

# The Relationship between Organizational Commitment and Perceived Organizational Support: Case of a Luxury Concept Hotel

**Cemre Kalkandelen<sup>1</sup>, MBA student**

<sup>1</sup>Yeditepe University, cemre.kalkandelen@std.yeditepe.edu.tr  
ORCID ID: 0000-0003-1378-0272

**Senem Göl Beşer<sup>2</sup>**

<sup>2</sup>Yeditepe University, senemgolbeser@yeditepe.edu.tr  
ORCID ID: 0000-0001-9631-6752

## **Abstract**

This paper presents the results of research that aimed to investigate the effect of the perceived organizational support level and some socio-demographic characteristics on the level of organizational commitment, affective commitment, continuance commitment and normative commitment levels in a luxury concept hotel business environment. The socio-demographic characteristics consists of the age, marital and educational status, working time in current organization, total working time and working position of the hotel personnel.

The sample of the study consists of 177 people who work in the luxury concept hotel businesses in Istanbul in 2018. Specially designed forms were used to collect socio-demographic data along with the corresponding perceived organizational support and the organizational

---

Submission Date: 13.05.2019

Acceptance Date: 30.05.2019

Contemporary Research in Economics and Social Sciences Vol:3 Issue:1 Year:2019,  
pp. 115-151

commitment levels. Relational screening method was used.

Results of the research reveal that there exist a positive and significant relationship between Perceived Organizational Support levels and Affective Commitment and Organizational Commitment levels. There is also a positive but not significant relationship between Perceived Organizational Support levels and Continuance Commitment and Normative Commitment levels. On the other hand, the age, marital and educational status, working time in current organization, total working time and positions of the hotel personnel have led to a differentiation on the level of Affective Commitment, Continuance Commitment, Normative Commitment and Organizational Commitment, but their gender does not cause a differentiation.

**Keywords:** Organizational Commitment, Perceived Organizational Support, Hotel Business, Personal Characteristics.

### **Örgütsel Bağlılık ve Algılanan Örgütsel Destek Arasındaki İlişki: Lüks Konsept Otel Örneği**

#### **Öz**

Bu makalede, lüks konseptte hizmet veren bir otel işletmesinde, çalışanlarca algılanan örgütsel destek düzeyi ve bazı sosyo-demografik özelliklerin, çalışanların örgütsel bağlılık düzeylerine etkilerini inceleyen bir araştırma çalışmasının sonuçları sunulmaktadır. Araştırmada kullanılan sosyo-demografik özellikler otel çalışanlarının yaşları, medeni ve eğitim durumları, kurumdaki ve toplam çalışma süreleri ve çalıştıkları pozisyonlar olarak belirlenmiştir.

Araştırmanın örneklemini 2018 yılında İstanbul ilinde lüks konseptte hizmet veren bir otel işletmesinde çalışan 177 kişi oluşturmaktadır. Sosyo-Demografik verilerin toplanması ve algılanan örgütsel destek ve örgütsel bağlılık düzeylerinin ölçülebilmesi için özel tasarlanmış anket formları kullanılmıştır. Araştırmada ilişkisel tarama yöntemi kullanılmıştır.

Araştırma sonucunda otel çalışanlarının; algılanan örgütsel destek

düzeyleri ile duygusal bağlılık ve örgütsel bağlılık düzeyleri arasında pozitif yönlü anlamlı bir ilişki olduğu, algılanan örgütsel destek düzeyleri ile devam bağlılığı ve normatif bağlılık düzeyleri arasında pozitif yönlü bir ilişki olduğu ancak bu ilişkilerin anlamlı olmadığı tespit edilmiştir. Öte yandan, otel çalışanlarının yaşlarının, medeni durumlarının, eğitim durumlarının, kurumdaki çalışma sürelerinin, toplam çalışma sürelerinin ve çalıştıkları pozisyonların duygusal bağlılık, devam bağlılığı, normatif bağlılık ve örgütsel bağlılık genel düzeyi üzerinde bir farklılaşmaya neden olduğu ancak cinsiyetlerinin bir farklılaşmaya neden olmadığı da araştırmanın sonuçları arasındadır.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Örgütsel Bağlılık, Algılanan Örgütsel Destek, Otel İşletmesi, Kişisel Özellikler

## 1. Introduction

The human factor has become the most valuable component in today's organizations and company managers are continuously looking for new and effective ways of keeping qualified employees in their organizations while maximizing their work efficiencies (Kon, 2015). This has placed increased importance on human resources management to maximize organizational efficiency and effectiveness. Organizational efficiency and organizational effectiveness are closely related to the commitment levels of employees and therefore, new concepts and ideas to increase the self-sacrifice of employees are sought. Two of these new concepts are namely, organizational commitment and perceived organizational support.

The concept of organizational commitment has obtained considerable importance since the 1950s. After the 1970s, a number of studies have been conducted to determine the contribution of the organization's employees to the organization's effectiveness and success (Çakınberk et.al., 2011). Today, employees are considered as part of the companies' intellectual capital (Doğan and Kılıç, 2007). So, for all organizations, organizational commitment is considered as an important issue (İnce and Gül, 2005).

The human kind is not only a material or a physical but also a social being. They have social needs such as being appreciated, receiving emotional support and respect besides having a social status in the society. In the modern management approach, it is accepted that an employee's voluntary efforts and performance regarding his work are shaped by the organization in connection with the material and spiritual rewards he expects to receive in the future. Thanks to this exchange, the expectations of both sides are met. This relationship is called organizational support (Ceylan et al., 2015).

Organizational supporting involves the consideration of the well-being of the employees as an organizational value and the organizations' planned efforts to increase their employees' happiness (İplik et al., 2014). Via the organizational support process, employers openly state that they are aware of their employees' contributions and support to the organization and they are happy to work with them. Hence a strong message is delivered that their happiness and welfare is important for

the company. Through this message, the reflective need for respect, belonging and approval needs of the individual is simultaneously satisfied (Türe and Yıldırım, 2018).

The employee's actual perception of these efforts by the organization is defined as "perceived organizational support". The feeling of confidence in this support enables the employee to show a more positive attitude towards the organization and to view herself/himself as a part of the organization. Perceived organizational support is defined as the employees feel that they are part of the organization, the organization is aware of the employee and care for the employees to feel comfortable, peaceful and secure (Demirer, 2017). Increased levels of perception of this support by the employees have a direct positive effect on their job satisfaction. Hence, organizations actively need to work towards increasing the perception of organizational support (Şener, et al., 2015).

## **2. Literature Review**

### **2.1. Organizational Commitment**

The concept of organizational commitment was introduced in the 1950s and the first studies were based on Becker's (1960) "side-bet" theory. This theory is one of the oldest studies trying to explain the concepts of commitment and organizational commitment (Koç, 2009). Side-bet theory states that the employee, who shows commitment to an organization, has a partial or total secret interest on the basis of this commitment. This interest means that the employee will lose something if he leaves his organization (Barutçu, 2015).

In the 1980s, the organizational commitment concept was studied by Mowday et al. (1982) as a two-dimensional structure. The first of these dimensions was the status of organizational membership (absence, absenteeism) and the second dimension was related to the nature of organizational membership (loyalty, trust and cooperation) (Barutçu, 2015).

In the 1990s, Allen and Meyer further discussed the organizational commitment and introduced three dimensions to the concept: 1- Affective Commitment, 2- Continuance Commitment and 3-Normative Commitment (Allen and Meyer, 1991).

**2.1.1. Affective Commitment:** This dimension is described as an emotional attachment of employees to their organizations with identifying themselves with their organizations and feel as an active participant in organizational activities. In other words, affective commitment is the degree of integration of employees with their organizations. The reason why employees continue their membership to the organization is because they desire it. Hence, the goals and values of the employees and the goals and values of the organizations are integrated. As a result, the employees are pleased to be in that organization and actively participate in their works and have good relations with other members of the organization. Employees who are committed to their organizations with emotional commitment are a loyal member who devotes themselves to the organization. Therefore, they have a positive attitude towards the organization and do not refrain from making extra efforts for the organization when necessary (Allen and Meyer, 1991).

**2.1.2. Continuance Commitment:** This dimension includes the definitions introduced by the Side-bet theory, where organizational commitment was first defined. In the continuance commitment, focus is on the individuals' losses in case of leaving the organization and related with the possibility that the employee may be deprived of certain benefits, such as salary, seniority and retirement benefits, if they leave the organization. Therefore, employees may continue to work in the organization even though they do not wish to stay in the organization (Gülova and Demirsoy, 2012).

**2.1.3. Normative Commitment:** By this dimension, Allen and Meyer (1990) have added a sense of moral commitment to the concept of organizational commitment. According to this dimension, employees perceive loyalty to their organizations as a duty and continue to stay in the organization as a result of their loyalty (Barutçu, 2015).

Normative commitment develops under the influence of familial and cultural factors prior to the employee's participation in the organization along with the influence of social and other investments made by the orga-

nization. An example for these investments could be the training payments and professional development costs for the employee. The employee continues to work with the idea that it is a moral obligation to stay in the organization until these investments are repaid (Allen and Meyer, 1991).

## **2.2. Perceived Organizational Support**

Support means informational, emotional, discretionary and material help from different sources. Organizational support refers to the fact that the source of the support is the organization (Selçuk, 2003). The “perceived” adjective stresses that the mentioned support is the actual support measured by employee surveys.

Elton Mayo and his colleagues in the 1930s approached the concept of organizations from a “behavioral” perspective and designed the Hawthorne experiments. These experiments started with the purpose of investigating the relationship between the increase in productivity and physical improvements and eventually resulted in the determination that social factors are more important in productivity growth (Cole 1993; cited in Nayır, 2011).

Based on the results from the Hawthorne experiments, Mayo concluded that socio-emotional organizational support has an impact on the social changes of employees (Nayır, 2011). It enables the organization to deal with its employees, to accept the employees’ acceptance, approval and respect. This effort leads to more efforts by the employees for the organization. As a result, a change / exchange relationship develops. Organizational support theory in the business also deals with this exchange between organization and employee (Aselage and Eisenberger, 2003).

In today’s management, it is accepted that the only source that cannot be imitated among competing organizations is human resources. To succeed in this competitive environment, businesses should use their available resources in a most efficient way. Considering the inimitability of human resources, managers need give effort to earn their employees’ commitment, dedication and self-sacrifice towards the organization. As a result of this approach, organizations began to consider

the idea of giving their employees the impression that they were behind them (Akin, 2008).

Emotional needs such as moral support, respect, approval and appreciation are needed by employees. The managers show organizational support by making them feel that they are aware of their contributions to the organization, think about their happiness and feel happy to be with them (Özdemir, 2010).

Blau (1964) says that the organizational support concept is based on the theory of social change. According to this approach, there is a change of welfare between the two parties (organizations and employees) depending on mutual conditions (Özdemir, 2010).

Thanks to organizational support; it is felt that they are happy to work with them, they are happy for their happiness and welfare and they are aware of their contribution and support to the organization. Thus, as a human being, the needs of employees such as being respected, being approved and belongingness are satisfied (İplik et. al., 2014).

Özdemir (2010) lists the characteristics of a supporting organization as follows:

1. Take into consideration the ideas, suggestions and criticisms of its employees; evaluate and implement the applicable ones.
2. Provide assurance to its employees and provide assurance that those who meet the success criteria of the organization will remain in the organization.
3. Maintain a high level of internal communication in order to ensure positive relations among employees.
4. Establish organizational justice in the organization.
5. Consider employees and provide some benefits in favor of them.

Managers should take the necessary measures in this regard. Considering that their employees are social human beings, they should be given the opportunity to participate in various groups and their contributions, personalities and ideas should be valued. Therefore, employees will be feeling themselves more valuable, in other words, organizational support will be provided.



### **3. Methodology**

#### **3.1. Research Purpose, Importance and Hypothesis**

Perceived organizational commitment is an important topic for business management since 1950s. This subject has been studied in many different sectors. In this study, the relationship between organizational commitment and some personal characteristics and perceived level of perceived organizational support will be discussed in a hotel business that serves luxury concept.

The hotel businesses are in the service sector and have a labor-intensive way of working (Kozak, 2008). In other words, hotel businesses depend mostly on human labor while performing their functions (Çolak, 2012). For almost all offered hotel services, this is an easily observable phenomenon. Functions like greeting of the guests, arrival and departure assistances and services like room cleaning, catering, laundry all require manpower.

On the other hand, almost all the services in the hotel business (room preparation, service, food and beverage services, front desk services, etc.) are intertwined with the guest and in the social environment (Kozak, 2008). In this respect, interpersonal communication is more intense in hotels than any other businesses (Kuşluyan et al., 2010). For this reason, it is expected that the employees who face the customers should be friendly, gentle and be utmost careful about human relations (Costen and Barrash, 2006).

The majority of services in hotels are offered instantaneously. This situation rises the risks of all employees in the hotel business to face instant and genuine problems compared to many other sectors. In this respect, hotel staff should possess the ability to take immediate responsibility and always ready to contribute to the solution of all requests (Erhart, 2006).

In tourism enterprises and hotel businesses, the fixed costs are high. A significant part of the capital is connected to fixed values even before the hotel starts its activities and variable costs are relatively less important (Çolak, 2012). Therefore, managers concentrate their attention and efforts on “guest” and “income” issues rather than costs (Gürbüz,

1998). This characteristic of hotel business is another aspect that stresses on the importance of human relations.

Today, competition is a phenomenon that manifests itself in many sectors. The competition in the hotel businesses is fierce. Especially in recent years, competition rose extraordinary levels. Many businesses are trying to survive this competition.

The necessity of qualified personnel is an undeniable issue for businesses to protect their assets (Çolak, 2012). In this context, it has been deemed worthwhile to examine whether there is a relationship between certain socio-demographic characteristics and organizational commitment levels of the employees for a hotel business serving a luxury concept. Also, it is considered as an important issue to investigate whether there is a relationship between the perceived levels of organizational support and the levels of organizational commitment.

For this purpose, the following hypotheses were stated to be analyzed:

*H1*: There is a significant relationship between Perceived Organizational Support and Organizational Commitment.

*H2*: Organizational commitment levels differ significantly based on socio-demographic factors.

### **3.2. Research Model, Sampling and Data Collection Method**

This research is a relational survey model study in order to reveal the effect of certain socio-demographic characteristics and perceived organizational support on organizational commitment in a hotel that serves in a luxury concept. The hotel is a member of a chain hotel group with units operating in North America, Europe, Middle East / Africa and Asia Pacific regions.

The population of the research was the employees in a hotel management company which provides luxury services in Istanbul in 2018. The number of employees in the hotel has shown an average of 250 people per year. Since the population was large, it was decided to work with a statistically acceptable sample size.

When calculating the sample size, 95% confidence level and 5% confidence interval criteria used in social sciences were taken into con-

sideration and pre-calculated statistical tables were employed. Given the population is 250 people and the confidence level and the confidence interval is set to be 95% and 5% respectively, the sample size can be determined to be 152 people (Cohen et al., 2007).

The research data were collected by survey. The questionnaires were sent via e-mail to all people working in the hotel business on the date of the survey. A total of 185 people returned their surveys at the end of the study. However, 8 out of the filled questionnaires were excluded due to missing data. For this reason, the sample size was determined as 177 people.

The questionnaire used in this research consists of 3 sections: “Personal Information Form”, “Organizational Commitment Scale” and “Perceived Organizational Support Scale - Short Form”.

Taking into consideration the organizational commitment literature, the socio-demographic characteristics were determined as the gender, age, marital status, educational status, working time in the institution, total working time and working position. These data were collected with the “Personal Information Form”.

In order to measure the level of organizational commitment of the participants, “the Organizational Commitment Scale”, which was developed by Meyer and Allen (1990) and finalized by Özkan (2010), was used.

This scale consists of 3 sub-dimensions and 22 items. The first sub-dimension of the scale is “Affective Commitment” and includes the first 7 items. The second sub-dimension of the scale is Continuance Commitment and covers the following 8 items. The last sub-dimension of the scale is Normative Commitment and covers the last 7 items.

In order to measure the perceived level of organizational support of the participants, “the Perceived Organizational Support Scale - Short Form”, which was developed by Turunc et al. (2012) based on Eisenberger et al. (1986) “the Perceived Organizational Support Scale”, was used.

This scale (Perceived Organizational Support Scale - Short Form) has one-dimensional structure consisting of a total of 8 questions. For 4 of the questions (Q.2, Q.3, Q.5 and Q.7), it was necessary to reverse the scores.

Data obtained from participants' forms and scales were entered into SPSS 22.0 data analysis program for analysis. For variance analysis, Independent Sample T Test was used for two group variables and One-Way Variance Test (ANOVA) and Welch Test were used for the variables with more than two groups. For correlation analysis, Pearson Correlation was used. The findings were evaluated at 95% confidence interval and 5% significance level.

**4. Empirical Results**

**4.1. Descriptive Analysis Findings**

The socio-demographic characteristics of the participants were summarized in Table 1.

**Table 1:** Frequency and Percentage Analysis Results by Socio-Demographic Characteristics of the Participants

<b>Socio-Demographic Characteristics</b>	<b>Groups</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>
Gender	Female	98	55,4
	Male	79	44,6
	Total	177	100
Age	30 and under	79	44,6
	31-40	57	32,2
	41-50	37	20,9
	51 and over	4	2,3
	Total	177	100
Marital Status	Married	86	48,6
	Single	91	51,4
	Total	177	100
Education	High School or below	41	23,2
	Associate/College Degree	25	14,1
	Bachelor Degree	88	49,7
	Master's Degree	23	13,0
	Total	177	100

Working Time in Organization	1 year or less	65	36,7
	2-3 years	27	15,3
	4 years	85	48,0
	Total	177	100
Total Working Time	1-5 years	66	37,3
	6-10 years	61	34,5
	11-15 years	24	13,6
	16 years and above	26	14,7
	Total	177	100
Working Position	Staff	122	68,9
	Manager	55	31,1
	Total	177	100

According to Table 1, 55.4% of the participants were female and 44.6% were male. For age group data, 44.6% of the participants were between 30 years old and under, 32.2% of them were between 31-40 years old, 20.9% were between 41-50 years old and 2.3% were 51 years old and over. For marital status, 48.6% of the participants were married and 51.4% were single. When the participants were analyzed according to their educational status, it was determined that 23.2% of them were graduated from high school or below, 14.1% graduated from associate / college degree, 49.7% from bachelor degree and 13% graduated from master degree education. It was determined that 36.7% of the participants were working in the institution for 1 year or less, 15.3% for 2-3 years and 48% for 4 years. When the participants were examined in terms of total working time, it was understood that 37.3% were 1-5 years, 34.5% were 6-10 years, 13.6% were 11-15 years and 14.7% were 16 years or more.

Both Perceived Organizational Support Scale and Organizational Commitment Scale are 5-Likert Scale. The expressions and scoring in the scales are as follows: I strongly disagree = 1; I disagree = 2; I am undecided = 3; I agree = 4; I strongly agree = 5. In the scales and subscales, higher scores mean higher levels of commitment and higher levels of perceived support.

Based on the assumption that the intervals in the scales are equal, the upper and lower limits for the mean can be determined as follows: I strongly disagree (1.00-1.79), I disagree (1.80-2.59), I am undecided (2.60-3.39), I agree (3.40-4.19) and I strongly agree (4.20-5.00). These grades can be combined into three categories as low-medium-high: Low level (I strongly disagree and I disagree); Mid-level (I am undecided); High level (I strongly agree and I agree). Low level is between (1.00-2.59); intermediate level is between (2.60-3.39); High level is between (3.40-5.00) (Uçar and Uçar, 2014).

The mean of the scales / subscales used in the study were summarized in the Table 2.

**Table 2:** The mean of the scales / sub-scales

Scale	$\bar{x}$	SD
AC SS.	4,03	1,019
CC SS.	2,96	,919
NC SS.	3,04	,781
OC S.	3,33	,707
POS S.	3,86	,887

According to Table 2, the mean of the Affective Commitment Sub Scale was found  $\bar{X} = 4.03 (\pm 1.019)$ , the mean of the Continuance Commitment Sub Scale was found  $\bar{X} = 2.96 (\pm ,919)$ , the mean of the Normative Commitment Sub Scale was found  $\bar{X} = 3.04 (\pm ,781)$ , the mean of Organizational Commitment Scale was found  $\bar{X} = 3.33 (\pm ,707)$ . Accordingly, the level of affective commitment of the participants was high ( $3.40 < \bar{X} < 5.00$ ); the level of continuance commitment was on medium level ( $2.60 < \bar{X} < 3.39$ ); the level of normative commitment was on medium level ( $2.60 < \bar{X} < 3.39$ ); the level of organizational commitment was on medium level ( $2.60 < \bar{X} < 3.39$ ). On the other hand, the mean of Perceived Organizational Support Scale was  $3.86 (\pm ,887)$ , and the level of organizational support perception was high ( $3.40 < \bar{X} < 5.00$ ).

## 4.2. Inferential Analysis Findings

The results of the reliability analysis of the scales are given in Table 3.

**Table 3:** The Results of the Scales Reliability Analysis

Scale	Number of Items	Cronbach's Alfa ( $\alpha$ )
AC SS.	7	,954
CC SS.	8	,854
NC SS.	7	,760
OC S.	22	,903
POS S.	8	,902

As can be seen from Table 3, it was found that the reliability levels of the scales used in the study were highly reliable ( $0.7 < \alpha < 0.9$ ).

In order to determine whether the data collected from the scales used in the study showed a normal distribution, the skewness and kurtosis values of the scores were examined and the results are summarized in the following table.

**Table 4:** The Results of the Scales Skewness and Kurtosis Analysis

Scale	Mean	S.Dev.	Skewness		Kurtosis	
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic	Std. Error
AC SS.	4,030	1,019	-1,100	,183	,571	,363
CC SS.	2,956	,918	,153	,183	-,688	,363
NC SS.	3,042	,781	-,053	,183	-,002	,363
OC S.	3,325	,707	-,525	,183	,629	,363
POS S.	3,861	,887	-,641	,183	,247	,363

In the literature, different values are given about the accepted skewness and kurtosis values for a normal distribution:  $\pm 1,0$  (Hair et al.,

2013);  $\pm 1,5$  (Tabachnick and Fidell, 2013);  $\pm 2,0$  (George and Mallery, 2010). As can be seen from Table 4, the skewness and kurtosis values for the scales and the subscales were within the range of  $\pm 1.0$ , excluding only AC value. According to these data; Perceived Organizational Support Scale (Short Form), Organizational Commitment Scale and subscales (Affective Commitment, Continuance Commitment and Normative Commitment) data were evaluated to have a normal distribution.

### 4.3. Testing Hypotheses

#### **H1: There is a significant relationship between Perceived Organizational Support and Organizational Commitment.**

Pearson Correlation Analysis was applied to determine whether there was a significant relationship between the scores of the perceived organizational support scale and the organizational commitment scale and its sub-scales. The results of Pearson Correlation Analysis are given in Table 5.

**Table 5:** The Results of Pearson Correlation Analysis Between Perceived Organizational Support and Affective Commitment, Continuance Commitment, Normative Commitment, Organizational Commitment

	AC	CC	NC	OC	POS
<b>1 Affective Commitment</b>	1				
<b>2 Continuance Commitment</b>	,308**	1			
<b>3 Normative Commitment</b>	,508**	,441**	1		
<b>4 Organizational Commitment</b>	,782**	,768**	,792**	1	
<b>5 Perceived Organizational Support</b>	,734**	,087	,146	,429**	1

\*\* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level ( $p < 0,01$ ).

\* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level ( $p < 0,05$ ).

$r = 0,000-0,300$  Low Correlation

$r = 0,301-0,700$  Medium Correlation

$r = 0,701-1.000$  High Correlation



When the correlation analysis in Table 5 was examined, it was observed that there was a positive and high level ( $r = .734$ ) significant ( $p < 0.01$ ) relationship between the Perceived Organizational Support levels and Affective Commitment levels of the participants. This result is consistent with the findings of the Eisenberger et al. (1990), Hochwarter et al. (2003), Bilgin and Demirer (2012) and Kaur and Aneet (2017).

Also, it was determined that there was a positive and medium level ( $r = .429$ ) significant ( $p < 0.01$ ) relationship between Perceived Organizational Support levels of the participants and Organizational Commitment levels. This result is consistent with the findings of the Bishop et al. (2000), Yoon and Thye (2002), Garg and Dhar (2014) and Barutçu (2015).

On the other hand, it was determined that there was no significant relationship between Perceived Organizational Support levels of participants and Continuance Commitment. This result is consistent with the findings of the Shore and Wayne (1993) and Aube et al. (2007).

Also, there was no significant relationship between Perceived Organizational Support levels of participants and Normative Commitment levels. This result contradicts the findings of the Shore and Wayne (1993), O'Driscoll and Randall (1999), Eisenberger et al. (2001), Meyer et al. (2002), Özdevecioğlu (2003), Aube et al. (2007), Panaccio and Vandenberghe (2009), Üren (2011), Wann-Yih and Htaik (2011), Kaplan and Ögüt (2012), Barutçu (2015), Malik et al. (2016) and Özkan (2017).

Shore and Wayne (1993), Eisenberger et al. (2001), Aube et al. (2007), Barutçu (2015) and Özkan (2017).

## **H2: Organizational commitment levels differ significantly based on socio-demographic factors.**

It was analyzed whether the affective commitment, continuance commitment, normative commitment and organizational commitment levels of the participants differ according to the socio-demographic characteristics. The socio-demographic characteristics to be taken into consideration are the gender, age, marital status, educational status, working time in the organization, total working time and position.

Independent samples T-test was used for the variables with two sub-groups. For variables with 3 or more subgroups firstly, the homogeneity of variance was analyzed by the Levene’s test. In cases where the homogeneity of variance requirement was provided, ANOVA was used for analysis of variance. In cases where it was not provided, Welch test was used. The differences between the sub-groups were investigated using multiple comparisons, i.e. post-hoc, tests. Scheffe and Games-Howell tests were used, respectively, because the sub-group sizes were different. The tests used are shown in the related tables. Also, in the ANOVA and the Welch Test tables, if there is a significant difference between the groups, this is shown in the result column.

**Table 6:** Independent Sample T-Test Results between Gender Variable and Affective Commitment-Continuance Commitment-Normative Commitment Sub-Scales, Organizational Commitment Scale

Scale	Gender	N	$\bar{x}$	SD.	t	df	p																																
AC SS.	Female	98	3,99	,997	-,560	175	,576																																
	Male	79	4,08	1,050				CC SS.	Female	98	3,01	,900	,808	175	,420	Male	79	2,89	,943	NC SS.	Female	98	3,01	,747	-,629	175	,530	Male	79	3,08	,826	OC S.	Female	98	3,32	,673	-,096	175	,923
CC SS.	Female	98	3,01	,900	,808	175	,420																																
	Male	79	2,89	,943				NC SS.	Female	98	3,01	,747	-,629	175	,530	Male	79	3,08	,826	OC S.	Female	98	3,32	,673	-,096	175	,923	Male	79	3,33	,752								
NC SS.	Female	98	3,01	,747	-,629	175	,530																																
	Male	79	3,08	,826				OC S.	Female	98	3,32	,673	-,096	175	,923	Male	79	3,33	,752																				
OC S.	Female	98	3,32	,673	-,096	175	,923																																
	Male	79	3,33	,752																																			

In Table 6, the gender oriented comparative t-test results of the participants in terms of their AC, CC, NC and OC are displayed. There are no significant differences in the level of AC, CC, NC and OC on the basis of gender (p values >.050). This result is consistent with the findings of the Yalçın and İplik (2005), Sığırı (2007), Taşkın and Dilek (2010) and Özkan (2017).

**Table 7:** Variance Tests Results between Age Variable and Affective Commitment-Continuance Commitment-Normative Commitment Sub-Scales, Organizational Commitment Scale

Scale	Age	N	$\bar{x}$	SD.	df	F	p	Tests	Results
AC SS.	30 and under (1)	79	3,78	1,052					
	31-40 (2)	57	3,94	1,080					
	41-50 (3)	37	4,65	0,492	3/14,934	14,022	,000*	Welch & Games-Howell	1-3 2-3
	51 and below (4)	4	4,64	0,623					
	Total	177	4,03	1,019					
CC SS.	30 and under (1)	79	2,87	0,816					
	31-40 (2)	57	2,66	0,953					
	41-50 (3)	37	3,56	0,824	3/173	8,627	,000*	ANOVA & Scheffe	1-3 2-3
	51 and below (4)	4	3,19	0,807					
	Total	177	2,96	0,919					
NC SS.	30 and under (1)	79	2,79	0,772					
	31-40 (2)	57	3,09	0,742					
	41-50 (3)	37	3,53	0,664	3/173	8,504	,000*	ANOVA & Scheffe	1-3
	51 and below (4)	4	2,82	0,427					
	Total	177	3,04	0,781					
OC S.	30 and under (1)	79	3,13	0,663					
	31-40 (2)	57	3,20	0,743					
	41-50 (3)	37	3,90	0,417	3/173	12,789	,000*	ANOVA & Scheffe	1-3 2-3
	51 and below (4)	4	3,53	0,452					
	Total	177	3,33	0,707					

\* Significant at the 0.05 level (p<0,05).

In Table 7, the age oriented comparative test (Welch& Games-Howell and ANOVA& Scheffe) results of the participants in terms of their AC, CC, NC and OC are displayed. There are significant differences in the level of AC, CC, NC and OC on the basis of age (p values <.050). It was determined that the commitment level of the older participants was higher than younger. This result is consistent with the findings of the Chang (2002), Durna and Erden (2005), Özkaya et al. (2006) and Özkan (2017).

**Table 8:**Independent Sample T-Test Results Between the Marital Status Variable and Affective Commitment-Continuance Commitment-Normative Commitment Sub-Scales, Organizational Commitment Scale

Scale	Marital Status	N	$\bar{x}$	SD.	t	df	p
AC SS.	Married	86	4,40	,841	5,040	175	,000*
	Single	91	3,68	1,051			
CC SS.	Married	86	3,11	,923	2,217	175	,028*
	Single	91	2,81	,895			
NC SS.	Married	86	3,30	,727	4,575	175	,000*
	Single	91	2,79	,753			
OC S.	Married	86	3,58	,640	5,042	175	,000*
	Single	91	3,08	,684			

\* Significant at the 0.05 level (p<0,05).

In Table 8, the marital status oriented comparative t-test results of the participants in terms of their AC, CC, NC and OC are displayed. There are significant differences in the level of AC, CC, NC and OC on the basis of gender (p values <,050). It was determined that the commitment level of the married participants was higher than the singles. This result is consistent with the findings of the Durna and Eren (2005), Özkaya et.al. (2006), Bozkurt and Yurt (2013), Seçgin (2014) and Küçüközkan (2015).

**Table 9:** Variance Tests Results Between Educational Status Variable and Affective Commitment-Continuance Commitment-Normative Commitment Sub-Scales, Organizational Commitment Scale

Scale	Education	N	$\bar{x}$	SD.	df	F	p	Tests	Results
AC SS.	High School or below (1)	41	3,56	1,031					
	Associate/College D. (2)	25	4,11	0,907					
	Bachelor D. (3)	88	4,14	0,982	3/173	4,252	,006*	ANOVA & Scheffe	1-3 1-4
	Master D. (4)	23	4,34	1,047					
	Total	177	4,03	1,019					
CC SS.	High School or below (1)	41	2,56	0,764					
	Associate/College D. (2)	25	2,75	0,971					
	Bachelor D. (3)	88	3,00	0,836	3/173	9,606	,000*	ANOVA & Scheffe	1-4 2-4 3-4
	Master D. (4)	23	3,72	0,967					
	Total	177	2,96	0,919					
NC SS.	High School or below (1)	41	2,80	0,773					
	Associate/College D. (2)	25	3,13	0,718					
	Bachelor D. (3)	88	2,99	0,722	3/173	5,848	,001*	ANOVA & Scheffe	1-4 3-4
	Master D. (4)	23	3,60	0,852					
	Total	177	3,04	0,781					
OC S.	High School or below (1)	41	2,96	0,634					
	Associate/College D. (2)	25	3,30	0,672					
	Bachelor D. (3)	88	3,36	0,636	3/173	9,788	,000*	ANOVA & Scheffe	1-3 1-4 2-4 3-4
	Master D. (4)	23	3,88	0,773					
	Total	177	3,33	0,707					

\* Significant at the 0.05 level (p<0,05).

In Table 9, the education oriented comparative test (ANOVA& Scheffe) results of the participants in terms of their AC, CC, NC and OC are displayed. There are significant differences in the level of AC, CC, NC and OC on the basis of education (p values <,050). It was determined that the commitment level of the participants who had higher education level were also higher. This result contradicts the findings of the Allen and Meyer (1990), Balay (2000), Yalçın and İplik (2005), Seçgin (2014), Uçar and Uçar (2014) and Özkan (2017).

**Table 10:** Variance Tests Results between Working Time in Organization Variable and Affective Commitment-Continuance Commitment-Normative Commitment Sub-Scales, Organizational Commitment Scale

Scale	Working Time in Organization	N	$\bar{x}$	SD.	df	F	p	Tests	Results
AC SS.	1 year or less (1)	65	3,69	1,069					
	2-3 years (2)	27	3,86	0,839					
	4 years (3)	85	4,35	0,940	2/174	8,901	,000*	ANOVA& Scheffe	1-3
	Total	177	4,03	1,019					
CC SS.	1 year or less (1)	65	2,65	0,875					
	2-3 years (2)	27	3,06	0,753					
	4 years (3)	85	3,16	0,943	2/174	6,267	,002*	ANOVA& Scheffe	1-3
	Total	177	2,96	0,919					
NC SS.	1 year or less (1)	65	2,89	0,712					
	2-3 years (2)	27	2,78	0,955					
	4 years (3)	85	3,24	0,729	2/174	5,741	,004*	ANOVA& Scheffe	1-3 2-3
	Total	177	3,04	0,781					
OC S.	1 year or less (1)	65	3,06	0,684					
	2-3 years (2)	27	3,23	0,695					
	4 years (3)	85	3,56	0,652	2/174	10,913	,000*	ANOVA& Scheffe	1-3
	Total	177	3,33	0,707					

\* Significant at the 0.05 level (p<,0,05).

In Table 10, the working time in organization oriented comparative test (ANOVA& Scheffe) results of the participants in terms of their AC, CC, NC and OC are displayed. There are significant differences in the level of AC, CC, NC and OC on the basis of working time in organization (p values <.050). It was determined that the commitment level of the participants who had higher working time in the organization were also higher. This result is consistent with the findings of the Allen and Meyer (1993), Durna and Eren (2005), Uçar and Uçar (2014) and Seggin (2014).

**Table 11:** Variance Tests Results Between Total Working Time Variable and Affective Commitment-Continuance Commitment-Normative Commitment Sub-Scales, Organizational Commitment Scale

Scale	Total Working Time	N	$\bar{x}$	SD.	df	F	p	Tests	Results
AC SS.	1-5 years (1)	66	3,76	1,116	3/76,804	12,822	,000*	W e l c h & Games-Howell	1-4
	6-10 years (2)	61	3,97	1,024					
	11-15 years (3)	24	4,20	0,835					
	16 years and over (4)	26	4,69	0,481					
	Total	177	4,03	1,019					
CC SS.	1-5 years (1)	66	2,70	0,846	3/173	10,221	,000*	A N O V A & Scheffe	1-4
	6-10 years (2)	61	2,83	0,797					
	11-15 years (3)	24	3,09	1,024					
	16 years and over (4)	26	3,76	0,832					
	Total	177	2,96	0,919					
NC SS.	1-5 years (1)	66	2,81	0,757	3/173	6,811	,000*	A N O V A & Scheffe	1-4
	6-10 years (2)	61	3,01	0,738					
	11-15 years (3)	24	3,20	0,659					
	16 years and over (4)	26	3,56	0,806					
	Total	177	3,04	0,781					
OC S.	1-5 years (1)	66	3,07	0,737	3/173	13,499	,000*	A N O V A & Scheffe	1-4
	6-10 years (2)	61	3,25	0,583					
	11-15 years (3)	24	3,48	0,632					
	16 years and over (4)	26	3,99	0,510					
	Total	177	3,33	0,707					

\* Significant at the 0.05 level (p<0,05).

In Table 11, the total working time oriented comparative test (Welch& Games-Howell and ANOVA& Scheffe) results of the participants in terms of their AC, CC, NC and OC are displayed. There are significant differences in the level of AC, CC, NC and OC on the basis of total working time (p values <,050). It was determined that the commitment level of the participants who had higher total working time were also higher. This result is consistent with the findings of the Chang (2002), Durna and Eren (2005), Uçar and Uçar (2014) and Seçgin (2014).

**Table 12:** Independent Sample T-Test Results Between Working Position Variable and Affective Commitment-Continuance Commitment-Normative Commitment Sub-Scales, Organizational Commitment Scale

Scale	Working Position	N	$\bar{x}$	SD.	t	df	p																																
AC SS.	Staff	122	3,78	1,075	-6,333	168,100	,000**																																
	Manager	55	4,58	,592				CC SS.	Staff	122	2,82	,884	-2,988	175	,003**	Manager	55	3,26	,931	NC SS.	Staff	122	2,90	,770	-3,783	175	,000**	Manager	55	3,36	,715	OC S.	Staff	122	3,15	,703	-5,220	175	,000**
CC SS.	Staff	122	2,82	,884	-2,988	175	,003**																																
	Manager	55	3,26	,931				NC SS.	Staff	122	2,90	,770	-3,783	175	,000**	Manager	55	3,36	,715	OC S.	Staff	122	3,15	,703	-5,220	175	,000**	Manager	55	3,71	,550								
NC SS.	Staff	122	2,90	,770	-3,783	175	,000**																																
	Manager	55	3,36	,715				OC S.	Staff	122	3,15	,703	-5,220	175	,000**	Manager	55	3,71	,550																				
OC S.	Staff	122	3,15	,703	-5,220	175	,000**																																
	Manager	55	3,71	,550																																			

\* Significant at the 0.05 level (p<0,05).

In Table 12, the working position oriented comparative t-test results of the participants in terms of their AC, CC, NC and OC are displayed. There are significant differences in the level of AC, CC, NC and OC on the basis of working position (p values <.050). It was determined that the commitment of the participants working in managerial positions was significantly higher than those working in the staff position. This result is consistent with the findings of Balay (2000), Ahmad and Bakar (2003), Pelit etal. (2007), Topaloğlu etal. (2008) and Zivalı (2018).



## 6. Conclusions

*“Commitment is an act, not a word.”*

Jean-Paul Sartre

The purpose of this research was to investigate the effect of certain socio-demographic characteristics and perceived organizational support level on the level of organizational commitment, affective commitment, continuance commitment and normative commitment in the luxury concept hotel businesses.

There is a significant positive correlation ( $r = .734$ ) between the perceived organizational support and affective commitment ( $p < 0.01$ ). This result is consistent with the findings of the Eisenberger et al. (1990), Hochwarter et al. (2003), Bilgin and Demirer (2012) and Kaur and Aneet (2017). Also, there is a significant positive correlation ( $r = .429$ ) between the perceived organizational support and organizational commitment ( $p < 0.01$ ). This result is consistent with the findings of the Bishop et al. (2000), Yoon and Thye (2002), Garg and Dhar (2014), Barutçu (2015). On the other hand, there is a positive ( $r = .087$ ) relationship between perceived organizational support and continuance commitment, but it is not significant ( $p > 0.05$ ). This result is consistent with the findings of the Shore and Wayne (1993) and Aube et al. (2007).

These results of the study are generally consistent with the findings of the studies in the literature but also suggest avenues for further research. Several important conclusions emerge from these findings:

The organizational commitment consists of the sum of sub-dimensions of the affective -continuance- normative commitment. Within these three sub-dimensions of commitment, the most valuable asset for an organization aiming at institutionalization is the affective commitment, while the least desirable is the continuance commitment (Aube et al., 2007). Both employees' organizational support perceptions and affective commitment levels are high. According to the results of the correlation analysis, these two variables are in a high level and positive relationship with each other. Employees think that their contribution to

the welfare of the organization is taken into consideration by the organization. Employees also enjoy talking about their own organization in their social environment. In this respect, it can be said that the corporate reputation is at the forefront in employees' loyalty and organizational support perceptions.

A second important finding of the present study is that there is a positive ( $r=,146$ ) relationship between perceived organizational support and normative commitment, but it is not significant ( $p> 0.05$ ). This result contradicts the findings of the Shore and Wayne (1993), O'Driscoll and Randall (1999), Eisenberger et al. (2001), Meyer et al. (2002), Özdevecioğlu (2003), Aube et al. (2007), Panaccio and Vandenberghe (2009), Üren (2011), Wann-Yih and Htaik (2011), Kaplan and Öğüt (2012), Barutçu (2015), Malik et al. (2016) and Özkan (2017).

The normative commitment is a type of commitment, which is expressed in almost all of the studies in the literature with a positive correlation relationship with the perceived organizational support. The findings of this study contradict the findings of the studies in the literature.

The normative commitment is a kind of commitment that is desirable for organizations to be immediately after affective commitment. In this respect, it should be emphasized that, although the employees' perception of organizational support is high, this situation is not reflected in the normative commitment. The normative commitment means a sense of moral obligation to stay in an organization. Normative commitment arises as a result of internal obligation. Investments made by the organization (training support, professional development courses, etc.) have an important impact on the emergence of this internal obligation. According to the results of this research, it is seen that the employees have a high level of perception of organizational support, but the problem is that their efforts are not appreciated by their organization.

A third important finding of the present study was that the participants' affective commitment, continuance commitment, normative commitment and organizational commitment did not differ according to their gender, but they differed according to their ages, marital sta-

tus, educational status, working time in organization, total working time and working positions. From these results, the results related to gender [Yalçın and İplik (2005), Sığrı (2007), Taşkın and Dilek (2010) and Özkan (2017)], age [Chang (2002), Durna and Erden (2005), Özkaya et al. (2006) and Özkan (2017)], marital status [Durna and Eren (2005), Özkaya et.al. (2006), Bozkurt and Yurt (2013), Seçgin (2014) and Küçüközkan (2015)], working time in current organization [Allen and Meyer (1993), Durna and Eren (2005), Uçar and Uçar (2014) and Seçgin (2014).], total working time [Chang (2002), Durna and Eren (2005), Uçar and Uçar (2014) and Seçgin (2014)] and working position [Balay (2000), Ahmad and Bakar (2003), Pelit et al. (2007), Topaloğlu et al. (2008) and Zıvalı (2018)] generally coincide with the findings of the studies in the literature.

Employees of both sexes are needed in the tourism sector. It is important in this respect that both sexes have close commitment levels. It is thought that the commitment of older employees due to reasons such as having more opportunities to make use of their own experience in performing their duties, having higher job satisfaction and career opportunities. It is pondered that the commitment of married participants depends on the need for more stability and confidence, more conservatism in changing institutions, having a family to which they are dependent, and being less willing to seek new jobs compared to singles. It is reflected that the commitment of the participants with higher working time in organization depends on the fact that they feel responsible for the organization they have gained experience, their status as a result of time, and their satisfaction in their organizations. Again, in these results, it is considered that the organization has different advantages due to belonging to a chain hotel group and the corporate reputation of the organization is effective. It is considered that the commitment of the participants with a higher total working time depends on their higher wages and their understanding of their interests and the interests of the organization parallel to each other. Again, in obtaining these results, it is considered that having a very high proportion of managers in the group with the highest total working time has a significant effect. It is

thought that the commitment of the managers is linked to the fact that being more autonomous in their work, having a say in the decisions / implementations of the organization, identifying with their organizations and internalizing their organizations, increasing their status in the organization and generating higher income from the employees in their seniority.

It was determined that the participants' affective commitment, continuance commitment, normative commitment and organizational commitment levels differed according to their educational status. Differentiation is in favor of participants with undergraduate and graduate education. This result contradicts the findings of many studies [Allen and Meyer (1990), Balay (2000), Yalçın and İplik (2005), Seçgin (2014), Uçar and Uçar (2014) and Özkan (2017)] in the literature. In the commitment of participants with high levels of education, the possibility of using personal initiative; taking more responsibility and independent decision making/implementation; the fact that the organization has different advantages due to belonging to a chain hotel group (such as the satisfaction of the people who want to live); the corporate reputation of the organization is considered to be effective.

Finally, corporate reputation has emerged as an important factor in the affective commitment of participants. Also, it is seen that the corporate reputation is effective in higher commitment of the employees who are well educated and have a higher working time. In this context, it is reflected that the organization should invest more in its employees by means of in-service training, language course at abroad, participation in experience programs in other countries, more active rotation with employees in other countries, job enrichment, etc.

The present study does have a number of methodological limitations that suggest further research. First of all, our sample was from a luxury hotel in Istanbul and this unit of analysis may be unique to limit the external validity of our findings. Second, a deeper understanding of the issue involves a broader focus on the societal factors such as economy, politics, sociocultural realms since the organization is immersed within that system. Thirdly, this research is a correlational design thus

the nature of the data does not permit a systemic casual analysis of the variables. Even with these limitations, we believe that we have contributed to the study of organizational behavior via suggesting a positive relationship between the perceived support of the organization and the organizational commitment in luxury hotel business setting. The results suggest that managers need to seek ways in order to increase the level of support to the hotel employees which would eventually lead them to be more committed to fulfilling of their role requirements of their jobs, establish trust, belongingness, loyalty and organizational citizenship.

### **Acknowledgement**

We would like to express our sincere gratitude to Mr. Aziz Gürsoy and Dr. A. Kemal Tuğcu for their support through the study and the research, for their immense knowledge and valuable experience.

### **References**

Ahmad, K. Z., Bakar, R. A. (2003). The association between training and organizational commitment among white collar workers in Malaysia. *International Journal of Training and Development*, Volume 7, Issue 3, 166-185.

Akın, M. (2008). “Örgütsel Destek, Sosyal Destek ve Aile Çatışmalarının Yaşam Tatmini Üzerindeki Etkileri”, *Bozok Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, Issue 25, 141-170.

Allen, N.J., Meyer J.P. (1990). “The Measurement and Antecedents of Affective, Continuance and Normative Commitment to the Organization”, *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, Issue 63, 1–18.

Allen, N.J., Meyer, J.P. (1991). “A Three Model Conceptualization Of Organizational Commitment”, *Human Resource Management Review*, Volume 1, Issue 1, 61-89.

Allen, N.J., Meyer, J.P. (1993). “Organizational Commitment: Evidence of Career Stage Effects?”, *Journal of Business Research*, Volume 26, 49-61.

Aselage, J., Eisenberger, R. (2003). “Perceived Organizational Support and Psychological Contracts: A Theoretical Integration”, *Journal and Organizational Behavior*, Issue 24, 491–509.

Aube, C., Rousseau, V., Morin, E.M. (2007). “Perceived Organizational Support and Organizational Commitment the Moderating Effect of Locus of Control and Work Autonomy”, *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, Volume 22, Issue 5, 479-495.

Balay, R. (2000). *Yönetici ve Öğretmenlerde Örgütsel Bağlılık*, Nobel Yayın Dağıtım, Ankara.

Barutçu, K. (2015). “Kamu Personelinde Algılanan Örgütsel Desteğin Örgütsel Bağlılık Ve Örgütsel Özdeşleşme Düzeyleri İle İlişkisini Belirlemeye Yönelik Bir Araştırma”, Eskişehir Osmangazi Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Master’s Thesis, Eskişehir.

Bilgin, N., Demirer, H. (2012). “The Examination of the Relationship Among Organizational Support, Affective Commitment and Job Satisfaction of Hotel Employees”, *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, Issue 51, 470-473.

Bishop, J.W., Scott, K.D., Burroughs, S.M. (2000). “Support, Commitment, and Employee Outcomes in A Team Environment”, *Journal of Management*, Volume 26, Issue 6, 1113-1132.

Bozkurt,Ö., Yurt, İ. (2013). “Akademisyenlerin Örgütsel Bağlılık Düzeylerini Belirlemeye Yönelik Bir Araştırma”, *Yönetim Bilimleri Dergisi*, Volume 11, Issue 22, 121-139.

Ceylan,AK., Çelik, GM., Emhan, A. (2015). “Personel Güçlendirmesi ve Yönetici Desteğinin İş Memnuniyeti Üzerindeki Etkisi: Enerji Sektöründe Bir Uygulama”, *İşletme Araştırmaları Dergisi*, Volume 7, Issue 1, 168-185.

Chang, E. (2002). “Distributive Justice and Organizational Commitment Revisited: Moderation by Layoff in the Case of Korean Employees”, *Human Resource Management*, Volume 41, Issue 2, 261-270.

Cohen, L., Manion, L., Morrison, K. (2007). *Research Methods in Education*, Taylor&Francis Group, New York.

Costen, W.M., Barrash, D.I. (2006). “ACE-Ing The Hiring Process: A Customer Service Orientation Model”, *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality and Tourism*, Volume 5, Issue 1, 35-49.

Çakınberk, A., Derin, N., Demirel, E.T. (2011). “Örgütsel Özdeşleşmenin Örgütsel Bağlılıkla Biçimlenmesi: Malatya ve Tunceli

Özel Eğitim Kurumları Örneği”, *İşletme Araştırmaları Dergisi*, Volume 3, Issue 1, 89-121.

Çolak, G. (2012). *Ön Büro Hizmetleri*, Murathan Yayınları, Ankara.

Demirer, M.C. (2017). “Örgütlerde Destek Algılarının Çalışanın Duygularını İfade Etmesi Üzerine Etkisi”, *Hitit Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, Yıl 10, Issue 2, 1043-1060.

Doğan, S., Kılıç, S. (2007). “Örgütsel Bağlılığın Sağlanmasında Personel Güçlendirmenin Yeri ve Önemi”, *Erciyes Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, Issue 29, 37-61

Durna, U., Eren, V. (2005). “Üç Bağlılık unsuru Ekseninde Örgütsel Bağlılık”, *Doğuş Üniversitesi Dergisi*, Volume 6, Issue 2, 210-219.

Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., Sowa, D. (1986). “Perceived Organizational Support”, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Volume 71, Issue 3, 500-507.

Eisenberger, R., Fasolu, P., Davis-LaMastro, V. (1990). “Perceived Organizational Support and Employee Diligence, Commitment, and Innovation”, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Volume 75, Issue 1, 51-59.

Eisenberger, R., Armeli, S., Rexwinkel, B., Lynch, PD., Rhoades, L. (2001). “Reciprocation of Perceived Organizational Support”, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Volume 86, Issue 1, 42-51.

Erhart, K.H. (2006). “Job Characteristics Beliefs and Personality as Antecedents of Subjective Person-Job Fit”, *Journal of Business and Psychology*, Volume 21, Issue 2, 193-226.

Garg, S., Dhar, R.L. (2014). “Effects of Stress, LMX and Perceived Organizational Support on Service Quality: Mediating Effects of Organizational Commitment”, *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, Volume 21, 64-75.

Gülova, A.A., Demirsoy, Ö. (2012). “Örgüt Kültürü ve Örgütsel Bağlılık Arasındaki İlişki: Hizmet Sektörü Çalışanları Üzerinde Ampirik Bir Araştırma”, *Business and Economics Research Journal*, Volume



3, Issue 3, 49-76.

Gürbüz, A.K. (1998). *Turizmin Ekonomik Analizi*, Alem Basım-Yayım, Balıkesir.

Gürcü, E. (2014). “Beş Yıldızlı Otel İşletmelerinde Personel Güçlendirmenin Örgütsel Bağlılık Oluşturmadaki Etkileri Üzerine Bir Alan Araştırması: Swisotel İstanbul Örneği”, İstanbul Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Master’s Thesis, İstanbul.

Hochwarter, W.A., Kacmar, C., Perrewe, P.L., Johnson, D. (2003). “Perceived Organizational Support as a Mediator of The Relationship Between Politics Perceptions and Work Outcomes”, *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Issue 63, 438-456.

İnce, M, Gül, H. (2005). *Yönetimde Yeni Bir Paradigma: Örgütsel Bağlılık*, Çizgi Kitabevi, Ankara.

İplik, E., İplik, F.N., Efeoğlu, İ.E. (2014). “Çalışanların Örgütsel Destek Algılarının Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranışı Üzerindeki Etkisinde Örgütsel Özdeşleşmenin Rolü”, *International Journal of Economic and Administrative Studies*, Yıl 6, Issue 12, 109-122.

Kaplan, M., Ögüt, A. (2012). “Algılanan Örgütsel Destek İle Örgütsel Bağlılık Arasındaki İlişkinin Analizi: Otel İşletmelerinde Bir Uygulama”, *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, Volume 17, Issue 1, 387-401.

Kaur, S., Aneet, A. (2017). “Perceived Organizational Support and Affective Commitment: A Demographic Analysis”, *IOSR Journal of Business and Management (IOSR-JBM)*, Volume 19, Issue 1, 54-59.

Koç, H. (2009). “Örgütsel Bağlılık ve Sadakat İlişkisi”, *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, Volume 8, Issue 28, 200-211.

Kon, B. (2015). “Günümüzdeki ve Gelecekteki İnsan Kaynakları Yönetimi”, <http://www.humanica.com.tr/gunumuzdeki-ve-gelecekteki-insan-kaynaklari-yonetimi>

Kozak, M. (2008). *Otel İşletmeciliği, 2. Baskı*, Detay Yayıncılık,

Ankara.

Kuşluyan, S., Kuşluyan, Z., İlhan, İ., Buyruk, L. (2010). “The Human Dimension: A Review of Human Resources Management Issues in the Tourism and Hospitality Industry”, *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly*, Volume 51, Issue 2, 171-214.

Küçüközkan, Y. (2015). “Örgütsel Bağlılık ile Cinsiyet Arasındaki İlişki: Hastanelerde Çalışan Sağlık Personeli Üzerinde Bir Araştırma”, *Uluslararası Akademik Yönetim Bilimleri Dergisi*, Volume 1, Issue 1, 14-37.

Malik, S. Z., Kazmi, S. Z., Nadeem, N. (2016). “The Effect of Perceived Organizational Support on Doctors’ Organizational Commitment in Pakistan”, *The Lahore Journal of Business*, Volume 4, Issue 2, 73-92.

Meyer, J. P., Stanley, D. J., Herscovitch, L., Topolnytsky, L. (2002). “Affective, Continuance, and Normative Commitment to the Organization: A Meta-Analysis of Antecedents, Correlates, and Consequences”, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Issue 61, 20-52.

Nayır, F. (2011). “İlköğretim Okulu Yöneticilerinin Öğretmenlere Sağlanan Örgütsel Desteğe İlişkin Görüşleri, Öğretmenlerin Örgütsel Destek Algısı Ve Örgütsel Bağlılıkla İlişkisi”, Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Doctoral Thesis, Ankara.

O’Driscoll, M. P., Randall, D. M. (1999). “Perceived Organizational Support, Satisfaction with Rewards, and Employee Job Involvement and Organizational Commitment”, *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, Volume 48, Issue2, 197-209.

Özdemir, A. (2010). “Örgütsel Özdeşleşmenin Algılanan Örgütsel Destek, Cinsiyet ve Kıdem Değişkenlerine Göre İncelemesi”, *TSA*, Volume 14, Issue 1, 237-250.

Özdevecioğlu, M. (2003a). “Algılanan Örgütsel Destek ile Örgütsel Bağlılık Arasındaki İlişkilerin Belirlenmesine Yönelik Bir Araştırma”, *Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi İ.İ.B.F. Dergisi*, Volume 18, Issue 2, 113-130.

Özkan, Ç. (2017). “Algılanan Örgütsel Desteğin, Örgütsel Bağlılığa Etkisinde Kişilik Özelliklerinin Rolü: Otel İşletmelerinde Bir Araştırma”, Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Doctoral Thesis, Çanakkale.

Özkaya, M.O., Kocakoç, İ.D., Kara, E. (2006). “Yöneticilerin Örgütsel Bağlılıkları ve Demografik Özellikleri Arasındaki İlişkileri İncelemeye Yönelik Bir Alan Araştırması”, *Yönetim ve Ekonomi*, Volume 13, Issue 2, 77-96.

Panaccio, A., Vandenberghe, C. (2009). “Perceived Organizational Support, Organizational Commitment and Psychological Well-being: A Longitudinal Study”, *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Issue 75, 224-236.

Pelit, E., Boylu, Y., Güçer, E. (2007). “Gazi Üniversitesi Ticaret ve Turizm Eğitim Fakültesi Akademisyenlerinin Örgütsel Bağlılık Düzeyleri Üzerine Bir Araştırma”, *Ticaret ve Turizm Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, Issue 1, 86-114.

Seçgin, Y. (2014). “Kontrol Odağının Örgütsel Bağlılık Üzerine Etkisinde Personel Güçlendirmenin Aracılık Rolü: Ankara İl Merkezindeki Dört ve Beş Yıldızlı Otel İşletmelerinde Bir Araştırma”, Gaziosmanpaşa Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Doctoral Thesis, Tokat.

Selçuk, G. (2003). “Örgütsel Desteğin Çalışanların Tutumlarına Etkisi”, Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Master’s Thesis, İzmir.

Shore, L.M, Wayne, S.J. (1993). “Commitment and Employee Behavior: Comparison of Affective Commitment and Continuance Commitment with Perceived Organizational Support”, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Volume 78, Issue 5, 774-780.

Sığrı, Ü. (2007). “İş Görenlerin Örgütsel Bağlılıklarının Meyer ve Allen Tipolojisiyle Analizi: Kamu ve Özel Sektörde Karşılaştırmalı Bir Araştırma”, *Anadolu Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, Volume 7, Issue 2, 261-278.

Şener, İ., Turhan, Y.D., Yıldırım, N.Z. (2015). “Algılanan Örgütsel Destek ve İş Çevresine Uyumun İşe Yabancılaşma Üzerine Etkisi: Eğitim Sektöründe Bir Uygulama”, *Gaziosmanpaşa Üniversitesi, 3. Örgütsel Davranış Kongresi*, 509-514.

Taşkın, F., Dilek, R. (2010). “Örgütsel Güven ve Örgütsel Bağlılık Üzerine Bir Alan Araştırması”, *Organizasyon ve Yönetim Bilimleri Dergisi*, Volume 2, Issue 1, 37-46.

Topaloğlu, M., Koç, H., Yavuz, E. (2008). “Öğretmenlerin Örgütsel Bağlılığının Bazı Temel Faktörler Açısından Analizi”, *Kamu-İş Dergisi (e-dergi)*, Volume 9, Issue 4, <http://www.kamu-is.org.tr/pdf/949.pdf>

Turunç, Ö., Akkoç, İ., Çalışkan, A. (2012). “Örgütlerde Gelişim Kültürü ve Algılanan Örgütsel Desteğin İş Tatmini ve İş Performansına Etkisi: Güvenin Aracılık Rolü”, *Yönetim ve Ekonomi Dergisi*, Volume 19, Issue 1, 106-135.

Türe, A., Yıldırım, A. (2018). “Algılanan Örgütsel Destek Ölçeğinin Hemşirelikte Geçerlik ve Güvenirliği”, *Sağlık ve Hemşirelik Yönetimi Dergisi*, Volume 5, Issue 1, 9-18.

Uçar, D., Ötken, A. B. (2010). Perceived organizational support and organizational commitment: The mediating role of organization based self-esteem. *Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 25(2).

Uçar, R., Uçar, İ.H. (2014). “Müfettişlerin Örgütsel Bağlılık Düzeyleri”, *Adnan Menderes Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, Volume 5, Issue 2, 1-16.

Üren, S. G. (2011). “Algılanan Örgütsel Desteğin Örgütsel Bağlılığa Etkisi: İmalat Sektöründe Faaliyet Gösteren Bir Firma Örneği”, *Eskişehir Osmangazi Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Master's Thesis, Eskişehir*.

Wann-Yih, W., Htaik, S. L. (2011). “The Impacts of Perceived Organizational Support, Job Satisfaction, and Organizational Commitment on Job Performance in Hotel Industry”, *The 11th International DSI and*

*the 16th APDSI Joint Meeting, Taipei, Taiwan, July 12 – 16, 2011.*

Yalçın, A., İplik, F.N. (2005). “Beş Yıldızlı Otellerde Çalışanların Demografik Özellikleri ile Örgütsel Bağlılıkları Arasındaki İlişkiyi Belirlemeye Yönelik Bir Araştırma: Adana İli Örneği”, *Çukurova Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, Volume 14, Issue 1, 395-412.

Yoon, J., Thye, S.R. (2002). “A Dual Process Model of Organizational Commitment”, *Work and Occupations*, Volume 29, Issue 1, 97-124.

Zıvalı, E. (2018). “Mutfak Personelinin Örgütsel Bağlılığının İşten Ayrılma Niyetine Etkisi: Ankara’daki Beş Yıldızlı Otel İşletmelerine Yönelik Bir Araştırma”, Gazi Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Master’s Thesis, Ankara.

