



GLOBAL JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT AND BUSINESS RESEARCH: A
ADMINISTRATION AND MANAGEMENT
Volume 14 Issue 10 Version 1.0 Year 2014
Type: Double Blind Peer Reviewed International Research Journal
Publisher: Global Journals Inc. (USA)
Online ISSN: 2249-4588 & Print ISSN: 0975-5853

Measuring Commitment and its Impact on Sustainable Performance: A Case Study on Hajee Mohammad Danesh Science and Technology University, Bangladesh

By Fahim Ahmed, Md. Zahangir Kabir & Md. Mostafizur Rahman

Hajee Mohammad Danesh Science & Technology University, Bangladesh

Abstract- Faculty members' of any University are playing a crucial role for students and the administration of University should be aware of the importance of faculty members' commitment and its role in motivating them for sustaining their performance. The purpose of this study was to identify the impact of faculty members' commitment on sustained performance in University sector of Bangladesh. Both primary and secondary data has been used for the study. Primary data were collected through structured questionnaires and secondary data were used to identify the commitment related problems of the faculty members' of University and collected from related journals, books, websites. In this study Satisfaction, Affective Commitment, Continuance Commitment & Normative Commitment have been used as independent variables and Sustained performance as the dependent variable. The findings of the study indicated that normative commitment is significantly related to sustained performance, continuance commitment is negatively related and affective commitment, satisfaction have no relation with sustained performance. The finding reveals that there exists a significant relation between satisfaction and Affective Commitment, Continuance Commitment, Normative Commitment. The study suggests that the administration should be working towards the faculty members' satisfaction and organizational commitment.

Keywords: *satisfaction, affective commitment, continuance commitment, normative commitment, sustained performance.*

GJMBR - A Classification : *JEL Code: M10*



Strictly as per the compliance and regulations of:



RESEARCH | DIVERSITY | ETHICS

© 2014. Fahim Ahmed, Md. Zahangir Kabir & Md. Mostafizur Rahman. This is a research/review paper, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial 3.0 Unported License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/3.0/>), permitting all non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Measuring Commitment and its Impact on Sustainable Performance: A Case Study on Hajee Mohammad Danesh Science and Technology University, Bangladesh

Fahim Ahmed^α, Md. Zahangir Kabir^σ & Md. Mostafizur Rahman^ρ

Abstract- Faculty members' of any University are playing a crucial role for students and the administration of University should be aware of the importance of faculty members' commitment and its role in motivating them for sustaining their performance. The purpose of this study was to identify the impact of faculty members' commitment on sustained performance in University sector of Bangladesh. Both primary and secondary data has been used for the study. Primary data were collected through structured questionnaires and secondary data were used to identify the commitment related problems of the faculty members' of University and collected from related journals, books, websites. In this study Satisfaction, Affective Commitment, Continuance Commitment & Normative Commitment have been used as independent variables and Sustained performance as the dependent variable. The findings of the study indicated that normative commitment is significantly related to sustained performance, continuance commitment is negatively related and affective commitment, satisfaction have no relation with sustained performance. The finding reveals that there exists a significant relation between satisfaction and Affective Commitment, Continuance Commitment, Normative Commitment. The study suggests that the administration should be working towards the faculty members' satisfaction and organizational commitment.

Keywords: satisfaction, affective commitment, continuance commitment, normative commitment, sustained performance.

I. INTRODUCTION

The characteristics of the academic profession are not frequently met in other professions, such as self-direction, freedom and flexibility as well as the teaching/research conflict, the tenure system which provides job (in) security, etc. (Kelly, 1989). According to Bellamy (1999, mentioned in Bellamy, Morley, & Watty, 2003), faculty members are mostly motivated by intrinsic motives (e.g., autonomy, showing initiative, intellectual challenges) rather than extrinsic motives (e.g., financial or social rewards).

Organization commitment has been a topic of interest to faculty members in hopes of sustaining

*Author α σ ρ : Department of Management, Hajee Mohammad Danesh Science & Technology University, Dinajpur, Bangladesh.
e-mail: mostafiz7241@yahoo.com*

performance. In today's competitive world many university is facing new challenges regarding sustained performance and creating committed faculty members. Hence, it is important to understand the concept of commitment and its viable outcome. Organizational commitment is the pre-condition of organizational development for any organization. In case of university the development or the success means the quality teaching of the faculty members. In higher studies if we do not ensure quality education to students then the future of the nation will be in dark. Quality teaching is possible only when the faculty members of university are committed to their university. In the educational sector, Organization commitment has been a rarely studied variable both in primary and secondary education faculty members. So, empirical evidence regarding organization commitment of higher education faculty members is scarce in the international literature especially in Bangladesh. According to Pearson and Seiler (1983), this area has not received much attention because a high level of job satisfaction has generally been presumed to exist in a university setting. Whether organizational commitment either has an effect on sustainable performance or not will be explored in the present study.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Commitment as a word cannot stand alone. We must always ask, "Committed to what?" Goethe wrote, "What you can do, or dream you can, begin it. Boldness has genius, power, and magic in it." We would add that commitment has genius, power, and magic in it. The journey of success is long and is dotted with a series of commitments to worthy goals. According to Hall et al. (1970) the process by which the goals of the organization and those of the individual become increasingly integrated or congruent is commitment. Salancik (1977) said commitment is that a state of being in which an individual become bound by his action and through these action to beliefs that sustain the activities of his own involvement. "Organizational commitment" this concept comes from an article "The organization Man" written by Whyte in 1956. Organizational

commitment is an important means of determining employees' organizational goals, participation in organizational management and activities, and creative and innovative attributes for the organization (Durna and Eren, 2005). Organizational commitment was asserted by Grusky (1996) as an individual's connection to an organization. When teachers are intimately attached to an organization, they become more willing to remain with the organization and to maintain their membership in the organization. Hence, situations such as not liking one's job, being late for a job and quitting a job are reduced to the minimum level through organizational commitment (Aydın, 1993 and Bayram, 2005). Sezgin (2010) suggested that a teacher with high commitment to his or her profession and school would make greater efforts to ensure students' success and would be more adaptable to the goals and values of the school. Some researchers (Busch et al., 1998; Chiu-Yueh, 2000; Feinstein & Vondraek, 2006; Freund, 2005; Mannheim et al., 1997) found that job satisfaction was a significant predictor of organizational commitment. However few researchers argued that job satisfaction reflects Prompt affective reactions to the job while commitment to the organization develops slowly after the individual forms more embracing valuations of the employing organization, its values, and expectations and one's own future in it. Rajendran Muthuveloo and Raduan Che Rose (2005) study explores that organizational commitment, leads to positive organizational outcomes. Komal Khalid Bhatti, Samina Nawab (2011) said that job satisfaction has the highest impact on high employees' commitment and productivity. Biljana Dordevic (2004) stated that the commitment of employees is an important issue because it may be used to predict employee's performance, absenteeism and other behaviors. Allen & Mayer (1990) claim that commitment is psychological states that bind the individual to the organization. According to the Meyer & Allen (1997) commitment is a psychological state that characterizes the employee's relationship with the organization and has implication for the decision to continue membership in the organization. Research has shown that a high level of engagement from employees is positively correlated with financial performance (Benkhoff, 1997; Collins, 2001; Collins & Porras, 1998; Ingelgård & Norrgren, 2001). If we believe that a focus on commitment and performance must be embraced simultaneously for sustained success, then the proliferation of strategic practices in the organization is pivotal to the creation of competitive advantage.

a) *Organizational Commitment*

Meyer and Allen (1984, 1990, and 1991) identified three dimensional model of commitment: Affective, Continuance and Normative. They said affective commitment is based on how much individual 'want' to remain in the organization. Continuance

commitment refers to an awareness of the costs associated with leaving the organization. Normative commitment reflects a feeling of obligation to continue employment. Employees with a high level of normative commitment feel that they ought to remain with the organization.

i. *Affective commitment*

Some studies recognized that commitment is the affective reaction of the employees towards the organization. Jaros (1993) the degree to which an individual is psychological attach to an employing organization through feeling such as loyalty, affection, worth, belongingness, pleasure and so on. Porter and Mowday et al. (1979) describe affective approach as the relative strength of an individual's identification with and involvement in a particular organization. Therefore, an individual who is affectively committed or emotionally attached to the organization, (i) believe in the goal and values of the organization, (ii) works hard for the organization and (iii) intend to stay with the organization (Mowday et al.,1982). Allen and Mayer (1990) affective commitment is a members' through to stay within and work for an organization.

ii. *Continuance Commitment*

After entering into an organization an employee become confined to sustain a relationship with the organization or committed to remain with the organization because of awareness of the costs associated with leaving the organization. Allen and Meyer (1990) he proposed that continuance commitment develops on the basis of two factors: (1) number of investment (side – bets) individuals make in their current organization and (2) perceived lack of alternatives. Kanter (1968) defined continuance commitment as cognitive, continuance commitment as that which occurs when there is a profit associated with continued participation and a cost associated with leaving. Meyer and Allen (1991) also specified that an individual who's most important connection with the organization is based on continuance commitment stay with the organization simply because they have no choice. Whereas affective commitment is, where individuals remain with an organization because they want to and because they are familiar with it and they have emotional attachment with it.

iii. *Normative Commitment*

An employee receive benefits from the employer in exchange for his or her labor, when an employee believes that his or her employer provides more benefits than he or she deserves, that beliefs or feelings increase the normative commitment. The normative aspect develops as individuals' perception of their moral obligation to remain with a specific organization, irrespective of how much status improvement or fulfillment the organization gives the individual over the

years (March and Mannari 1977). Normative commitment develops on the basis of earlier experiences influenced by, for example family-based experiences (parents that stress work loyalty) or cultural experiences (sanctions against "job-hopping") (Allen & Meyer, 1996).

b) Employees Commitment and Sustained Performance

An employee who committed to his or her organization means that he or she will stay with the organization in good time and bad time also, he or she will give the best effort to the organization, works willingly; make sure the best use of organization's assets as a result ultimately the productivity is increasing. Dixit & Bhati (2012) Employee commitment can benefit organization in a number of ways such as it can improve performance; reduced absenteeism, and turnover thereby resulting in sustained productivity. Horton too stated that organization commitment could result in less turnover absenteeism, thus increasing organization productivity (Schuler & Jackson, 1996). According to Konovsky and Cropanzano (1991) and Meyer and other (1998) have uncovered a positive relationship between commitment and job performance. Employees who are committed to their respective organization are more likely not only to remain with the organization but are also likely to exert more efforts on behalf of the organization and work towards its success and therefore are also likely to exhibit better performance than the uncommitted employees. According to Arturo L. Tolentino (2004) Sustained productivity improvement depends on the enterprise's human capital (the skills, knowledge, competencies and attitudes that reside in the individual employee of the enterprise) and its social capital (trust and confidence, communication, cooperative working dynamics and interaction, partnership, shared values, teamwork, etc. among these individuals. The committed employee has been found to be more creative; they are less likely to leave an organization than those who are uncommitted (Porter et.al. 1974).

III. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The main aim of this study is to identify the impact of faculty members' Commitment on sustained performance in HSTU. It is vital as suggestions may be given to the HSTU administration or authority in order to bring an awareness of the commitment level of faculty members'. The specific objectives of the study are as follows:

- To study the impact of faculty members' Commitment on sustained performance.
- To identify the independent factors responsible for low commitment and poor performance of the faculty members'.

- To suggest the ways of improvement the organization commitment of the faculty members'.

IV. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

Self-reported measures were used to evaluate organizational commitment and sustained performance. The respondents were from only one public university (HSTU) so the findings cannot be generalized to faculty members of all public universities in Bangladesh. But as the research was based on realistic hypotheses it is more or less applicable on the total population.

V. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study was based on both primary and secondary data. Primary data were collected through a structured questionnaire which was distributed personally to the 70 faculty members' (lecturers, assistant professors, associate professors and professors) working in HSTU to recognize the effect of commitment on sustained performance. The total number of items in questionnaire were 43 among which organizational commitment questionnaire (OCQ) consists of 24 items which were taken from OCQ by Allen and Mayer. The questionnaire was developed by using a five point Likert scale measure faculty members' organizational commitment on sustained performance, ranging from Strong Agree (5), Agree (4), Neutral or Undecided (3), Disagree (2) and Strongly Disagree (1). The secondary data which have been used in this study were collected from related journals, books, and websites. Collected data were analyzed through SPSS to get accurate result on organization commitment and sustaining performance. There were 195 faculty members in HSTU total 70 faculty members were randomly selected as a sample.

a) Hypotheses Development

The following null hypotheses have been rendered based on various factors of organization commitment

H1₀: Faculty members' organizational commitment (AC, CC and NC) does not influence sustained performance.

H2₀: There is no association between faculty members' satisfaction and sustained performance.

H3₀: There is no association between faculty members' Satisfaction, Commitment (AC, CC and NC), sustained performance and Age, Education, Experience.

VI. ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

a) Descriptive Statistics

Table 1 : Descriptive Statistics

| | N | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|-----|----|---------|---------|--------|----------------|
| SAT | 70 | 2.83 | 4.83 | 3.7024 | .32956 |
| AC | 70 | 2.25 | 4.88 | 3.8286 | .45850 |
| CC | 70 | 2.38 | 4.25 | 3.5036 | .45493 |
| NC | 70 | 2.25 | 4.63 | 3.1786 | .40523 |
| SP | 70 | 1.67 | 4.67 | 3.3048 | .66119 |

Table 2 : Demographic profile of the respondents

| Employee Category | Number | Percentages |
|-------------------|--------|-------------|
| Gender | | |
| Male | 62 | 88.6 |
| Female | 8 | 11.4 |
| Age | | |
| Under 25 | 1 | 1.4 |
| 25-29 | 20 | 28.6 |
| 30-39 | 25 | 35.7 |
| 40-49 | 21 | 30.0 |
| 50-59 | 2 | 2.9 |
| 60+ | 1 | 1.4 |
| Education | | |
| Bachelor Degree | 2 | 2.9 |
| Masters Degree | 46 | 65.7 |
| M Phil | 1 | 1.4 |
| PhD | 18 | 25.7 |
| Post Doctorate | 3 | 4.3 |
| Experience | | |
| Below One Year | 7 | 10.0 |
| 1-2 Year | 15 | 21.4 |
| 3-5 Year | 12 | 17.1 |
| 6-10 Year | 24 | 34.3 |
| 11-15 Year | 5 | 7.1 |
| 16-20 Year | 4 | 5.7 |
| 20 Year Above | 3 | 4.3 |

From table 01 of mean & std. deviation it is found that the average satisfaction of the respondents is 3.70 & std. deviation is .329, the average Affective Commitment of the respondents is 3.82 & std. deviation is .458, the average continuance commitment of the respondents is 3.50 & std. deviation is .454, the average normative commitment of the respondents is 3.17 & std. deviation is .405, the average sustained performance of the respondents is 3.30 & std. deviation is .661.

Table 3 : Correlations

| | SAT | AC | CC | NC | SP |
|-----|-----|------|-------|-------|--------|
| SAT | 1 | .235 | .199 | .356* | .068 |
| AC | | 1 | .340* | -.018 | -.361* |
| CC | | | 1 | .881 | .002 |
| NC | | | | 1 | .504* |
| SP | | | | | 1 |

| | | | | | |
|---------------------|-------|-------|--------|-------|--------|
| N | 70 | 70 | 70 | 70 | 70 |
| Pearson Correlation | .235 | 1 | .340* | .356* | .049 |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | .050 | | .004 | .002 | .685 |
| N | 70 | 70 | 70 | 70 | 70 |
| Pearson Correlation | .199 | .340* | 1 | -.018 | -.361* |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | .099 | .004 | | .881 | .002 |
| N | 70 | 70 | 70 | 70 | 70 |
| Pearson Correlation | .356* | .356* | -.018 | 1 | .504* |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | .002 | .002 | .881 | | .000 |
| N | 70 | 70 | 70 | 70 | 70 |
| Pearson Correlation | .068 | .049 | -.361* | .504* | 1 |
| Sig. (2-tailed) | .578 | .685 | .002 | .000 | |
| N | 70 | 70 | 70 | 70 | 70 |

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

b) Correlation between satisfaction, affective commitment, continuance commitment, normative commitment and sustained performance

From the table 03 it can be seen that satisfaction and affective commitment is positively correlated with each other at 5% level of significance. Satisfaction and continuance commitment is positively correlated with each other at 9% level of significance. Satisfaction and normative commitment is positively correlated with each other at 0% level of significance. Sustained Performance and normative Commitment is positively correlated with each other at 0% level of significance. Sustained Performance and Continuance Commitment are negatively correlated with each other at 0% level of significance. Continuance commitment and normative commitment negatively correlated with each other.

c) Multivariate analysis

Stepwise multiple regression analysis was used to determine the impact of Satisfaction, Affective Commitment, Continuance Commitment, Normative Commitment on Sustained Performance and Age Education Experience on Satisfaction, Affective Commitment, Continuance Commitment, Normative Commitment, Sustained Performance of faculty members working in HSTU.

i. Relationships between satisfaction, affective commitment, continuance commitment, normative commitment and sustained performance

Table 4 : Model Summary

| R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|
| .616 ^a | .380 | .342 | .53654 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), SAT, AC, CC, NC

Table 5 : ANOVA

| | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|------------|----------------|----|-------------|-------|-------------------|
| Regression | 11.453 | 4 | 2.863 | 9.946 | .000 ^a |
| Residual | 18.712 | 65 | .288 | | |
| Total | 30.165 | 69 | | | |

a. Predictors: (Constant), SAT, AC, CC, NC
b. Dependent Variable: SP

Table 6 : Coefficients

| (Constant) | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | | Sig. |
|------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|--------|------|
| | B | Std. Error | Beta | T | |
| (Constant) | 2.748 | .887 | | 3.096 | .003 |
| SAT | -.095 | .215 | -.047 | -.443 | .659 |
| AC | -.013 | .162 | -.009 | -.077 | .939 |
| CC | -.493 | .156 | -.339 | -3.167 | .002 |
| NC | .845 | .183 | .518 | 4.620 | .000 |

a. Dependent Variable: SP

From the Coefficient table 06 it can be seen that Satisfaction and Affective Commitment have no relation with Sustained Performance. Continuance Commitment is negatively related with Sustained Performance at a .002 significance level. Normative Commitment is positively related with Sustained Performance at a .000 significance level. So, the null hypothesis can be rejected and the alternative hypothesis can be accepted.

ii. Relationships between satisfaction and age, education, experience

From the Coefficient table 09 it can be seen that there is no significant relationship between Satisfaction and Age, Education, Experience. The values of t and Beta are not standard. So, the null hypothesis can be accepted and the alternative hypothesis can be rejected.

Table 7 : Model Summary

| R | R Square | Adj. R Square | Std. Error of the Es. |
|-------------------|----------|---------------|-----------------------|
| .095 ^a | .009 | -.036 | .33545 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), Age, Education, Experience

Table 8 : ANOVA

| | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|------------|----------------|----|-------------|------|-------------------|
| Regression | .067 | 3 | .022 | .199 | .897 ^a |
| Residual | 7.427 | 66 | .113 | | |
| Total | 7.494 | 69 | | | |

a. Predictors: (Constant), Age, Education, Experience
b. Dependent Variable: Satisfaction

Table 9 : Coefficients

| | Unstd Coefficients | | Std Coef | | Sig. |
|------------|--------------------|------------|----------|--------|------|
| | B | Std. Error | Beta | t | |
| Constant | 3.714 | .151 | | 24.563 | .000 |
| Age | .013 | .087 | .038 | .151 | .880 |
| Education | .021 | .049 | .065 | .425 | .672 |
| Experience | -.031 | .054 | -.144 | -.578 | .565 |

a. Dependent Variable: Satisfaction

iii. Relationships between affective commitment and age, education, experience

Table 10 : Model Summary

| R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|
| .287 ^a | .083 | .041 | .44904 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), Age, Education, Experience

Table 11 : ANOVA

| | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|------------|----------------|----|-------------|-------|-------------------|
| Regression | 1.197 | 3 | .399 | 1.980 | .126 ^a |
| Residual | 13.308 | 66 | .202 | | |
| Total | 14.505 | 69 | | | |

a. Predictors: (Constant), Age, Education, Experience
b. Dependent Variable: Affective Commitment

Table 12 : Coefficients

| | Unstd Coefficients | | Std Coef | | Sig. |
|------------|--------------------|------------|----------|--------|------|
| | B | Std. Error | Beta | t | |
| Constant | 4.064 | .202 | | 20.079 | .000 |
| Age | -.059 | .116 | -.121 | -.507 | .614 |
| Education | .075 | .065 | .171 | 1.160 | .250 |
| Experience | -.074 | .072 | -.244 | -1.021 | .311 |

a. Dependent Variable: Affective Commitment

From the Coefficient table it can be seen that there is no significant relationship between Affective Commitment and Age, Education, Experience. The values of t and Beta are not standard. So, the null

hypothesis can be accepted and the alternative hypothesis can be rejected.

iv. Relationships between continuance commitment and age, education, and experience

Table 13: Model Summary

| R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
|---|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|
| .152 ^a | .023 | -.021 | .45973 |
| a. Predictors: (Constant), Age, Education, Experience | | | |

Table 14: ANOVA

| | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|------------|----------------|----|-------------|------|-------------------|
| Regression | .331 | 3 | .110 | .523 | .668 ^a |
| Residual | 13.949 | 66 | .211 | | |
| Total | 14.280 | 69 | | | |

a. Predictors: (Constant), Age, Education, Experience
b. Dependent Variable: Continuance Commitment

From the Coefficient table 15 it can be seen that there are no significant relationship between Continuance Commitment and Age, Education, Experience. Here Beta and t values are not standard. So, the null hypothesis can be accepted and the alternative hypothesis can be rejected.

Table 15: Coefficients

| | Unstd Coefficients | | Std Coeff | T | Sig. |
|------------|--------------------|------------|-----------|-------|------|
| | B | Std. Error | Beta | | |
| Constant | 3.525 | .207 | | 17.01 | .000 |
| Age | -.089 | .119 | -.186 | -.751 | .456 |
| Education | -.018 | .067 | -.040 | -.265 | .792 |
| Experience | .088 | .074 | .294 | 1.194 | .237 |

a. Dependent Variable: Continuance Commitment

v. Relationships between normative commitment and age, education, experience

Table 16: Model Summary

| R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
|---|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|
| .207 ^a | .043 | -.001 | .40537 |
| a. Predictors: (Constant), Age, Education, Experience | | | |

Table 17: ANOVA

| | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Sq. | F | Sig. |
|------------|----------------|----|----------|------|-------------------|
| Regression | .485 | 3 | .162 | .984 | .406 ^a |

| | | | |
|----------|--------|----|------|
| Residual | 10.845 | 66 | .164 |
| Total | 11.330 | 69 | |

a. Predictors: (Constant), Age, Education, Experience
b. Dependent Variable: Normative Commitment

Table 18: Coefficients

| | Unstd Coefficients | | Std Coeff | t | Sig. |
|------------|--------------------|------------|-----------|--------|------|
| | B | Std. Error | Beta | | |
| Constant | 3.474 | .183 | | 19.015 | .000 |
| Age | -.106 | .105 | -.247 | -1.011 | .316 |
| Education | -.015 | .059 | -.040 | -.263 | .794 |
| Experience | .021 | .065 | .079 | .325 | .746 |

a. Dependent Variable: Normative Commitment

From the Coefficient table 18 it can be seen that there are no significant relationship between Normative Commitment and Age, Education, Experience. Here Beta and t values are not standard. So, the null hypothesis can be accepted and the alternative hypothesis can be rejected.

vi. Relationships between sustained performance and age, education, experience

Table 19: Model Summary

| R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|
| .180 ^a | .032 | -.012 | .66504 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), Age, Education, Experience

Table 20: ANOVA

| Model | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|------------|----------------|----|-------------|------|-------------------|
| Regression | .975 | 3 | .325 | .734 | .535 ^a |
| Residual | 29.191 | 66 | .442 | | |
| Total | 30.165 | 69 | | | |

a. Predictors: (Constant), Age, Education, Experience
b. Dependent Variable: Sustained Performance

Table 21: Coefficients

| | Unstd Coefficients | | Std Coeff | t | Sig. |
|----------|--------------------|------------|-----------|--------|------|
| | B | Std. Error | Beta | | |
| Constant | 3.655 | .300 | | 12.192 | .000 |
| Age | -.027 | .172 | -.039 | -.159 | .874 |

| | | | | | |
|--|-------|------|-------|-------|------|
| Education | -.082 | .096 | -.128 | -.846 | .400 |
| Experience | -.015 | .107 | -.034 | -.140 | .889 |
| a. Dependent Variable: Sustained Performance | | | | | |

From the Coefficient table 21 it can be seen that there are no significant relationship between Sustained Performance and Age, Education, Experience. Here Beta and t values are not standard. So, the null hypothesis can be accepted and the alternative hypothesis can be rejected.

VII. CONCLUSION

This research identified the impact of organizational commitment of the faculty members' and its impact on sustained performance in HSTU. In HSTU the sustained performance of the faculty members' depends more upon the Normative Commitment. From this study it has been seen that HSTU faculty members' are committed to their organization and they are satisfied to their job but their sustained performance do not depend on satisfaction, affective commitment and continuance commitment. Though it has been examined that organizational commitment and satisfaction. The administration of HSTU suggested to take some measure to increase the satisfaction of the faculty members' and should ensure that faculty members' are highly committed to the organization. Increase in satisfaction and commitment will help the faculty members' to become more performance oriented. Faculty members' do not feel a strong sense of belonging to this university. From this research it is also found that faculty members' organizational attachment with this university is low in some extent. So for solving this problem quality supervision and training in organizational commitment for faculty members' should be provided by academic administrators and policy makers. University faculty members' organizational commitment and sustained performance is under-researched area particularly in the public universities in Bangladesh. So, the current investigation has contributed to improve the understanding on significant issue. This research paper would be of value to researchers seeking information on how organizational commitment and sustained performance are linked.

REFERENCES RÉFÉRENCES REFERENCIAS

1. Allen, N., & Meyer, J. (1990) Organizational socialization tactics: a longitudinal analysis of links to newcomers' commitment and role orientation. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 33(4): 847-858.
2. Allen, N., & Meyer, J. (1990) The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative

- commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63:1-18.
3. Aydin M (1993) Contemporary educational supervision. Ankara: Pegem Press.
4. Biljana Dordevic, (2004) Employee Commitment in Times of Radical Organizational Changes. *Economics and Organization*, 2(2) 111-117.
5. Busch, T., Fallan, L., & Pettersen, A. (1998) Disciplinary differences in job satisfaction self-efficacy, goal commitment and organizational commitment among faculty employees in Norwegian Colleges: An empirical assessment of indicators of performance. *Quality in Higher Education*, 4(2): 137- 157.
6. Bellamy, S., Morley, C., & Watty, K. (2003) Why business academics remain in Australian universities despite deteriorating working conditions and reduced job satisfaction: An intellectual puzzle. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 25: 13-28.
7. Bayram L (2005) A new paradigm in management of organizational commitment. *Saystay Journal* 59:125-139.
8. Benkhoff, B. (1997) Ignoring commitment is costly: New approaches establish the missing link between commitment and performance. *Human Relations*, 50(6): 701-726.
9. Chiu-Yueh, T. (2000) A Study on the Relationship among Organizational Commitment, Job Satisfaction and Organizational Citizenship Behavior of Nursing Personnel. *Master's Thesis, Department of Human Resource Management*.
10. Collins, J. (2001) *Good to Great*. New York: Harper Collins.
11. Collins, J. C. & Porras, J. I. 1998. *Built to last* (1 ed.). London: Harper Business.
12. Demir, Hayri., (2013) Physical education teachers' organizational commitment. *Educational Research and Review*, Vol. 8(5): 164 – 170.
13. Durna U, Eren V (2005) Three-axis organizational commitment factor. *Journal of Dogus University* 6: 210-219.
14. Dixit, Varsha & Bhati, Monika (2012) A Study about Employee Commitment and its impact on Sustained Productivity in Indian Auto-Component Industry. *European Journal of Business and Social Sciences*, 1(6): 34 – 51.
15. Freund, A. (2005) Commitment and job satisfaction as predictors' turnover intentions among welfare workers. *Administration in Social Work*, 29(2):05-21.
16. Fredberg, T., Beer, M., Eisenstat, R., Foote, N., & Norrgren, F., (2008) Embracing Commitment and Performance: CEOs and Practices to Manage Paradox.

17. Grusky (1966) Career mobility and organizational commitment, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 10:488-503.
18. Hall, D.T., Schneider, B., & Nygren, H.T. (1970) Personal factors in organizational identification, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 15:176-189.
19. Ingelgård, A. & Norrgren, F. (2001) Effects of change strategy and top management on quality of working life and economic results. *The International Journal of Industrial Ergonomics*, 27(2): 93-105.
20. Kelly, J. D. (1989) Gender, pay and job satisfaction of faculty in journalism. *Journalism Quarterly*, 66 (2): 446-452.
21. Kanter, R.M. (1968) Commitment and social organization: a study of commitment mechanisms in Utopian communities. *American Sociological Review*, 33(4): 499-517.
22. Meyer & Allen (1997) Commitment in the workplace, Theory, research and application. *Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage*
23. Mannheim, B., Baruch, Y., & Tal, J. (1997). Alternative models for antecedents and outcomes of work centrality and job satisfaction of high-tech personnel. *Human Relations*, 50(2): 1537-1562.
24. Malik, M.E., Nawab, Samina., Naeem, Basharat., & Danish, R.Q., (2010) Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment of University Teachers in Public Sector of Pakistan. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 5(6).
25. Mowday, Richard. R.T., Steers, R.M. & Porter, L.W. (1979) The measurement of organizational.
26. Mowday RT, Porter LW, Steers RM (1982) Employee-organizational linkages. The Psychology of Commitment, Absenteeism and Turnover. NY: *Academic Press Inc.*
27. March, J. G. 1991 Exploration and Exploitation in Organizational Learning. *Organization Science*, 2(1):72-87.
28. N., J., Allen and J. Meyer (1996) Affective, Continuance, and Normative Commitment to the Organization: An Examination of Construct Validity, *Journal of vocational behavior*, 49: 252-276.
29. Porter, L., Steers, R., Mowday, R., & Boulian, P. (1974) Organizational commitment, job satisfaction and turnover among psychiatric technicians. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 59: 603- 609. *Quarterly*, 10: 488-503.
30. Pearson, D. A., & Seiler, R. E. (1983) Environmental satisfiers in academe. *Higher Education*, 12:35-47.
31. Platsidou, M., & Diamantopoulou, G., (2009) Job satisfaction of Greek university professors: Is it affected by demographic factors, academic rank and problems of higher education? *Thessaloniki: Grafima Publications* 535-545.
32. Rajendran Muthuveloo and Raduan Che Rose (2005) Typology of Organizational Commitment. *American Journal of Applied Science*, 2(6):1078-1081.
33. Rahman, M, I., & Parveen, R., (2006) Job Satisfaction: A study among Public and Private University Teachers of Bangladesh.
34. Salancik, G.R. (1977) Commitment and the control of organizational behavior and belief, *New direction for organizational behavior*, 1-54, *Chicago: St.Clair.*
35. Sezgin F (2010) School culture as a predictor of teachers' organizational commitment. *Education Science*, 35:142-159.