

**THE EFFECT OF ORGANIZATIONAL
COMMITMENT ON THE SOCIAL
EXCHANGE AND ORGANIZATIONAL
SOCIALIZATION: A STUDY IN
RESEARCH AND PRACTICE
HOSPITAL OF KOCAELI UNIVERSITY**



Kafkas University
Economics and Administrative
Sciences Faculty
KAUJEASF
Vol. 7, Issue 12, 2016
ISSN: 1309 – 4289
E – ISSN: 2149-9136

Article Submission Date: 28.02.2016

Accepted Date: 13.03.2016

İhsan YİĞİT
Assistant Professor
Marmara University
Faculty of Business
Administration
ihsanyigit@gmail.com

ABSTRACT | In this study, the effect of organizational commitment variable on social exchange and organizational socialization was examined. According to social exchange, concrete rewards such as money and other benefits make employees spend extra effort and not to leave their organizations. Organizational socialization process shows the changes in certain attitudes and beliefs of an individual in organizational commitment. According to the findings, affective commitment factor has a positive effect on institution-duty factor, education factor and work-colleague factor of organizational socialization. According to this result, it is possible to say that when the level of organizational commitment increases, social exchange level of Kocaeli University employees also increases.

Keywords: Organizational commitment, social exchange, organizational socialization.

Jel Codes: D23, M19

Type: Research

DOI: 10.9775/kauibfd.2016.002

Cite this Paper: YİĞİT, İ. (2016) "The Effect of Organizational Commitment on the Social Exchange and Organizational Socialization: A Study in Research and Practice Hospital of Kocaeli University" *KAUJEASF* 7(12), 25-50.

**ÖRGÜTSEL BAĞLILIĞIN SOSYAL
DEĞİŞİM VE ÖRGÜTSEL
SOSYALİZASYON ÜZERİNDEKİ
ETKİSİ: KOCAELİ ÜNİVERSİTESİ
ARAŞTIRMA VE UYGULAMA
HASTANESİNDE BİR ARAŞTIRMA**



Kafkas Üniversitesi
İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler
Fakültesi
KAÜİİBFD
Cilt. 7, Sayı 12, 2016
ISSN: 1309 – 4289
E – ISSN: 2149-9136

Makale Gönderim Tarihi: 28.02.2016 *Yayına Kabul Tarihi: 13.03.2016*

İhsan YİĞİT
Yrd. Doç. Dr.
Marmara Üniversitesi
İşletme Fakültesi
ihsanyigit@gmail.com

ÖZ | Bu çalışmada örgütsel bağlılığın sosyal değişim ve örgütsel sosyalizasyon üzerindeki etkisi incelenmiştir. Sosyal değişim teorisine göre para ve diğer ödüller çalışanların örgütlerinden ayrılmamasına daha fazla performans göstermesine katkı sağlayabilmektedir. Örgütsel Sosyalizasyon süreci bireylerin davranış ve inançlarında değişime ve örgütsel bağlılığa neden olabilmektedir. Bulgulara göre duygusal bağlılık faktörü, örgütsel sosyalizasyonun alt boyutlarından kurumsal görev, eğitim ve iş arkadaşları faktörleri üzerinde pozitif etkisi vardır. Araştırmanın bulgularına göre Kocaeli üniversitesi çalışanlarının örgütsel bağlılık düzeyleri artarken sosyal değişim seviyesi artmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Örgütsel bağlılık, örgütsel değişim, örgütsel sosyalizasyon

Jel Kodu: D23, M19

Türü: Araştırma

Atıfta bulunmak için: YİĞİT, İ. (2016) “Örgütsel Bağlılığın Sosyal Değişim ve Örgütsel Sosyalizasyon Üzerindeki Etkisi: Kocaeli Üniversitesi Araştırma ve Uygulama Hastanesinde Bir Araştırma” *KAÜİİBFD* 7(12), 25-50.

1. INTRODUCTION

This research aims to study the relationship among organizational socialization, organizational commitment and social exchange. Socialization is a process of learning the functions entailed by a role (Parsons, 1951). Organizational socialization is defined as a process which individuals acquire new knowledge related to their prior or future studies and adapt themselves with emerging new situations (Ashfort and others, 2007). Louis (1980) describes this concept as a process of acquiring knowledge and adaptation of an individual who recently joined to an organization.

Mowday and his colleagues developed a perspective about organizational commitment. This perspective has been carefully investigated so far. This approach shows the importance of the employee's affective connection with the organization. This viewpoint claims that there are three factors typical to organizational commitment. These are (a) "believing in and accepting the organization's objectives and values strongly; (b) a wanting to exert effort important enough on behalf of the organization; and (c) a strong feeling of willing to keep on being a member in the organization" (Mowday and others, 1979; La Mastro, 1999). Such things like payment that encourages employees and extra benefits supplementing employees' salary and such socio emotional benefits like respect, approval, and caring increase organizational commitment. According to social exchange, concrete rewards such as money and other benefits make employees spend extra effort and not to leave their organizations (Eisenberger and others, 1986; Armeli and others, 1998). The norm of reciprocity is one of the causes of exchange process, which holds that the receiving benefits makes the employee obliged to pay the donor back (Armeli and others, 1998).

There are no studies about these three variables- social exchange, organizational commitment and organizational commitment in the literature. However there are many studies intended for the relationship of any two variables in both Turkish and foreign literature.

Regarding the relationship between organizational commitment and organizational exchange, the analyses showed that economic exchange approach is a variable that has a negative effect on committing to the organization. Organizational support perception has a conditional variable role in the effect of economic exchange approach on organizational commitment (Goktepe, 2012). Relationships based on social exchange approach can have beneficial effects for the organizations. Psychological contract found such evidences in the studies related to perceived organizational support that support social exchange approach and the norm of reciprocity predictions (Panaccio and

Venderberghe, 2009). These studies show that employees have more positive attitudes against positive corporate behaviours and their performances are higher (Eisenberger and others, 1987).

Considering the literature, the difference of this study is as below. First of all, there is no research about Kocaeli Medical School Hospital in Turkish literature. Also, correlation and regression analysis were applied for the relationships stated but no control variables were used for controlling the effect of independent variables on the dependent variables. Such variables as age, working time in the profession and working time in the current organization will be used to control the relationship stated in this study. This study will deal with the question about if perceived organizational commitment has an effect on organizational commitment and social exchange factors or not. If so, the direction of this relationship, its scope, details and conditions will be introduced as a basic research question. Therefore, organizational socialization will be discussed in the first section of the study. In the second section organizational commitment and in the third section social exchange will be discussed. In the fourth section of the study, expressing direction of the relationships specified and conditions, the hypotheses will be stated. Next, the methodology of the research will be explained and the findings will be presented. Finally, the findings and theoretical framework will be reviewed and the results, suggestions and discussion sections will be written.

2. ORGANIZATIONAL SOCIALIZATION

While sociologists consider socialization as a learning process (O'Sullivan, 1997), Porter and his friends (1981) stated that socialization is an individual's harmony with group standards. Organizational socialization is such a process that starts before an individual enrolls in an organization and continues to intensify after the enrolment. Socialization does not end at this point. It resumes when the individual changes his job, gets a promotion or joins to another organization (Porter, Lawler and Hackman, 1975). It is clearly understood in the related literature that organizational socialization is based on the individual's harmony with organization and that harmony is handled in two ways: learning process of organizational values and behaviours by the individual (Chatman 1991) and teaching process of adaptation which is provided by the organization (Schein 1975).

Taormina (1998) expresses organizational socialization as a four-dimensional structure: training, understanding company policies and operations, support of colleagues and future designs of the organization. Ashfort and others (2007) classify it in four dimensions: organizational socialization tactics, proactive behaviour, socialization process and socialization outputs.

The socialization of a new member of the organization and his/her adaptation process take place in various stages. These stages were classified in different ways by the researchers. Feldmans (1976a, 1976b) divides these stages into three as creating expectations, acceptance and reconciliation and determining a role. 3-stage socialization model of Schein (1978) is based on mutual recognition. Wanous (1980) classifies socialization in 4 stages: uncertainty, solution of conflicts, clarification of roles and organizational adaptation, and job satisfaction. Furthermore, Kartal (2007) listed phases of organizational socialization as pre-socialization, selection, placement, on-job training, communication and interaction with the friends and business groups, test and lapse.

On the other hand, there are different classifications in the literature related to organizational socialization tactics expressed as formal efforts carried out by the organization towards adaptation of members (Ashfort and others, 2007). Organizational socialization tactics developed by Van Maanen and Schein were used by many researchers in various ways, so it is understood that its constructive validity has been proved. The classification consists of 6 different tactics as follows (Ergün and Taşgit, 2011):

- Serial socialization tactics: It includes creating key step series related to development steps.
- Collective socialization tactics: It includes applications of grouping newcomers and treating them to a common learning experience set.
- Investiture socialization tactics for reconstruction: It includes recreation of value perception, attitude and behaviour pattern for newcomers.
- Sequential socialization tactics: It consists of implementation phases that takes place within a program for socialization.
- Fixed socialization tactics: These tactics include descriptions related to steps to be taken for socialization.
- Formal socialization tactics: These tactics contains a training-development program designed in the institutional sense to tutor employees.

3. ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT

Organizational commitment, its dimensions and its relations with similar principles have been an important subject for researchers. Desiring to spend time together, be a member of a group and getting voluntary tasks and sense of responsibility are some outcomes of commitment in social and personal relations. Job satisfaction results in increase in performance, decrease in turnover, cooperation between employees and effective group work (Uyguç and Çımrın, 2004; Koç, 2009). Also organizational commitment can be defined as a dynamic process among staff, organization and environment. If employees feel

themselves as a part of the institution, this will increase the level of commitment (Liou, 2008).

Organizational commitment is generally defined as accepting and believing in organizational aims by employees, willingness to give more effort for their organization and decision to remain a member of the organization. However, writers do not agree with the definition of organizational commitment as a result of the variety of models related to the structure of organizational commitment and different backgrounds of the writers (Çekmecelioğlu, 2006; Uygur, 2007).

Continuance and affective commitment have been studied more than normative commitment. *Affective Commitment*: It is an employee sentimental connection, belongingness and participation in the organization. Affective commitment is composed by emotional attachment, belongingness and involving in the organization as found by Meyer and Allen (Meyer and Allen, 1984). Some other researchers (Dunham and others, 1994) define it as an individual's belongingness and sentimental affection with organization and its aims. It is told by these researchers and Meyer and Allen that affective commitment is emotional affection with the organization and its aims and to be willing to stay with the organization as found by (Akpınar and others, 2013; Allen and Meyer, 1990).

Continuance Commitment: It is based on the idea that leaving the organization has some costs (Meyer and Allen, 1984). An employee wants to continue work in the organization owing to the inter-employee relationships and associations and other non-transferable funds and investments such as allowance and retirement fund or retirement remuneration (Reichers, 1985).

Affective, continuance, and normative commitment are related with different dimensions of the same phenomenon. While affective commitment refers to the employees' identification with, involvement in, and emotional attachment to the organization, continuance commitment refers to the employees' recognition of the costs related to leaving the organization. On the other hand, normative commitment refers to the employees' sense of loyalty or moral obligation toward the organization (Allen and Meyer, 1990; Akpınar and Tas, 2013). However, these dimensions may be different types of commitment rather than dimensions of the same construct. As affective, continuance, and normative commitment are different in concept, they predict different behaviors (Solinger and others, 2008).

Most empirical research have been influenced by Etzioni and Kanter's approaches because acceptable and right commitment scales developed by Penley and Gould (1988) and Meyer and Allen (1991) can be obtained for both

(Bussing, 2002). Penley and Gould defined moral, calculative and alienative commitment (1988) subsequent to Etzioni's idea. Moral and alienative commitments are the affective type and calculative commitment is the instrumental type. The characteristics of moral commitment are accepting and identification with organisational goals. Calculative commitment is defined as the employee's receiving stimulation to match his/her contributions. Alienative commitment is a negative sense of strong attachment to organisation. Employees do not desire much to meet organisational needs but continue to be a part of the organisation despite the deficit in rewards for efforts.

4. SOCIAL EXCHANGE

Employee-organization relationship as an exchange relation can be expressed as a both social and economic change (Tsui and others, 1997). According to Blau social exchange is voluntary behaviours individuals get motivated through feedbacks they hope to get. According to the theory, an individual does others a favour expecting similar favours in future. It is impossible to predetermine the nature of social exchange theory. Thus, social exchange focuses on long-term exchange of favours. Also it is based on fulfilling the mutually obligated things. Additionally, an economic exchange is based on a formal contract agreed on the real amounts that are subject to exchanging (Whitener and others, 1998). One of the principles of social exchange is that relationships are developed by trust, commitment and mutual responsibilities. Each party has to obey the rules of the exchange (Cropanzano and Mitchell, 2005).

According to social exchange theory, individuals do not know when and how their helps and suggestions will affect them. Individuals believe that they will be rewarded only for the benefits they provide (Blau, 2009). Yet there is an uncertainty. Employees may not be rewarded or this reward may not be enough. However, such exchange has importance in forming trust and commitment (Molm and others, 2000). The disappearance of this uncertainty is directly proportional to the development of relationship in the course of time. Relations begin by exchanging partially low-valued benefits. As long as parties trust in each other these relations continue by exchanging high-valued benefits (Whitener and others, 1998).

Some meaning to emotions through general notions like sentiment, comparison level, and intrinsic attraction were attributed by classic exchange theorists. However, emotions were less important and under theorized (Lawler, 2001). On the other hand, emotion as a related phenomenon to exchange theory has diminished farther into the background in the last 30 years partly because of Emerson's seminal theoretical work (1981). He developed and presented the

operant reinforcement foundation for exchange in details and made social structures (networks) the main problem but in the process he made emotions epiphenomenal or unrelated like in the work of Thibaut and Kelley. Emotional aspects of exchange were regarded more important in their early work than in their later process of developing theory, where the more central issue was cognition (Kelley and Thibaut, 1978).

5. HYPOTHESES OF THE RESEARCH AND THE RELATIONSHIP AMONG ORGANIZATIONAL SOCIALIZATION, ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT AND SOCIAL EXCHANGE

5.1. The Relationship between Organizational Socialization and Organizational Commitment

One of the organizational socialization indicators is organizational commitment (Wanous, 1980:198). Although organizational commitment, which is one of the employees' work-related attitudes, has been a subject studied widely, there are diverse definitions made by various different writers. According to Becker (1960), commitment results from incorporating a series of consistent behaviours into interests not directly related to these behaviours. Porter and his friends (1974) define commitment as an identifying oneself with the organization and his/her power of willing to participate in the activities of the organization. This kind of commitment can generally be described with three main factors as follows a) binding tightly to the goals and objectives of the organization and recognizing them b) willingness to make considerable efforts on behalf of the organization and c) having a strong desire to sustain organizational membership.

The main purpose of organizational socialization is to instigate the employee an active member of the organization (Can 1999). While a successful socialization of an individual increases organizational commitment, harmony and success rate (Balci 2000), joining of the individual to the organization to start a career and his/her progress in this career depend on the socialization program implemented by organizations and individual's success of this program (Can and others. 2001). Not only socialization enables employees to have organizational commitment it also eases their adaptation to organizational values, rules, norms, methods and social relationships (Hellriegel and others. 1998). Failure of an employee to socialize may lead the employee to leave the organization and this situation causes harm to both the employee and the organization (Balci, 2000).

Wanous (1980:171) emphasized on socialization psychology which expresses internal commitment to organization to comply with organizational

practice. Socialization psychology shows the changes in certain attitudes and beliefs of an individual in organizational commitment. In this regard, there is a need to understand how people's attitudes change. This occurs in two ways: (1) providing a status and (2) health factors (wages, working conditions, etc.). Based on these explanations, the first hypothesis of the study is constructed as follows.

H1: Organizational Commitment has a positive effect on organizational socialization.

5.2. The relationship of Organizational Commitment and Social Exchange

Employees are likely to feel obliged to care about the organization's success because of perceived organization support so that their affective commitment to the organization can increase. Also, with the satisfaction of social emotional needs like affiliation and emotional support (Eisenberger and others, 2001), a stronger identification with the organization that improves their affective organizational commitment is felt by employees (Armeli and others, 1998).

Getting involved in an exchange with the same actor again and again despite the availability of alternative exchange partners is described as behavioural commitment (Molm and others, 2000). Normative commitment and continuance commitment are the types of behaviour commitment in organizational literature. Feeling of being obliged to work in the organization is normative commitment while continuance commitment is defined as knowledge of the fact that leaving the organization makes employees lose something". Coming after as a result of behavioural commitment principles, normative commitment and continuance commitment are set up owing to the power structures in organizations. Individuals feel obliged to continue their work in the organization due to the continual exchanges. Individuals may also behave in a particular way to stay with the organization and in their present role because of the negative costs that may be caused by trying to find positions somewhere else (Meyer and Allen, 1991).

H2: Organizational commitment of employees has a positive effect on organizational exchange in favour of the organization.

6. RESEARCH METHOD

6.1. The aim and significance of the research

The aim of the study is to state the effect of organizational commitment of the employees in Kocaeli University Hospital on organizational exchange

and organizational socialization. In addition, it is expected to be observed whether the perspectives of employees in Kocaeli University Hospital about organizational commitment, organizational socialization and social exchange differ according to some social and demographic characteristics. Furthermore, the significance of this study is that it is the first study on organizational commitment, organizational socialization and social exchange levels of health workers all together in an organization.

6.2. Universe and Sample

Personnel of Kocaeli University Hospital Medical doctors, including nurses, medical secretaries, office staff and biomedical technicians were surveyed using a paper-and-pencil questionnaire that contained the study measures. All these personnel were informed that their participation was voluntary and that individual responses would remain confidential. Questionnaires were sent to 1166 personnel. 270 questionnaires were returned to the researchers representing a response rate of 23.15 percent.

The sample gender rate was 37.1 percent male and 62.9 percent female. 65.8 percent of the sample was married. The demographic and job-context (job status and occupational) characteristics in our sample approximated the proportions observed in the overall organization.

6.3. Variables of the Research

The questionnaire consists of 4 different parts towards measuring organizational commitment, social exchange, organizational socialization and socio-demographic data. The variables and measurement methods are as follows:

6.3.1. Organizational Commitment

In this paper, "Meyer and Allen's three-dimensional Organizational Commitment Scale" which consists of a questionnaire containing 18 questions was used. Organizational commitment validity analysis of the scale was carried out by Wasti (2000) in Turkey. The same scale was used in Göktepe (2012) and its Croanbach alpha value was found out to be above 0.95. The expressions were measured by 6-grading system ranging from "never agree" (1) to "certainly agree" (6).

6.3.2. Social Exchange

Social Exchange Measure is a scale of 8 statements used by Shore and his friends in their study of "Social and Economic Exchange: Construct Development and Validation" published in "Journal of Applied Psychology" in 2006. This scale was used in Goktepe (2012) and the Croanbach alpha value

was 0.96. The expressions were measured by 6-grading system ranging from “never agree” (1) to “certainly agree” (6).

6.3.3. Organizational Socialization

Mael and Ashforth’s (1992) Organizational Identification questionnaire that is widely used in the literature and considered to measure organizational identification better was applied for organizational socialization. The expressions were measured by 6-grading system ranging from “never agree” (1) to “certainly agree” (6).

6.3.4. Socio-Demographic variables

The third section of the questionnaire includes demographic variables. Ages of the employees, working times in the organization and professional working time were asked as open-ended questions.

7. FINDINGS

7.1. Reliability of the Research

The scales of the study and Cronbach alpha values to determine the reliability of the study are presented in Table 1. As the 10th, 13th and 18th questions were omitted because of sample qualification criterion problem as it impairs the factor reliability for organizational socialization scale. Likewise, the 2nd, 4th and 18th questions are omitted because of deficiencies for the factor reliability for organizational commitment scale. After omitting the questions, factor analyses and reliability analyses are reapplied and the values shown in Table 1 are obtained. Thus, the reliability of the study is considered to be satisfactorily high.

Table 1. Cronbach Alfa Values related to the inventories used in the study

Inventory		Exposition of the factor (%)	Cronbach Alfa
Organizational Socialization	Questionnaire 1		0.88
	Factor 1	19.998	0.88
	Factor 2	15.890	0.79
	Factor 3	13.250	0.78
	Factor 4	12.926	0.77
Organizational Commitment	Questionnaire 2		0.88
	Factor 1	43.742	0.93
	Factor 2	17.390	0.71
Social Exchange	Questionnaire 3		0.89
	Factor 1	55.047	0.89

7.2. Factor Analyses

In this study, factor analysis was applied for organizational socialization, organizational commitment and social exchange measures as more precise calculations are preferred and how the factors for health workers will be is questioned.

KMO value of organizational socialization, organizational commitment and social exchange, which measures the three aforementioned concepts, is found to be 0.888, 0.923 and 0.89 respectively. In addition, Bartlett's test p-value less than 0.05 shows that the data studied as a precondition research is suitable for factor analysis. This information is given in Table 2.

Table 2. KMO and Barlett's Test Results

KMO and Bartlett's Test		Questionairre 1	Questionairre 2	Questionairre 3
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		0.888	0.923	0.895
Approx. Chi-Square		1980.863	2150.956	959.985
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Df	136	105	28
	Sig.	.000	.000	.000

7.2.1. Organizational Socialization

According to the factor analysis, explanatory power of the factors is 62.064 % and organizational socialization consists of four factors. The reliability of each factor is assessed by Cronbach's alpha value. The 10th, 13th and 18th questions are omitted due to the impairments of factor reliability. As a result of factor analysis repeated, four factors are obtained.

The reliability coefficient (Cronbach's alpha) is found to be at least 0.7. Accordingly, the factors, the questions omitted, the alpha values of each factor, mean, standard deviation and explanatory level of each question are presented in table 3.

Table 3. Organizational Socialization

Qu.N	Question	Ave.	Std. D.	Factor loading			
Factor 1: Institution-Education, Explanatory power of variance:%19.998, Croanbach Alfa:0.888							
q.12	This organization presents opportunities for promotion available to almost everyone.	2,3216	1,5502	,832	,097	,102	,054
q.16	In this institution, I can easily foresee my expectations about the promotion.	2,3262	1,4391	,781	,053	,237	,006
q.8	I'm pleased with the awards at this institution.	1,8905	1,1814	,776	,006	,042	,125
q.4	This institution gives many chances and opportunities to make a good career.	2,5830	1,5214	,753	,097	,154	,278
q.9	This company offers excellent training to improve job skills of their employees.	2,1131	1,2122	,696	,093	,082	,375
q.17	This organization gives employees a very effective training.	2,3592	1,3283	,678	,182	,203	,367
Factor 2: Institution-duty, Explanatory power of variance :%15.890, Croanbach Alfa:0.79							
q.14	I have a good knowledge about how this institution operates.	4,0500	1,4459	,193	,767	,123	,093
q.2	I know well how to run a business in this institution.	4,6254	1,3077	,000	,766	,115	,229
q.6	I know all my duties in this organization.	4,4613	1,4567	,025	,696	,246	,134
q.19	My relationship with other employees in the organization is very good.	4,4858	1,3075	-,036	,695	,322	,049
q.20	I think this organization would employ me for many years.	4,1095	1,5705	,281	,685	,104	-,243
Factor 3: Colleagues, Explanatory power of variance :%13.250, Croanbach Alfa:0.78							
q.7	My colleagues often help me and share their suggestions.	4,1655	1,43557	,089	,240	,770	,052
q.15	My colleagues helped me by showing a great interest for adapting this institution.	3,8333	1,56379	,230	,213	,738	,035
q.3	Other employees helped me in several ways.	3,8456	1,38809	,233	,107	,714	,182
q.11	Most of my colleagues accepted me as a member of this institution.	4,3887	1,46259	,065	,487	,639	,013
Factor 4: Education, Explanatory power of variance:%12.926, Croanbach Alfa:0.77							
q.1	I received a perfect education related to my job in this institution.	2,6879	1,58343	,313	,057	,076	,839
q.5	The education I received in this institution let me to do my job very well.	2,9395	1,56064	,398	,189	,155	,695
The questions omitted							
q.18	The goals of this institution are understood by almost all employees.						
q.10	The goals were set very clearly.						
q.13	The instructions given by my superior helped me to do my work better.						

7.2.2. Organizational Commitment

According to the factor analysing, the explanatory power of factors is 61.132 % and organizational commitment consists of two factors. The reliability of each factor is assessed by Cronbach's alpha. As a result of anti-image correlation test results, the questions impairing the factor reliability are omitted from the analysis. After omitting the 4th, 2nd and 18th questions, factor analysis

and reliability analysis are repeated. The reliability coefficient (Cronbach's alpha) is found to be at least 0.7. Accordingly, the factors, the omitted questions, the alpha value of each factor, the mean, the standard deviation and the explanatory level of each question are presented in table 4.

Table 4. Organizational Commitment

No	Question	Mean	St. D.	Factor loading	
Factor 1: Affective Commitment, Explanatory power of variance, Cronbach Alfa: 0.93					
q.10	I feel sincerely committed to my institution.	3,5324	1,65336	,883	,054
q.1	I am happy to spend the rest of my career at this institution.	3,5409	1,60555	,848	,094
q.15	I feel myself like I belong to this institution.	3,3584	1,61173	,847	,041
q.14	My organization deserves my loyalty.	3,4368	1,68985	,835	,039
q.17	I would not leave my work now because I feel that I have obligations to other employees.	3,3069	1,73301	,806	,132
q.8	I owe a lot to my institution.	3,3262	1,68074	,794	,197
q.11	Working in this organization means a lot for me.	3,6761	1,71276	,791	-,086
q.7	I feel myself as "a member of the family" in this institution.	3,1978	1,68034	,760	-,041
q.5	I regard the problems of these institutions as my own problems.	4,0528	1,64758	,684	-,031
q.13	If I left my work now, I would feel guilty.	3,5704	1,73819	,565	,429
Factor 2: Normative, Explanatory power of variance: %17.390, Cronbach Alfa: 0.71					
q.16	Since there are less job opportunities out, I do not think of leaving this institution.	3,5771	1,7404	,063	,766
q.6	The main reason to keep working in this organization is that I need.	4,1068	1,6763	-,084	,751
q.12	If I decided to leave my work now, many things in my life would be interrupted.	3,9242	1,6761	,267	,737
q.9	It would be difficult for me to leave my work even if I wanted.	4,0683	1,6969	,483	,574
q.3	I can't leave my work as there are no other job opportunities			-,245	,565
The questions Omitted					
q.2	I do not feel obliged to keep working in this organization.				
q.18	I might have considered working in another institution if I didn't sacrifice a lot of things.				
q.4	Even though leaving my work now is to my advantage, I don't think this will be a right decision.				

7.2.3. Social Exchange

According to the factor analysis, there is only one factor and the explanatory power factor is found to be 55.047 %. The reliability of the factor is assessed by Cronbach's alpha value and obtained as 0.881. Accordingly, the

factors, the omitted questions, the alpha value for each factor, mean, standard deviation and explanatory level of each problem are shown in Table 5.

Table 4. Social Exchange

Que. No	Question	mean	Std. D.	Factor loading
Factor 1: Social Exchange, Explanatory power of variance: %55.047, Croanbach Alfa: 0.881				Factor 1
q.7	I give importance to my organization's interests and I watch them because I trust it will think of me.	3,2120	1,54745	,811
q.6	My relations with the Hospital Management are based on mutual trust.	3,2660	1,65864	,805
q.5	I don't care about working hard because I know that I will be rewarded for this.	2,2606	1,42506	,783
q.3	My relationship with my institution consists of mutual self-sacrifice.	2,9894	1,65640	,783
q.8	Although I am not appreciated in the way that I deserve I know my efforts will be rewarded in the future.	2,7491	1,54046	,773
q.2	What I do now as a requirement of my job provides advantages for long-term stay in the institution.	3,3759	1,68112	,726
q.4	I never worry about whether all my efforts on behalf of the hospital will be rewarded.	2,4555	1,59429	,616
q.1	My organization has made significant and important investments for me so far.	2,2316	1,37728	,606

7.3. Findings of Hypothesis Tests

Normal distribution analysis was applied for the factors before deciding on which analysis technique will be used as a result of factor analysis. Histogram and Q-Q graphics are examined for each factor and the distribution is obtained to be close to the normal. Parametrical techniques are decided to be used in analysis because the sample size is above 30 that is accepted as the lower limit of parametric analysis and both normal distribution graphics are found to be close to normal distribution.

7.3.1. Relationships Among Organizational Commitment, Social Exchange, Organizational Socialization And Socio-Demographic Variables

The results of Pearson Moment correlation coefficient calculated for the analysis of the first hypothesis of the research are shown in Table 6. For correlation, (r) the values between 0.0-0.29 are considered as showing a low-level relationship; those values between 0.30-.69 are considered as showing a medium-level relationship; the values between 0.70-1.00 are considered as showing a high-level relationship.

Table 6. The relationship among Organizational Commitment, Social Exchange, Organizational Socialization and Demographic Variables

	Pearson Correlation									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Total working time	1	.697**	.756**	-.024	.040	.100	-.165**	.116	-.161**	-.100
2. Age of the employee		1	.879**	.147*	.167**	.040	-.054	.072	-.143*	-.064
3. Official working hours at that hospital			1	.092	.126*	.035	-.137*	.090	-.168**	-.153*
4. Social Exchange				1	.698**	-.028	.623**	.385**	.364**	.476**
5. Affective					1	.238**	.563**	.475**	.401**	.422**
6. Normative						1	.029	.221**	.229**	.084
7. Institution - education							1	.278**	.396**	.607**
8. Institution-duty								1	.569**	.255**
9. Work-colleague									1	.324**
10. Education										1
N	275									

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). * . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

H1 was accepted substantially.

When Table 6 is examined, it is understood that social exchange with affective commitment ($r=.698$, $p=.001$), institution-education ($r=.623$, $p=.001$), institution-duty ($r=.385$, $p=0.001$), work-colleague ($r=.364$, $p=0.001$) and education ($r=.476$, $r=.001$) are in a medium-level with positive relationships. In other words, when perceived social exchange level increases, affective commitment and organizational socialization factors-institution education, institution duty, work colleague, and education factor levels increase. There is no relationship between social exchange and other factors identified.

On one hand, there is also a medium-level with positive relationship between affective commitment and organizational socialization factors that are institution education ($r=.563$, $p=.001$) institution duty ($r=.475$, $p=0.001$), work colleague ($r=.401$, $p=0.001$) and education ($r=.422$, $r=.001$). In other words, when perceived affective commitment level increases, institution-education, institution-duty, work-colleague and education factors' levels increase. There is no relationship among affective commitment and other factors.

On the other hand, there is a medium-level but positive relationship between normative commitment and institution-duty ($r=.221$, $p=0.001$) and

between normative commitment and work-colleague ($r=.229$, $p=0.001$). In other words, when perceived normative commitment level increases, institution-duty and work-colleague factors' levels increase. There are no relationships among normative commitment and other factors.

There is a low-level and negative relationship between seniority and institutional education, which is one of the institutional socialization factors, ($r=-.165$, $p=0.05$) and between seniority and work-colleague ($r=-.161$, $p=0.05$). In other words, as seniority level of the employee increases, the levels of institution educational factor and colleague factor decrease. There is no relationship found out between seniority factor and any of the other factors.

There is also a positive relationship between age and social exchange variable ($r=.147$, $p=.05$) and between age and affective commitment ($r=.167$, $p=.05$). Besides, there is a negative and low-level relationship between age and colleagues ($r=-.143$, $p=0.05$). There is no relationship between the employee's age and any of any of the other factors. The relationship between the total working time of the employee and affective commitment ($r=.126$, $p=.05$) is positive while it is a negative low-level relationship between the total working time and institution-education ($r=-.137$, $p=.05$) and education ($r=-.153$, $p=0.05$). There is no relationship identified between the total working time of the employee factor and the other factors.

7.3.2. Findings the Effect Of Organizational Commitment Level On Social Exchange

In this stage, the effects of each one of organizational commitment factors, all of which are independent, on social exchange is examined. Only the tables of hypotheses that are statistically significant will be presented. On the other hand, age of employees, total working time and working time in the organization are not included in the regression model created in this point.

According to the correlation analysis results, the correlation level identified between organizational commitment and any of these variables and between organizational commitment and any of the values indicated were estimated to be low (Table 6). That is why, simple linear regression to understand the impact of factors related to organizational commitment levels on social exchange variable is valid.

The regression analyses results showing the effect of affective commitment factor on social exchange variable is presented in Table 7. The effect of the affective commitment factor, which is an independent variable, on social exchange, which is a dependent variable, is statistically significant ($p=0.000<0.05$). Therefore, the research model is formulized as "*Social*

$Exchange = 0.690 + 0.613 * Affective\ Commitment$ ". According to this model, affective commitment predicts 4.87 % of the variation in social exchange variable ($R=0.698$, $R^2=0.487$).

Table 7. Affective Commitment Factor-Social Exchange Regression Analyses Results

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	F
	.698(a)	.487	.485	227.570
	B	Beta	T	Sig
(Constant)	.690		4.524	.000
Affective Commitment	.613	.698	15.085	.000

Dependent Variable : Social Exchange

7.3.3. Findings About the Effect of Organizational Commitment on Organizational Socialization

At this stage, the effect of each one of organizational commitment factors, all of which are independent variables, on organizational socialization factors is analysed. In this section, the hypotheses with variables with meaningful effects are presented in several tables. On the other hand, the ages of employees, the total working time and working times in the organization will not be included in regression model created in this stage. As a result of correlation analysis, the relation between any of these variables and organizational commitment as in table 6 was found to be low. Thus, to understand the effect of factors related to organizational commitment level on social exchange variable, simple linear regression is considered as the field of the study.

7.3.3.1. Findings about the Effect Affective of Organizational Commitment on Organizational Socialization

7.3.3.1.1. Findings about the Effect of Affective Commitment Factor on Institution Education Socialization Factor

Table 8 shows the results of regression analysis applied to explain the effect of affective commitment factor on institution-education that is one of the organizational socialization factors. Accordingly, the effect of affective commitment factor that is the independent variable on institution-education factor that is the dependent variable is statistically significant ($p=0.000 < 0.05$). The research model is formulized as " $Education = 0.609 - 0.482 * Affective$

commitment". According to this model, affective commitment predicts 3.16 %of the variation in institution-education factor ($R=0.563$, $R^2=0.316$).

Table 8. Affective Commitment Factor-institution-education Regression Analyses results

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted Square	R F
	.563(a)	.316	.314	114.827
	B	Beta	T	Sig
(Constant)	0.609		3.612	.000
Affective Commitment	.482	.563	10.716	.000

Dependent variable : institution-education

7.3.3.1.2. Findings about the effect of Affective Commitment Factor on Institution Duty Socialization factor

Table 9. Affective Commitment Factor-Institution-Duty Regression Analyses Results

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	F
	.475(a)	.225	.222	72.119
	B	Beta	T	Sig
(Constant)	2.989		17.468	.000
Affective Commitment	.387	.475	8.492	.000

Dependent variable: Institution-Duty factor

Table 9 shows the results of regression analysis applied to explain the effect of affective commitment factor on institution-duty that is one of the organizational socialization factors.

Accordingly, the effect of affective commitment factor that is the independent variable on institution-duty factor that is the dependent variable is statistically significant ($p=0.000<0.05$). The research model is formulized as "*Institution-Duty= 2.989 + 0.387*Affective Commitment*". According to this model, 2.25% of institution-duty is explained by affective commitment ($R=0.475$, $R^2=0.225$).

7.3.3.1.3. Findings About the Effect of Affective Commitment Factor on Work Colleague Socialization Factor

Table 10 shows the results of regression analysis applied to explain the effect of affective commitment factor on work-colleague that is one of the organizational socialization factors. Accordingly, the effect of affective commitment factor that is the independent variable on work-colleague factor that is the dependent variable is statistically significant ($p=0.000<0.05$). The research model is; “*work-colleague*= 2.852+0.352**Affective Commitment*”. According to this model, 1.61% of work-colleague is explained by affective commitment ($R=0.401$, $R^2=0.161$).

Table 10 Affective Commitment Factor Work-colleague Regression Analyses Results

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted Square	R F
	.401(a)	.161	.157	48.034
	B	Beta	T	Sig
(Constant)	2.852		14.951	.000
Affective Commitment	.352	.401	6.931	.000

Dependent variable: work-colleague

7.3.3.1.4. Findings about the effect of Affective Commitment Factor on Education Factor

Table 11. Affective Commitment-Education Regression Analyses Results

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted Square	R F
	.422(a)	.178	.175	53.994
	B	Beta	T	Sig
(Constant)	1.220		5.199	.000
Affective Commitment	.459	.452	7.348	.000

Dependent variable: Education

Table 11 shows the results of regression analysis applied to explain the effect of affective commitment factor on education that is one of the organizational socialization factors. Accordingly, the effect of affective commitment factor that is the independent variable on education factor that is the dependent variable is statistically significant ($p=0.000<0.05$). The research model is formulized as “*Education = 1.220 + 0.459*Affective Commitment*”. According to this model 1.78 % of education factor is explained by Affective commitment ($R=0.422, R^2=0.178$).

7.3.3.2. Findings about the Normative Affective of Organizational Commitment on Organizational Socialization

7.3.3.2.1. Normative Commitment Institution-duty Regression Analyses Results

Table 12 shows the results of regression analysis applied to explain the effect of normative commitment factor on institution-duty that is one of the organizational socialization factors. Accordingly, the effect of normative commitment factor that is the independent variable on institution-duty factor that is the dependent variable of the study is statistically significant ($p=0.000<0.05$). The research model is formulized as “*Institution-duty= 3.636 + 0.197*Normative Commitment*”. According to this model 4.9% of institution-duty is explained by normative commitment ($R=0.221, R^2=0.049$).

Table 12. Normative Commitment institution-duty Regression Analyses Results

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted Square	R F
	.221(a)	.049	.045	13.184
	B	Beta	T	Sig
(Constant)	3.636		17.298	.000
Normative Commitment	.197	.221	3.631	.000

Dependent variable: institution-duty

7.3.3.2.2. Normative Commitment -work-colleague Regression Analyses Results

Table 13 shows the results of regression analysis applied to explain the effect of normative commitment factor on work-colleague that is one of the organizational socialization factors. Accordingly, the effect of normative

commitment factor that is the independent variable on work-colleague factor that is the dependent variable is statistically significant. ($p=0.000<0.05$). The research model is formulized as “*work-colleague*= $3.245+0.222*Normative\ commitment$ ”. According to this model 5.2% of work-colleague is explained by normative commitment.

The results of the regression analysis presented in Table 2 show that organizational communication and job satisfaction are significant determinants, predicting 78.5 % of the variation in organizational commitment ($F = 122.470$; $p = .000$ $\beta = .163$, $\beta = .567$, respectively).

Table 13. Normative Commitment-work-colleague Regression Analyses Results

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted Square	R F
	.229(a)	.052	.049	14.423
	B	Beta	T	Sig
(Constant)	3.245		14.290	.000
Normative Commitment	.222	.229	3.798	.000

Dependent variable: work-colleague

8. DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

The essence of organizational commitment, which is one of the recent issues of modern management, refers to the strength of the employee's commitment to the organization. Socialization is defined as adaptation of individuals to group standards (Porter, Lawler and Hackman, 1975). Social exchange is described as voluntary behaviours that individuals are motivated through feedback they expect to acquire (Blau, 2009). In this study, the effect of organizational commitment variable on social exchange and organizational socialization was examined.

A successful socialization of an individual in an organization increases organizational commitment, harmony and success (Balci 2000). The first hypothesis of this study is about whether organizational commitment levels of employees have any effect on organizational socialization level or not. According to the findings, affective commitment factor has a positive effect on institution-duty factor, education factor and work-colleague factor of organizational socialization. On the other hand, it was found out that normative commitment factor has a positive effect on institution-duty factor and work-colleague factor. Hence, it is possible to state that there are problems about

harmony within the organization and organizational integrity for academic personnel of Kocaeli University, who are the main body of this study. Doğan and Kılıç (2007) state that organizational commitment has a positive effect on organizational performance, so they claim that organizational commitment decreases such undesired results as being late to work, absenteeism and resigning from work, and contributes positively to the quality of products or services. As a result of the findings and the theoretical framework, it is possible to express that the organizational commitment levels of Kocaeli University Hospital employees increase the organizational socialization level so their performance increases while being late to work and absenteeism decrease.

According to the second hypothesis of the research, it is accepted that some levels of dependent variable of social exchange have positive effect on the independent variable organizational commitment. According to this result, it is possible to say that when the level of organizational commitment increases, social exchange level of Kocaeli University employees also increases. In order to increase patient and employee satisfaction, employees equipped with the best skills should be chosen; socialization process of employees should be supported and it should be understood that organizations are a means of social exchange for employees. Therefore, social exchange, organizational socialization and organizational commitment processes established between the parties must be managed effectively.

This research was conducted only on the employees of Kocaeli University Hospital due to financial limits and limited time. It is possible to make comparative researches about organizational commitment, organizational socialization and organizational exchange relationships on health workers working not only in public but also private institutions. The age of the participants, employment time and working time at the university where he/she was employed were used as a control variable. Other variables such as intention to leave work, organizational trust and organizational commitment which may influence this relationship can also be used in further studies.

9. REFERENCES

- AKDOĞAN, A. A. ve O. KÖKSAL (2014), “Aidiyet Algısının Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranışı Üzerindeki Etkisinde Yöneticiye Güvenin Aracılık Rolü”, *Atatürk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 18 (1), pp.25-43.
- AKPINAR, A. T., Y. TAŞ ve M. E. OKUR (2013), “The Effect of Job Satisfaction and Emotional Exhaustion on Affective Commitment of Emergency Services Employees”, *British Journal of Economics, Finance and Management Sciences*, 7 (2), p.169-176.
- AKPINAR, A. T. ve Y. TAŞ (2013), “Effect of Distributive Justice, Procedural Justice and Organizational Trust on Affective Commitment”, *Interdisciplinary Journal*

- of *Research in Business*, 2(8), pp.61-66.
- ALLEN, D., L. SHORE ve R. GRIFFITH (2003), "The Role Of Perceived Organizational Support And supportive human resources practices in the turnover process", *Journal of Management*, 29(1), pp.99-118.
- ARMELI, S., R. EISENBERGER, P. FASOLO, ve P. LYNCH (1998), "Perceived organizational support and police performance: The moderating influence of socioemotional needs". *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83(2), pp.288-297.
- ASHFORTH, B. E., M. DAVID SLUSS. ve A. SAKS, M. (2007), "Socialization tactics, proactive behavior, and newcomer learning: Integrating socialization models" , *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 70(3), pp. 447-462.
- BÖRÜ, D. ve B. GÜNEŞER (2006), "Algılanan Örgütsel Destek ve Lider Üye Etkileşiminin Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranışı ile İlişkisi ve Güvenin Rolü", *Öneri Dergisi*, 7(25), pp. 43-58.
- BUSSING, A. (2002), "Trust and Its Relations to Commitment and Involvement in Work and Organisations". *Sa Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 28 (4), pp.36-42.
- BYRNE, Z. S. ve W. A. HOCHWARTER;(2008), " Perceived Organizational Support and Performance: Relationships Across Levels of Organizational Cynicism", *Journal of Managerial Psychology* , 23(1), pp. 54-72.
- CEKMECIOGLU, H. G. (2006), "Örgüt İklimi, Duygusal Bağlılık Ve Yaraticilik Arasındaki İlişkilerin Değerlendirilmesi: Bir Araştırma", *Ataturk Üniversitesi İktisadi Ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi*, 20(2), pp. 295-310.
- CHEN, Z. R. EISENBERGER, K. M. JOHNSON, I. L. SUCHARSKI, ve J. ASELAGÉ (2009), "Perceived Organizational Support and Extra-Role Performance: Which Leadsto Which?", *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 149(1), pp.119-124.
- DOĞAN, S. ve S. KILIÇ (2007), "Örgütsel Bağlılığın Sağlanmasında Personel Güçlendirmenin Yeri Ve Önemi" , *Erciyes Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 29, pp.37-61.
- DUNHAM, R. B., J. A. GRUBE ve M. B. CASTANDEA (1994), "Organizational Commitment: The Utility of an Integrative Definition", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79, pp.370-380.
- EISENBERGER, R., P. FASOLO ve DAVIS-LA MASTRO. V. (1990), "Perceived Organizational Support And Employee Diligence Commitment And Innovation", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75, pp.51-59.
- EINSENBERGER, R., S. ARMENI, B. REXWINKEL, P. LYNCH, ve L. RHOADES (2001), "Reciprocation of Perceived Organizational Support, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(1), pp.42-51.
- ERGÜN, E. Y. E. TAŞGİT (2011), " Örgütsel Sosyalleşme Taktiklerinin Sosyalleşme Çıktıları Üzerindeki Etkisine Yönelik Bir Araştırma", *Dumlupınar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*.3, pp.97-111.
- GOKTEPE, A. O. (2012), *Zihni Temsillerin (Sosyal Ve Ekonomik Takas Yaklaşımı) Çalışılan Kuruma Bağlanmaya (Cezbolma, Özdeşleşme Ve Bağlılık) Etkisinde Örgütsel Destek Ve Dışsal Prestij Algılarının Rolü*, Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi, İstanbul.

- KAPLAN, M. (2010), *Otel İşletmelerinde Etiksel İklim Ve Örgütsel Destek Algulamalarının Örgütsel Bağlılık Üzerindeki Etkisi: Kapadokya Örneği*, Konya Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi.
- KELLEY, H. H., ve J. W. THIBAUT (1978), *Interpersonal Relations: A Theory of Interdependence*, New York: Wiley.
- KOC, H. (2009), "Örgütsel Bağlılık Ve Sadakat İlişkisi", *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 28(8), pp.200-211.
- LAMASTRO, V. (1999), "Commitment And Perceived Organizational Support", *National Forum Of Applied Educational Research Journal*, 12(3), pp. 99-118.
- LAWLER, E. J. (2001), "An Affect Theory of Social Exchange" , *The American Journal of Sociology*, 107(2), pp. 321-352.
- LIOU, S.-R. (2008), "An Analysis of the Concept of Organizational Commitment", *Nursing Forum*, 43(3), pp.116-125.
- MADEN, C. (2010), *Person-Environment Fit, Social Exchange Relationships, And Employee Outcomes In Organizations*, Boğaziçi University Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi.
- MEYER, J. P. ve N. J. ALLEN (1991), "A Three Component Conceptualization of Organizational Commitment", *Human Resource Management Review* 1, pp.61-89.
- MEYER, J. P. ve N. J. ALLEN (1984), "Testing the "Side-Bet Theory" of Organizational Commitment:Some Methodological Considerations", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 69, pp. 372-378.
- MEYER, J. P. ve N. J. ALLEN (1997), *Commitment in the Workplace: Theory, Research and Application*.Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- MOLM, L. D., N. TAKAHASHI ve G. PETERSON (2000), "Risk and Trust in Social Exchange: An Experimental Testof a Classical Proposition", *The American Journal of Sociology*, 105(5), pp.1396-1427.
- MOWDAY, R. T., R. M. STEERS ve L. W. PORTER (1979), "The measurement of organizational commitment", *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 14(2), pp.224-247.
- MUELLER, C. W., J. E. WALLACE ve, J. L. PRICE (1992), "Employee Commitment: Resolving Some Issues", *Work And Occupations*, 19, pp.211- 236.
- NAYIR, F. (2011),*İlköğretim Okulu Yöneticilerinin Öğretmenlere Sağlanan Örgütsel Desteğe İlişkin Görüşleri, Öğretmenlerin Örgütsel Destek Algısı Ve Örgütsel Bağlılıkla İlişkisi*, Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi.
- PANACCIO, A. ve C. VANDERBERGHE (2009), "Perceived Organizational Support, Organizational Commitment and Psychological Well-Being: A Longitudinal Study", *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 75(2), pp.224-236.
- PENLEY, L. E. ve S. GOULD (1988), "Etzioni's Model of Organizational Involvement: A Perspective for Understanding Commitment to Organizations", *Journal Of Organizational Behavior* 9, pp.43-59.
- REICHERS, A. E. (1985), "A Review and Re-Conceptualization of Organizational Commitment", *Academy of Management Review*, 11(5), pp. 465-476.

- SETTOON, R. P., N. BENNETT ve R. C. LIDEN (1996), "Social Exchange in Organizations: Perceived Organizational Support, Leader-Member Exchange and Employee Reciprocity", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81: 3, pp.219-227.
- SOLINGER, O. N., W. Van OLFFEN, ve R. A ROE (2008), "Beyond the three component model of organizational commitment", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93 (1), pp.70-83.
- TEKLEAB, A. G., R. TAKEUCHI, ve, M. S. TAYLOR (2005), "Extending the Chain of Relationships Among Organizational Justice, Social Exchange and Employee Reactions: The Role of Contract Violations", *Academy of Management Journal*, 48(1), pp.146-157.
- TURUNÇ, Ö. ve M. ÇELİK (2010), "Algılanan Örgütsel Desteğin Çalışanların İş/Aile Çatışması, Örgütsel Özdeşleşme Ve İşten Ayrılma Niyetine Etkisi: Savunma Sektöründe Bir Araştırma", *Atatürk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 14 (1), 209-232.
- UYGUÇ, N. ve D. CİRMİN (2004), "D.E.U. Arastirma Ve Uygulama Hastanesi Merkez Laboratuari Calisanlarinin Orgute Bagliliklerini Ve Isten Ayrilma Niyetlerini Etkileyen Faktörler", *D.E.Ü. İktisadi Ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 19(1), pp.91-99.
- UYGUR, A. (2007), "Örgütsel Bağlılık İle İlgilen Performansına İlişkin İncelemeye Yönelik Bir Alan Arastirmasi" *Ticaret Ve Turizm Egitim Fakültesi Dergisi* 1, pp.71-85.
- TSUI, A. S., J. L. PEARCE, L. W. PORTER ve A. M. TRIPOLI (1997), "Alternative Approaches to the Employee-Organization Relationship: Does Investment in Employees pay off?", *Academy of Management Journal*, 40(5), pp.1089-1121.
- WHITENER, E. M., S. E. BRODT, M. A. KORSGAARD ve J. M. WERNER (1998), "Managers as Initiators of Trust: An Exchange Relationship Framework for Understanding Managerial Trustworthy Behavior", *Academy of Management Review*, 23(3), p p.513-530.