal Agencies. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 2005; 15(4):529-557.
10. Cohen S. Defining and Measuring Effectiveness in Public Management. *Public Productivity and Management Review* 1993; 17(1):53-89.
11. Delaney JT, Huselid MA. The Impact of Human Resource Management Practices on Perceptions of Organizational Performance. *Academy of Management Journal*. 1996; 39(4):949-969.
12. Dollinger MJ, Golden PA. Interorganizational and Collective Strategies in Small Firms: Environmental Effects and Performance. *Journal of Management*. 1992; 18(4):695-715.
13. Frederickson HG. Public Administration and Social Equity. *Public Administration Review* 1990; 50:228-237.
14. Hatry HP. ed., Mini-Symposium on Intergovernmental Comparative Performance Data. *Public Administration Review*. 1999; 59(5):101-134.
15. Hatry HP, Wholey JS. The Case for Performance Monitoring. *Public Administration Review*. 1992; 52(5):604-610.
16. Hedley TP. Measuring Public Sector Effectiveness Using Private Sector Methods. *Public Productivity and Management Review*. 1998; 21:251-258.
17. Iaffaldano MT, Muchinsky PM. Job Satisfaction and Job Performance: A Meta-Analysis. *Psychological Bulletin* 1985; 97(2):251-273.
18. Ingraham PW, Joyce PG, Donahue AD. *Government Performance: Why Management Matters*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press. 2003.
19. Jennings ET, Ewalt JAG. Inter organizational Coordination, Administrative Consolidation, and Policy Performance. *Public Administration Review* 1998; 58(5):417-428.
20. Judge TA, Parker S, Colbert AE, Heller D, Ilies R. “Job satisfaction: A Cross-Cultural Review.” In N. Anderson, D.S. Ones, H.K. Sinangil, and C. Viswesvaran, eds., *Handbook of Industrial, Work and Organizational Psychology*, 2001a; 2:25-52. London: Sage.
21. Judge TA, Thoreson CJ, Bono JE, Patton GK. The Job Satisfaction-Job Performance Relationship: A Qualitative and Quantitative Review. *Psychological Bulletin*. 2001b; 127(3):376-407.
22. Kellough JE, Osuna W. Cross-Agency Comparisons of Quit Rates in the Federal Service: Another Look at the Evidence. *Review of Public Personnel Administration* 1995; 15(4):58-68.
23. Kettl DF, DiIulio JJ. *Inside the Reinvention Machine: Appraising Governmental Reform*. Washington, DC: Brookings. 1995.
24. Kettl DF *et al.*, *Civil Service Reform: Building a Government That works*. Washington D.C.: Brookings. 1996.
25. Kim S. Individual-Level Factors and Organizational Performance in Government Organizations. *Journal of Public Administration Research & Theory*. 2005; 15(2):245-261.
26. Kinicki AJ, McKee-Ryan FM, Schriesheim CA, Carson KP. Assessing the Construct Validity of the Job Descriptive Index: A Review and Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 2002; 87(1):14-32.
27. Kopczynski M, Lombardo M. Comparative Performance Measurement: Insights and Lessons Learned from a Consortium Effort. *Public Administration Review*. 1999; 59(2):124-134.
28. Kreitner R, Kinicki A. *Organizational Behavior*, 5th ed. Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill. 2001.
29. Lewis GB. Turnover and the Quiet Crisis in the Federal Civil Service. *Public Administration Review*. 1991; 51(2):145-155.
30. Lewis GB, Park K. Turnover in Federal White Collar Employment: Are Women More Likely to Quit than Men? *American Review of Public Administration*. 1989; 18(1):13-28.
31. Light PC. *The Troubled State of the Federal Public Service*. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution. 2002.
32. Liou K, Nyhan RC. Dimensions of Organizational Commitment in the Public Sector: An Empirical Assessment. *Public Administration Quarterly*. 1994; 18:99-118.
33. McCracken MJ, McIlwain TF, Fottler MD. “Measuring Organizational Performance in the Hospital Industry: An Exploratory Comparison of Objective and Subjective Methods. *Health Services Management Research*. 2001; 14:211-219.
34. Meyer JP, Allen NJ. A Three-Component Conceptualization of Organizational Commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*. 1991; 1(1):61-89.
35. Meyer JP, Allen NJ, Smith CA. Commitment to Organizations and Occupations: Extension and Rest of a Three Component Conceptualization. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 1993; 78:4:538-551.
36. Meyer JP, Paunonen SV, Gellatly IR, Goffn RD, Jackson DN. Organizational Commitment and Job Performance: It’s the Nature of the Commitment that Counts. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 1989; 74(1):152-56.
37. Osborne D, Gaebler T. *Reinventing Government*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley. 1992.

38. Parhizgari AM, Gilbert GR. Measures of Organizational Effectiveness: Private and Public Sector Performance. *Omega: The International Journal of Management Science*. 2004; 32(3):221-29.
39. Pearce JAI, Robbins DK, Robinson Jr RB. The Impact of Grand Strategy and Planning Formality on Financial Performance. *Strategic Management Journal*. 1987; 8(2):125-34.
40. Popovich MG, ed., *Creating High-Performance Government Organization*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. 1998.
41. Powell TC. Organizational Alignment as Competitive Advantage. *Strategic Management Journal*. 1992; 13(2):119-34.
42. Rainey HG. *Understanding and Managing Public Organizations*, 3d ed. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. 2003.
43. Rainey HG, Steinbauer P. Galloping Elephants: Developing Elements of a Theory of Effective Government Organizations. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*. 1999; 9(1):1-32.
44. Romzek BS. Personal Consequences of Employee Commitment. *Academy of Management Journal*. 1989; 32(3):649-61.
45. Rucci Anthony J, Steven P Kirn, Richard T Quinn, "The Employee-Customer Profit Chain at Sears. *Harvard Business Review*. 1998; 20(2):83-97.
46. Schafritz JM, Russell EW. *Introducing Public Administration*, 3rd ed. New York: Longman. 2003.
47. Selden SC, Brewer GA, Brudney JL. Reconciling Competing Values in Public Administration: Understanding the Administrative Role Concept. *Administration and Society*. 1999; 31(3):171-204.
48. Selden SC, Moynihan DP. A Model of Voluntary Turnover in State Government. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 2000; 20(2):63-74.
49. Spector PE. *Job Satisfaction*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board, 2003. *The Federal Workforce for the Twentieth Century: Results of the Merit Principles Survey 2000*. Washington, DC. 1997.
50. Walker RM, Boyne GA. *Public Management Reform and Organizational Performance: An Empirical Assessment of the UK Labour Government's Public Service Improvement Strategy*. Working Paper. Center for Local and Regional Government Research, Cardiff University. 2004.
51. Wolf PJ. A Case Survey of Bureaucratic Effectiveness in U.S. Cabinet Agencies: Preliminary Results. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*. 1993; 3:161-81.
52. Wooldridge JM. *Introductory Econometrics: A Modern Approach*, 2nd ed. Cincinnati, OH: South-Western College. 2003.
53. Youndt MA, Snell SA, Dean JW, Lepak DP. Human Resource Management, Manufacturing Strategy, and Firm Performance. *Academy of Management Journal*. 1996; 39(4):836-66.