

## **Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment in Relation to Work Performance and Turnover Intentions**

**Lynn McFarlane Shore<sup>1</sup>**

*Georgia State University*

**Harry J. Martin**

*Cleveland State University*

*The differential associations that job satisfaction and organizational commitment have with job performance and turnover intentions were studied in a sample of bank tellers and hospital professionals. Results showed that organizational commitment was more strongly related than job satisfaction with turnover intentions for the tellers, but not for the professionals. Job satisfaction was related more strongly than organizational commitment with supervisory ratings of performance for both samples. The findings suggest that specific job attitudes are more closely associated with task-related outcomes such as performance ratings, whereas global organizational attitudes are more closely associated with organization-related outcomes like turnover intentions.*

### **INTRODUCTION**

A great deal of research has been conducted that attempts to link employee attitudes with work outcomes. Early research tended to focus on job satisfaction as the key attitude related to employee behaviors such as job performance and turnover (Locke, 1976). More recent research has investigated organizational commitment as an important attitudinal predictor of employee behavior and intentions (Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982). The

<sup>1</sup>Requests for reprints should be sent to Lynn M. Shore, Department of Management, Georgia State University, University Plaza, Atlanta, Georgia 30303.

purpose of this study is to examine the differential relationship of job satisfaction and organizational commitment to two important variables: turnover intentions and job performance.

The theoretical framework utilized in this study originated from research that suggests attitudes toward the job and organization may be related to different work outcomes. Porter, Steers, Mowday and Boulian (1974) proposed that general attitudes toward the organization may have a greater impact on the decision to remain with the organization than more specific attitudes toward the job. Wiener and Vardi (1980) suggested that organizational attitudes should be more strongly associated with organization-oriented outcomes, such as turnover intentions, while the most likely behavior to be affected by job attitudes would be task-oriented outcomes, such as work effort or performance. In addition, Jackofsky and Peters (1983) suggested that job turnover should have a strong relationship with job satisfaction whereas organizational turnover should be more highly related to organizational commitment. Their reasoning was also based on the notion that job attitudes should be linked with job outcomes and that organizational attitudes should be linked with organizational outcomes.

### *Turnover Intentions*

Many studies have reported a significant association between organizational commitment and turnover intentions (Ferris & Aranya, 1983; Hom, Katerberg, & Hulin, 1979; Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1979; O'Reilly & Caldwell, 1980; Steers, 1977; Stumpf & Hartman, 1984; Wiener & Vardi, 1980). Other research has established a relationship between job satisfaction and turnover intentions. Overall job satisfaction appears to be associated with turnover intentions (Angle & Perry, 1981; Bedeian & Armenakis, 1981). Studies of facet satisfaction also have reported significant correlations between turnover intentions and satisfaction with the work itself (Hom et al., 1979; Kraut, 1975; Waters, Roach, & Waters, 1976) and pay and promotion (Hom et al., 1979; Waters et al., 1976).

Research has also compared the independent and joint effects of job satisfaction and organizational commitment on turnover intentions. For example, Peters, Bhagat, and O'Connor (1981) found that organizational commitment had a stronger relationship with turnover intentions than job satisfaction, though satisfaction did make an independent contribution to the prediction of turnover intentions. Arnold and Feldman (1982) also found that both work attitudes correlated significantly with turnover intentions, though organizational commitment showed the stronger relationship. Hom et al. (1979) compared organizational commitment with facet satisfaction

and reported that organizational commitment was a better predictor of intentions to re-enlist in the National Guard. Although both of these studies shed light on the differential ability of job satisfaction and organizational commitment to predict turnover intentions and turnover, the present study contributes to the literature by expanding on their ideas in two ways. First, it includes a second outcome variable, job performance, that allows for comparison of the differential effects of the two work attitudes. Second, it provides a test of a model that proposes that job and organizational attitudes are distinct constructs that yield differential relationships to the same outcome variables.

It appears that both satisfaction and commitment are related to turnover intentions. However, these studies also show that organizational commitment is associated more strongly than job satisfaction with turnover intentions. An additional issue when researching turnover intentions is the utility of such a concept. Steel and Ovalle's (1984) meta-analysis suggests that turnover intentions and turnover are related and that turnover intentions are better than affective variables, such as job satisfaction and organizational commitment, in predicting turnover. This suggests that turnover intentions is a valuable concept as it is linked with actual turnover behavior. Another benefit of using turnover intentions to test the notion that job and organizational attitudes lead to different outcome is that this intentions is under more individual control than turnover. Turnover is much more difficult to predict than intentions since there are many external factors that affect turnover behavior (Bluedorn, 1982; Price & Mueller, 1981).

### *Job Performance*

Research also has been conducted that investigates the relationship that job performance has with job satisfaction and organizational commitment. While some literature suggests job satisfaction and job performance are related (Petty, McGee, & Cavender, 1984), other analyses of the job satisfaction literature have concluded that satisfaction shows a negligible relationship with job performance (Iaffaldano & Muchinsky, 1985; Locke, 1976). There is much less research on the relationship between organizational commitment and job performance. Both Steers (1977) and Wiener and Vardi (1980) concluded that organizational commitment was not clearly related to job performance.

No studies were found that simultaneously examined that joint effects of job satisfaction and organizational commitment on job performance. A study by Lee and Mowday (1987) presented correlations between job performance and both job satisfaction ( $r = .11, p < .05$ ) and organizational

commitment ( $r = .09, p < .05$ ), and showed very similar relationships. However, they did not compare variance accounted for by each work attitude on job performance. Therefore, an empirical research base for determining which work attitude is a better predictor of job performance does not appear to exist. However, the theoretical framework provided by Porter et al. (1974) and Wiener and Vardi (1980) on the connection between the focus of work attitudes (job vs. organizational attitudes) and work outcomes suggests that job satisfaction would be a better predictor than organizational commitment of job performance.

The present study focused on a number of issues that contribute to the literature. The first purpose was to provide additional evidence establishing job satisfaction and organizational commitment as distinct work-related attitudes. That is, if these two work attitudes are distinct, they should relate to different work outcomes. This is important, especially given the concern expressed in the literature that these attitudes are often treated as different without sufficient evidence of this distinctiveness (Gechman & Wiener, 1975; Morrow, 1983; Scholl, 1981). A second purpose was to provide information on the value of the theoretical perspective presented by Porter et al. (1974) and Wiener and Vardi (1980). A third contribution of the study was to provide additional insight into the relationship between both work attitudes and job performance, since the research in this area is inconclusive. An additional objective of this study was to conduct an exploratory analysis of the differences between professional and non-professional employees. Two samples were utilized to evaluate the relationships between the work attitudes and work outcomes. These samples were chosen partially to test the generalizability of the results across different groups, but also to evaluate potential differences among the two samples, with professionalism as the variable of interest. Given the research and theory reviewed, two hypotheses were formulated.

Hypothesis 1. Organizational commitment will be more highly related than job satisfaction with turnover intentions.

Hypothesis 2. Job satisfaction will be more highly related than organizational commitment with job performance.

## METHOD

### *Subjects and Procedure*

A self-report mail questionnaire was completed by two samples. The first sample (professional) consisted of 94 professional staff in 15 departments of a large midwestern hospital. A total of 72 usable questionnaires

were returned (77% response rate). The second sample (clerical) consisted of 85 tellers in 11 branches of a large midwestern bank. In this sample, 71 usable questionnaires were returned (83% response rate). In addition, individual performance ratings were obtained from unit heads and paired with subordinate responses using a prearranged coding system. These data were available for 68 of the 72 respondents in the professional sample and 69 of the 71 respondents in the clerical sample. In the professional sample, 15 supervisors rated an average of six subordinates (ranging from 3–11). In the clerical sample, 11 supervisors rated an average age of seven subordinates (ranging from 4–10).

The professional sample included 18 men (25%) and 54 women (75%) with an average age of 35.5 years. All respondents were in their present position for at least 6 months with an average tenure of 4.3 years. The majority of respondents in this sample held an advanced degree (67%) with the remainder holding a bachelor's degree (18%) or having taken some college courses (15%). The clerical sample included one man (1%) and 70 women (99%) with an average age of 36.7 years. Respondents were in their present position for at least 4 months with an average tenure of 3.4 years. Eighty percent of respondents in this sample held a high school diploma with 17% having taken some college courses and 3% holding a college degree.

The questionnaire was distributed by the respondents' immediate supervisor and included a cover letter explaining the nature of the study and the fact that participation was voluntary. Respondents completed the survey at work but without the supervisor present and mailed it directly to the researchers.

### *Instruments*

*Job Satisfaction.* This was assessed using a single item developed by Van de Ven and Ferry (1980) that assessed satisfaction with the respondents' present position on a 5-point scale. While the internal consistency reliability of a single-item measure cannot be evaluated, research suggests such items are stable and reproducible and may reflect job satisfaction more accurately than many facet measures (Scarpello & Campbell, 1983).

*Organizational Commitment.* This was measured using the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ; Mowday et al., 1979). Internal consistency reliabilities (Cronbach's alpha) were .91 and .89 for the professional and clerical samples, respectively. It has been argued that the OCQ partially measures intentions to stay, thereby, confounding the analysis (Angle & Perry, 1981). To evaluate this possibility, a ten-item version of this scale was created that eliminated items addressing current or future expectations regarding continued employment with the organization (items 4, 7, 10, 12, and 14).

The original and shortened version were found to correlate .97 and .96 for the two samples. In addition, there were no significant differences between the two scales in their relationship with intentions to stay. Therefore, the original OCQ was used for all analyses in this study.

*Intent to Stay.* This was measured using four items adapted from Hunt, Osborn, and Martin (1981) and assessed the employee's intent to leave the organization (sample alphas were .78 and .74). The items did not make reference to intent to change profession or the type of work performed (scale items for this measure are reproduced in the Appendix).

*Job Performance.* This was measured using supervisory ratings. Unit heads in both samples provided ratings for each of their subordinates on four scales: dependability, planning, know-how, and cooperation with others (scale items for this measure are reproduced in the Appendix). Each dimension was evaluated on a 7-point scale and ratings were combined to form a single index (sample alphas were .93 and .92). Even though the samples were very diverse in nature, discussions with managers in each organization indicated that the rated dimensions were important to successful completion of the employee's duties.

*Over and Short Records.* These were used as an additional measure of performance for the sample of bank tellers. Over and short cash records were available for 52 of the respondents in this sample. The statistic provided by the bank was the total amount over or under for each teller for the 12 months immediately preceding the study. The absolute dollar value of this index was used with value near zero reflecting desirable performance and higher values reflecting increasingly undesirable performance, i.e., greater inaccuracy.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The hypotheses were evaluated by comparing (1) the relative correlations of job satisfaction and organizational commitment with the two outcome measures, and (2) the relative contribution of each predictor to the explained variance of each outcome measure using multiple regression. The significance of differences in correlations was assessed using Hotelling's *t* test as modified by Steiger (1980). Table I contains descriptive statistics and correlations for both samples. The results of the regression analysis are contained in Table II.

The results provided partial support for the first hypothesis. Organizational commitment had a significantly higher correlation ( $r = .76$ ) than job satisfaction ( $r = .60$ ) with intention to stay for the clerical sample ( $t(68) = -2.15$ ;  $p < .025$ ; one-tailed probabilities are reported for this and following tests). Although in the expected direction, this difference was not sig-

**Table 1.** Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations for Predictor and Outcome Measures in Two Samples

Variable	Number of items	Professional sample		Clerical sample		Correlations				
		M	SD	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5
		1. <sup>a</sup> Intent to stay	4	12.7	3.25	14.2	3.15	—	-.01	-.22
2. <sup>b</sup> Supervisory ratings	5	22.4	4.28	18.4	4.93	-.02	—	-.21	.24 <sup>e</sup>	.03
3. <sup>c</sup> Over satisfaction	—	—	—	215.2	224.30	—	—	—	-.11	-.27 <sup>d</sup>
4. <sup>a</sup> Job satisfaction	1	3.8	0.88	3.4	0.97	.26 <sup>e</sup>	.26 <sup>e</sup>	—	—	.56 <sup>f</sup>
5. <sup>a</sup> Organizational commitment	15	69.8	15.29	74.0	15.36	.40 <sup>f</sup>	.05	—	.46 <sup>f</sup>	—

<sup>a</sup>For the professional sample,  $n = 72$ ; for the clerical sample,  $n = 71$ .

<sup>b</sup>For the professional sample,  $n = 68$ ; for the clerical sample,  $n = 69$ .

<sup>c</sup> $n = 52$ .

<sup>d</sup> $p < .05$ .

<sup>e</sup> $p < .025$ .

<sup>f</sup> $p < .001$ ; one-tailed probabilities.

<sup>g</sup>Coefficients above the diagonal are for the clerical sample while coefficients below the diagonal are for the professional sample.

**Table II.** Regression Analysis of Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment on Outcome Measures in Two Samples

Outcome measure	Professional sample			Clerical sample		
	$R^2_{full}$	Job satisfaction given commitment, $\Delta R^2$	Commitment given job satisfaction, $\Delta R^2$	$R^2_{full}$	Job satisfaction given commitment, $\Delta R^2$	Commitment given job satisfaction, $\Delta R^2$
Intent to stay <sup>a</sup>	.17	.01	.10 <sup>f</sup>	.63	.05 <sup>e</sup>	.26 <sup>g</sup>
Supervisory ratings <sup>b</sup>	.08	.07 <sup>e</sup>	.01	.07	.06 <sup>e</sup>	.01
Over and short records	—	—	—	.08	.00	.06 <sup>d</sup>

<sup>a</sup>For the professional sample,  $n = 72$ ; for the clerical sample,  $n = 71$ .

<sup>b</sup>For the professional sample,  $n = 68$ ; for the clerical sample,  $n = 69$ .

<sup>c</sup> $n = 52$ .

<sup>d</sup> $p < .05$ .

<sup>e</sup> $p < .025$ .

<sup>f</sup> $p < .01$ .

<sup>g</sup> $p < .001$ ; one-tailed.



nificant for the sample of hospital professionals (.40 vs. .26;  $t(69) = -1.18$ ;  $p > .1$ ). However, the regression analyses showed that, when compared to job satisfaction, organizational commitment accounted for a greater proportion of unique variance in intentions to stay for both samples.

The second hypothesis was supported in both samples. Job satisfaction was related more strongly than organizational commitment with supervisory ratings of performance in both the professional (.26 vs. .05;  $t(65) = 1.68$ ;  $p < .05$ ) and clerical samples (.24 vs. .03;  $t(66) = 1.96$ ;  $p < .05$ ). This finding was also supported by the regression analyses where job satisfaction accounted for more unique variance in performance ratings than organizational commitment.

These results provide support for Porter et al.'s (1974) and Wiener and Vardi's (1980) contention that global attitudes toward the organization (like organizational commitment) are associated more closely with organization-oriented outcomes and that more specific attitudes (like job satisfaction) are more closely associated with task-oriented outcomes.

While the results support the second hypothesis using supervisory ratings as the measure of job performance, an interesting difference emerged for over and short records in the bank teller sample. Here, commitment rather than satisfaction was more closely related to performance. Greater levels of organizational commitment were associated with a decrease in the absolute difference in over and short records; that is, better performance was shown by employees with higher commitment. While the difference in correlations was not statistically significant ( $-.27$  vs.  $-.11$ ;  $t(49) = -1.22$ ;  $p > .1$ ), regression analyses showed that more variance in over and short records was accounted for by organizational commitment than by job satisfaction.

Although this result may seem to contradict the hypothesis, it may be that over and short records represent a very different type of performance measure than supervisory ratings. That is, over and short records were for a 12-month period and, hence, long term in nature. In contrast, supervisors in both samples were asked to rate employees' present job performance. These two performance measures may well be tapping different aspects of an employee's performance (short term vs. long term). In support of this view, Mowday et al. (1979) suggested that job satisfaction is a more transitory and changeable attitude than organizational commitment. Thus, we might expect a measure like over and short records, which represents long-term performance, to be more closely related to global attitudes toward the organization, like organizational commitment, whereas job satisfaction which is more transitory in nature may have a stronger influence on present performance levels.

It was also noted that, while the pattern of correlations was quite similar between samples, in the clerical sample, intent to stay had a significantly higher correlation with both job satisfaction ( $z = 2.53$ ;  $p < .012$ ) and or-

ganizational commitment ( $z = 3.39; p < .008$ ). These findings suggest that work attitudes among professionals may be much less predictive of intentions to remain in the organization than among non-professionals such as bank tellers. Perhaps professionals remain with organizations for different reasons than non-professionals. It may be that professionals' primary commitment is to the occupation rather than to the organization. Gouldner's (1957) research on locals and cosmopolitans suggests a theoretical framework for understanding these differences. He defined cosmopolitans as "those low on loyalty to the employing organization, high on commitment to specialized role skills, and likely to use an outer reference group orientation" while he viewed locals as "those high on loyalty to the employing organization, low on commitment to specialized role skills, and likely to use an inner reference group orientation" (p. 290). Furthermore, Gouldner proposed that experts (or professionals) are less likely to be locals because of the skills acquired through extensive training. Consistent with this perspective, Stahl, Manley, and McNichols (1978) found that those with greater education were more likely to be cosmopolitans. Therefore, professionals may be viewing a given job as a stepping stone to a better job since their primary commitment is to their profession, whereas the non-professional may be looking for a good job in an organization that provides some measure of job security. Future research should compare professionals and non-professionals with turnover as the dependent variable of interest. It may be that stated intentions are quite different than actual behavior for professionals and non-professionals.

The present study contributes additional information on the differences and similarities of job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Although highly related in both samples, the evidence suggests that job satisfaction and organizational commitment relate differently to the same outcome variables. This pattern is similar to many other studies (Hom et al., 1979; Peters et al., 1981), and suggest that job satisfaction and organizational commitment may not be completely distinct attitudes, but possess some uniqueness given the ability of these attitudes to account for distinct variance in the same work outcomes.

Another contribution of the present study was in the area of job performance. No prior research was found that investigated the differential affects of both job satisfaction and organizational commitment on job performance measures. The present results suggest that job satisfaction has a much stronger relationship than organizational commitment with shorter-term measures of performance, such as supervisory ratings. However, commitment may be more strongly associated with other types of performance measures, particularly long-term measures of performance. This study points to the importance of looking at multiple measures of performance, since different types of measures may be related to different types of attitudes. For

example, satisfied employees may be more pleasant people with whom to work, so that supervisors give these employees more favorable evaluations. In contrast, committed employees may show better performance when objective measures of performance are taken, such as over and short records.

Interpretation of these results must be done with two limitations in mind. First, the study was cross-sectional making it difficult to determine the causal relationships between satisfaction, commitment, and the work outcomes. Longitudinal research should be conducted to answer some very important questions regarding causal relationships among the variables in this study. The second potential limitation was the use of turnover intentions rather than actual turnover. Although turnover information is important, the study of turnover intentions is valuable in and of itself. That is, it is important to understand why people intend to leave organizations, since intentions seem to be related to later behavior. In addition, intentions can be considered work attitudes, which like satisfaction and commitment, are valuable constructs to study.

The fact that the pattern of results was similar in two widely different organizational settings suggests that the process that links satisfaction and commitment to employee outcomes may be a fundamental process. While the degree of association between intent to stay and satisfaction and commitment may vary according to the degree of professionalism, the present study suggests that job attitudes are more closely associated with task-related outcomes whereas organizational attitudes are associated more closely with organization-related outcomes. Additional research is also needed to clarify the role of career commitment in this process and to more firmly establish how attitudes are related to long- and short-term measures of employee performance.

## REFERENCES

- ANGLE, H. L., & PERRY, J. L. An empirical assessment of organizational commitment and organizational effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 1981, 26, 1-14.
- ARNOLD, H. J., & FELDMAN, D. C. A multivariate analysis of the determinants of job turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1982, 67, 350-360.
- BEDEIAN, A. G., & ARMENAKIS, A. A. A Path-analytic study of the consequences of role conflict and ambiguity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 1981, 24, 417-424.
- BLUEDORN, A. C. A unified model model of turnover from organizations. *Human Relations*, 1982, 35, 135-153.
- FERRIS, K. R., & ARANYA, N. A comparison of two organizational commitment scales. *Personnel Psychology*, 1983, 36, 87-98.
- GECHMAN, A. S., & WIENER, Y. Job involvement and satisfaction as related to mental health and personal time devoted to work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1975, 60, 521-523.
- GOULDNER, A. W. Cosmopolitans and locals toward an analysis of latent social roles—1. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 1957, 1, 281-306.

- HOM, P. W., KATERBERG, R., & HULIN, C. L. Comparative examination of three approaches to the prediction of turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1979, 64, 280-290.
- HUNT, J. G., OSBORN, R. N., & MARTIN, H. J. A multiple influence model of leadership (Technical report no. 520). Alexandria, Virginia: U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences, 1981.
- IAFFALDANO, M. T., & MUCHINSKY, P. M. Job satisfaction and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 1985, 97, 251-273.
- JACKOFSKY, E. F., & PETERS, L. H. Job turnover versus company turnover: Reassessment of the March and Simon Participation Hypothesis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1983, 68, 490-495.
- KRAUT, A. I. Predicting turnover of employees from measured job attitudes. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 1975, 13, 233-243.
- LEE, T. W., & MOWDAY, R. T. Voluntarily leaving an organization: An empirical investigation of Steers and Mowday's model of turnover. *Academy of Management Journal*, 1987, 30, 721-743.
- LOCKE, E. A. Nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology*. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1976, pp. 1297-1349.
- MORROW, P. Concept redundancy in organizational research: The case of work commitment. *Academy of Management Review*, 1983, 8, 486-500.
- MOWDAY, R. T., PORTER, L. W., & STEERS, R. M. *Employee-organization linkages: The psychology of commitment, absenteeism and turnover*. New York: Academic Press, 1982.
- MOWDAY, R. T., STEERS, R. M., & PORTER, L. W. The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 1979, 14, 224-227.
- O'REILLY, C. A., III, & CALDWELL, D. F. Job choice: The impact of intrinsic and extrinsic factors on subsequent satisfaction and commitment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1980, 65, 559-565.
- PETERS, L. H., BHAGAT, R. S., & O'CONNOR, E. J. An examination of the independent and joint contributions of organizational commitment and job satisfaction on employee intentions to quit. *Group and Organization Studies*, 1981, 6, 73-82.
- PETTY, M. M., MCGEE, G. W., & CAVENDER, J. W. A meta-analysis of the relationships between individual job satisfaction and individual performance. *Academy of Management Review*, 1984, 9, 712-721.
- PORTER, L. W., STEERS, R. M., MOWDAY, R. T., & BOULIAN, P. V. Organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover among psychiatric technicians. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1974, 59, 603-609.
- PRICE, J. L., & MUELLER, C. W. A causal model of turnover for nurses. *Academy of Management Journal*, 1981, 24, 543-565.
- SCARPELLO, V., & CAMPBELL, J. P. Job satisfaction: Are all the parts there? *Personnel Psychology*, 1983, 36, 577-600.
- SCHOLL, R. W. (1981). Differentiating organizational commitment from expectancy as a motivating force. *Academy of Management Review*, 1981, 6, 589-599.
- STAHL, M. J., MANLEY, T. R., & McNICHOLS, C. W. Operationalizing the Moskos Institution-Occupation Model: An application of Gouldner's cosmopolitan-local research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1978, 63, 422-427.
- STEEL, R. P., & OVALLE, N. K. A review and meta-analysis of research on the relationship between behavioral intentions and employee turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1984, 69, 673-686.
- STEERS, R. M. Antecedents and outcomes of organizational commitment. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 1977, 22, 46-55.
- STEIGER, J. H. Tests for comparing elements of a correlation matrix. *Psychological Bulletin*, 1980, 87, 245-251.
- STUMPF, S. A., & HARTMAN, K. Individual exploration to organizational commitment or withdrawal. *Academy of Management Journal*, 1984, 27, 308-329.
- VAN de VEN, A. H., & FERRY, P. L. *Measuring and assessing organizations*. New York: Wiley, 1980.
- WATERS, L. K., ROACH, D., & WATERS, C. W. Estimates of future tenure, satisfaction, and biographical variables as predictors of termination. *Personnel Psychology*, 1976, 29, 57-60.

- WIENER, Y., & VARDI, Y. Relationships between job, organization, and career commitment and work outcomes – an integrative approach. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 1980, 26, 81-96.

### BIOGRAPHICAL NOTES

LYNN McFARLANE SHORE earned her PhD in Industrial/Organizational Psychology from Colorado State University. She is Assistant Professor of Management at Georgia State University in Atlanta. Her research interests include work commitment, performance appraisal, and management development.

HARRY J. MARTIN earned his PhD in Organizational Psychology from Southern Illinois University at Carbondale. He is Associate Professor of Management and Organizational Behavior in the James J. Nance College of Business Administration at Cleveland State University. His research interests include organizational culture and the relationship between leadership and social power.

### APPENDIX. ITEMS CONTAINED IN MEASURES OF INTENT TO STAY AND JOB PERFORMANCE

#### Intent to stay:

1. Which of the following statements most clearly reflects your feelings about your future with this organization in the next year? (1 = I definitely will not leave, 2 = I probably will not leave, 3 = I am uncertain, 4 = I probably will leave, and 5 = I definitely will leave, reverse scored).
2. How do you feel about leaving this organization? (1 = I am presently looking and planning to leave, 2 = I am seriously considering leaving in the near future, 3 = I have no feelings about this one way or the other, 4 = As far as I can see ahead, I intend to stay with this organization, and 5 = It is very unlikely that I would ever consider leaving this organization).
3. If you were completely free to choose, would you prefer or not prefer to continue working for this organization? (1 = Prefer very much to continue working for this organization, 2 = Prefer to work here, 3 = Don't care either way, 4 = Prefer not to work here, and 5 = Prefer very much not to continue working for this organization, reverse scored).
4. How important is it to you personally that you spend your career in this organization rather than some other organization? (1 = It is of no importance at all, 2 = I have mixed feelings about its importance, 3 = It is of some importance, 4 = It is fairly important, and 5 = It is very important for me to spend my career in this organization).

#### Job performance

1. *Dependability*. Maintains high standards of work and performs all needed work. (1 = Cuts corners, must be watched closely to make sure the work is done properly, 4 = Can be counted on to perform assigned jobs without being watched, and 7 = Not only can be counted on to perform assigned jobs without being watched but performs other jobs that should be done without having to be told).
2. *Planning*. Makes good use of time and resources. (1 = Even on daily routine work does not select the most important job to do first and makes poor use of time and resources in getting the job done, 4 = Usually can select the most important job to do first and makes adequate use of time and resources to get the job done, and 7 = Even when overloaded with work can select the most important job to do first and makes the best use of time and resources to get the job done).

3. *Know-how and judgment.* Needed to do the job correctly. (1 = Work shows he/she does not have the necessary know-how and judgment needed to do the basic job properly, 4 = Work shows he/she has the know-how and judgment needed to do the basic job properly, and 7 = Work shows he/she has the know-how and judgment needed not only to do the basic job, but to foresee and handle unusual job problems as well).
4. *Cooperation.* Exchanges information which co-workers to facilitate individual member and group performance. (1 = Interacts to a minimal degree with others even though such exchanges are vital to performance, 4 = Interacts in an adequate fashion with others when information exchange is necessary, and 7 = Actively seeks interaction with others beyond requirements to solve problems and facilitate performance).