

## Relating Organizational Commitment to Eudaimonic Wellbeing

Mahima Raina\*

Junior Research Fellow

University of Jammu, Jammu.

\*E-mail of corresponding author : [mahima.raina@gmail.com](mailto:mahima.raina@gmail.com)

**Acknowledgement** : I thank Dr. John P. Meyer , Western University, Ontario, Canada, for his valuable inputs.

### Abstract

The paper examines relationships between organizational commitment - including affective, continuance and normative commitment and eudaimonic wellbeing. We employed a cross-sectional design and the data were obtained from different government organizations like hospitals , colleges and public administration offices ( N = 163). Multiple regression analysis revealed that organizational commitment significantly predicted eudaimonic wellbeing. Further, Affective commitment was found to be the strongest predictor. Normative and Continuance commitment did not predict eudaimonic wellbeing but we found negative relations between normative commitment and few indices of wellbeing. The research demonstrates that being affectively committed to your organization can result in greater levels of wellbeing. This presents a win-win situation for both the employer and the employee.

**Keywords** : organizational commitment , eudaimonic wellbeing , positive psychology.

### 1. Introduction

Organizational commitment (OC) has evinced the interest of psychology and management professionals alike. For decades, research has demonstrated the multiple benefits that commitment brings to an organization. For example, committed employees experience more job satisfaction (Kanwar, Singh & Kodwani, 2012; Cheng & Stockdale , 2003 ; Vandenberg & Lance, 1998) ; job involvement and occupational commitment ( Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch & Topolnysky, 2002); have less turnover intentions ( Harris & Cameron, 2012 ; Meyer et.al., 2002 ; Lum, Kervin, Clark, Reid & Sirola, 1998 ) ; exhibit citizenship behaviours ( Feather & Rauter, 2004) and perceive corporate social responsibility ( Mueller, Hattrup , Spiess & Lin-Hi., 2012) ; are less likely to be absent from work ( Woods, Poole & Zibarras., 2012) and perform better at work ( Meyer, Paunonen , Gellatly , Goffin & Jackson , 1989 ).

#### 1.1 Organizational commitment and wellbeing

While a vast array of organization-relevant variables have been explored in relation to organizational commitment, less emphasis has been given to employee-relevant outcomes ( Meyer & Maltin, 2010). Before we venture into implications of commitment for employees, it is important to explain what we mean by commitment. For the present purpose, we define commitment according to three-component model (Meyer & Allen, 1991, 1997 ; Meyer & Herscovitch , 2001) of commitment. According to this model, commitment is viewed as a “ force that binds individual to a target (social or non-social) and to a course of action of relevance to that target” ( Meyer, Becker, & Van Dick, 2006, p. 266). Further, there are three mind sets that characterize an employee’s commitment to an organization. These are - Affective (AC) : marked by emotional involvement with the target ; Continuance (CC) : recognition of costs involved with discontinuing involvement with the target ; and, Normative

(NC) : feelings of obligation to the target.

As we delve into the literature exploring links between commitment and employee wellbeing, we find a sizeable body of research examining such links. Mostly, research points to positive links between commitment and wellbeing (e.g., Galais & Moser, 2009; Siu, 2002), self esteem, satisfaction with life and self efficacy (e.g., Harris & Cameron, 2012). Many studies have reported negative relationship between burnout and commitment (e.g., Grawitch, Trares & Kohler, 2007; Lee & Henderson, 1996; psychological distress (Siu & Cooper, 1998), strain including emotional exhaustion and depersonalization (e.g., Schmidt, 2007; Kalliath, O’driscoll & Gillespie, 1998). Further, commitment has also been found to mediate a positive relationship between perceived organizational support and wellbeing (Panaccio & Vandenberghe, 2009). Studies have also examined the moderating effects of organizational commitment in the stress-outcome relationship and predicted that organizational commitment buffered such relationships (e.g., Siu, 2003; Leong, Furnham & Cooper, 1996; Begley & Czajka, 1993).

### *1.3 Organizational commitment and eudaimonic wellbeing*

Despite much research that exists to explain commitment-wellbeing relationships, we argue that conceptualization of wellbeing has been very simplistic and mostly surrounds physical and psychological aspects such as lack of illness, psychopathology or life/job satisfaction. For this research we conceptualize wellbeing within the framework of positive psychology (Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000). As emphasized by Ryff (1995), research focusing on psychological dysfunction far outnumbers the outputs on positive psychological functioning. For this research we conceptualize wellbeing within the framework of positive psychology (Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000). Eudaimonic wellbeing exceeds the feelings of pleasure, general happiness or life satisfaction. A more apt characterization of eudaimonia is striving for human perfection that represents the realization of one’s true potential (Bradburn & Norton, 1976; Waterman, 1993). Two major perspectives of eudaimonic wellbeing are that of Psychological Wellbeing (Ryff and Keyes, 1995) that includes autonomy, personal growth, self-acceptance, purpose in life, environmental mastery and positive relations with others and Self Determination Theory (Ryan & Deci, 2000) that defines eudaimonic wellbeing as a combination of autonomy, competence and psychological relatedness. For the present research, we choose Ryff and Keyes’ perspective on eudaimonic wellbeing.

Very little research exploring links between eudaimonic wellbeing and organizational commitment exists. The fragmented research that does exist however has established links mostly between Affective commitment (AC) and specific indicators of eudaimonic wellbeing. Positive links between AC and self-efficacy (Harris & Cameron, 2012); work engagement (Demerouti, Mostert, & Bakker, 2010); positive psychological capital (PsyCap; Luthans, Norman, Avolio & Avey, in press). A recent meta-analysis revealed positive linkages of PsyCap with organizational commitment (Avey, Reichard, Luthans & Mhatre, 2011). Only few researches have looked into all three commitment profiles in relation to eudaimonic wellbeing indices. Louison (2007) reported positive relation between work engagement and Normative commitment (NC) and negative with Continuance commitment (CC) while Wefald (2008) reported positive linkages of both NC and CC with work engagement. Maltin (2011a) did a meta-analysis in which all the commitment profiles were explored and their relationships with various indices of wellbeing (ill-health, hedonic and eudaimonic wellbeing) were established. The indices of eudaimonic wellbeing that were explored included professional efficacy, vigor, dedication, absorption and engagement. All the indices exhibited moderate positive correlation with AC and NC and weak or negative correlations with CC. In another study Maltin (2011b) reported strongest relationship between eudaimonic wellbeing and AC and weaker relationships with NC and near zero or negative relations with CC. This study utilized the Self determination theory as conceptualization of eudaimonic wellbeing.

## **2. Hypotheses**

Given the limited research that exists in relation to commitment types and eudaimonic wellbeing, we present this study to add to this limited but growing body of knowledge. Based on the review of literature, we propose the following hypotheses :

H1 (a) OC will have positive correlation with eudaimonic wellbeing.

H1 (b) OC will predict eudaimonic wellbeing.

H2 (a) AC will have positive correlation with eudaimonic wellbeing.

H2 (b) AC will best predict overall eudaimonic wellbeing.

H2 (c) AC will best predict different indices of eudaimonic wellbeing.

H3 (a) CC will have weak or near zero correlations with eudaimonic wellbeing.

H3 (b) CC will not predict overall or any particular index of eudaimonic wellbeing.

H4 (a) NC will have weak positive correlation with eudaimonic wellbeing.

H4 (b) NC will predict overall eudaimonic wellbeing and predict few indices of eudaimonic wellbeing.

### 3. Method

#### 3.1 Participants

The sample comprised 163 professionals ( 56.4 % males) including college professors ( 49.7% ), doctors ( 38 %) and administrators (12.3 %) working in various Government organizations . All the participants had a minimum 2 years of experience. This was to ensure that the participants had ample time to develop commitment based attitudes towards their respective organizations . Out of 163 participants, 68.1 % professionals had work experience of between 2-10 years, 25.2 % had work experience between 10-20 years and 6.8 % of the sample had work experience more than 20 years. The college professors were recruited from 5 different colleges ; doctors and administrators were recruited from 3 different hospitals and offices respectively.

#### 3.2 Measures

**Organizational Commitment Scale :** The organizational commitment scale by Meyer and Allen (1997) was used. Responses were obtained on a 7-point Likert scale ( 1= Strongly disagree and 7 = Strongly agree ). The scale included 6 items each for measuring Affective, Continuance and Normative commitment. A sample item from Affective Commitment subscale was , “ This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me” ; sample item from Continuance commitment subscale was , “ I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving this organization” and sample item from Normative commitment subscale was , “I would feel guilty if I left my organization now.”

**The Scale of Psychological Wellbeing Scale :** A short version of Scale of psychological wellbeing ( Ryff and Keyes, 1995) wellbeing scale developed by Drendonck (2005) was used to measure eudaimonic wellbeing. Participants responded to 39 items on a six point scale ranging from “ Strongly Disagree”(1) to “ Strongly Agree” (6). The scale has 6 subscales that comprise of following indices of eudaimonic wellbeing : autonomy, environmental mastery, purpose of life , personal growth, self-acceptance and positive relations with others. Sample item from autonomy scale was , “I tend to worry about what people think of me “ ; Environmental mastery - “I have difficulty in arranging my life in a way that is satisfying to me” ; Personal growth - , “I have the sense that I have developed a lot as a person over time” ; Positive relations with others - “I know that I can trust my friends, and they know they can trust me” ; Purpose in life was - “ . I enjoy making plans for future and working them to make them a reality and Self-acceptance - “For most part, I am proud of who I am and the life I lead.”

**Demographic Schedule** : A demographic schedule was constructed to collect basic information about the participants which included questions about gender, years of work experience and brief work profile information.

#### 4. Procedure

Testing took place after taking due permissions from the authorities of the organizations from where sample was recruited. Each participant was supplied a written note about the purpose of the study and assurance of confidentiality together with the set of questionnaires. The same information was provided verbally as well and that helped in striking a rapport with the participant as well. Further questions pertaining to the study were addressed as and when demanded by the participants. Paper-pencil method was employed and the data was collected individually from each participant in most of the cases. For some participants who could not respond immediately, the set of questionnaire was collected at a later date in their working hours. Usually, 2-3 visits were made to each organization. A total of 200 questionnaire sets were distributed out of which 173 were returned. Out of 173, 10 were discarded due to incomplete information supplied by the participants.

#### 5. Results

##### 5.1 Reliability, descriptive statistics and correlations

Reliability analysis was carried out to check the robustness of the tools. We examined Cronbach values for each item and in the Psychological Wellbeing questionnaire three items were deleted so as to improve the overall scale reliability. Both Organizational commitment scale ( $\alpha = .863$ ) and the psychological wellbeing scale ( $\alpha = .928$ ) demonstrated acceptable levels of reliability. Consistent with our hypotheses - H1 (a) : OC significantly and positively correlated with EW ( $r = 0.40, p < .01$ ) ; H2 (a) and H4(a) : AC and NC also significantly and positively correlated with EW ( $r = .53$  and  $r = .25$  respectively,  $p < .01$ ). We also accept hypothesis H3 (a) because CC showed significant and positive but not near zero correlation with EW as the existing literature demonstrates ( $r = .19, p < .01$ ). Thus, out of three commitment profiles, AC demonstrated strongest correlation with EW followed by NC and CC. This pattern of correlation is in line with the existing literature. All the variables within each scale correlated positively and significantly while some insignificant positive correlations were observed between : CC and positive relations ( $r = .10, p > .05$ ) and self acceptance ( $r = .117, p > .05$ ). Insignificant positive correlations were also observed between : NC and personal growth ( $r = .148, p > .05$ ) and positive relations ( $r = .104, p > .05$ ). The Cronbach alphas and gender-wise descriptive statistics for each variable under study appear in Table 1 and the correlations appear in Table 2.

##### 5.2 Multiple Regression Analysis

We ran several multiple regressions to assess 1) Predicting overall eudaimonic wellbeing from organizational commitment; 2) Predicting overall eudaimonic wellbeing as a result of each commitment profile ; and , 3) Predicting each index of eudaimonic wellbeing from each commitment profile. Summary of regression analysis appears in Table 3.

##### 1) Organizational commitment and overall eudaimonic wellbeing

We introduced demographics - gender and work experience in Step 1 and OC with demographics in Step 2. It was found that OC explained 16.4 % of variance ( $R^2 = .023$  for Step 1 and  $\Delta R^2 = .141, F(3,159) = 10.43, p < .01$ ). It was found that OC significantly predicted eudaimonic wellbeing ( $\beta = .386, p < .01$ ). Thus, hypothesis H1 (b) is supported by our results.

2) *Commitment profiles and overall eudaimonic wellbeing*

We introduced demographics in Step 1 and AC, CC and NC with demographics in Step 2. This model predicted 29 % of variance ( $R^2 = .023$  for Step 1 and  $\Delta R^2 = .266$ ,  $F(5,157) = 12.8$ ,  $p < .01$ ). Out of the three commitment profiles, AC only significantly predicted overall eudaimonic wellbeing ( $\beta = 0.55$ ,  $p < .01$ ). Thus, hypotheses H2 (b) and H3 (b) garnered support in our research. However, hypothesis H4 (b) was rejected as NC did not predict overall eudaimonic wellbeing and we rather found negative but insignificant associations.

3) *Commitment profiles and different indices of eudaimonic wellbeing*

We ran several multiple regressions to examine relationships between each of the commitment profiles and different indices of eudaimonic wellbeing. The independent variables remained same as (2) above but we changed dependent variables for every regression equation, therefore, introducing each of the index of eudaimonic wellbeing one after the other.

- (i) AC: Our hypothesis H2 (c) was supported. AC significantly predicted all the indices of eudaimonic wellbeing. AC significantly predicted Autonomy ( $\beta = 0.32$ ,  $p < .01$ ); Environmental Mastery (EM;  $\beta = 0.40$ ,  $p < .01$ ); Personal Growth ( $\beta = 0.54$ ,  $p < .01$ ); Personal Relations (PR;  $\beta = 0.57$ ,  $p < .01$ ); Purpose in life ( $\beta = 0.38$ ,  $p < .01$ ) and Self acceptance ( $\beta = 0.42$ ,  $p < .01$ ).
- (ii) CC: Our hypothesis H3 (b) was fully supported as CC did not predict any index of eudaimonic wellbeing.
- (iii) NC: Our hypothesis H4 (b) was rejected. NC did not predict overall eudaimonic wellbeing but we observed some significant negative standardized coefficients for select indices of eudaimonic wellbeing: Personal Growth ( $\beta = -.19$ ,  $p < .01$ ) and Positive Relations ( $\beta = -.21$ ,  $p < .01$ ). Although small, they reflect that NC negatively impacts eudaimonic wellbeing.

## 6. Discussion

The study provides direct support for the hypothesis that OC significantly predicts eudaimonic wellbeing. We further ventured into examining relationships between all three components of OC and eudaimonic wellbeing. The results reveal that AC best predicts eudaimonic wellbeing and all its indices that include autonomy, environmental mastery, personal growth, positive relations, purpose in life and self acceptance. CC does not significantly predict eudaimonic wellbeing. We found rather very contradicting results as far as NC and eudaimonic wellbeing are concerned. NC, though the values were very small, reflected negative association with overall eudaimonic wellbeing and also with its two indices: Personal growth and positive relations. Since eudaimonic wellbeing is a concept more aligned with positive psychology, it embraces the principles like congruence and positive regard. We believe that “feelings of obligations” which is a prime facet of NC does not go along well with the principles of positive psychology. This could explain as to why feelings of obligations could be a deterrent to personal growth and forming rewarding and enriching bonds with others. Although, most of the studies report a positive relation of NC with wellbeing, e.g., ill health, negative affect etc; few studies also report negative associations. For e.g., NC was reported to have positive correlation with negative affect (Panaccio & Vandenberghe, 2009). An especially pertinent study in this regard is by Tan & Akhter (1998) because the study was conducted in Asia. They reported that NC had significant positive effect on experienced burnout whereas AC had no significant impact. But as pointed at the outset, eudaimonic wellbeing varies considerably from such aspects of wellbeing.

Not much literature exists that studies direct relationship of all three components of

OC and eudaimonic wellbeing. The studies included in the literature utilize different correlates of eudaimonic wellbeing such as engagement, vigour, life satisfaction. Infact, so far only two studies Mayer and Maltin (2010) and Maltin (2011) provide an extensive review on commitment and wellbeing research and the latter also includes a primary study that examines OC and eudaimonic wellbeing conceptualized on the basis of self-determination theory . This research utilizes Ryff and Keyes theory of eudaimonic wellbeing that has not been examined so far in relation to all three aspects of wellbeing. The research contributes to the scanty literature that exists in relation to these variables.

Of course, our study is not without limitations. The correlations and causality reported here needs to be interpreted with caution given the small sample size. What adds to this is that very few studies exist exploring the three components of commitment to eudaimonic wellbeing stem from North America. We could not find even a single study in Indian context. In the light of inconsistent results that appear in studies especially regarding NC and CC components with wellbeing , it is imperative that we need more empirical studies that replicate our results . Using a longitudinal design would be most beneficial and apt. It would be especially more appropriate to establish cross-cultural validity of both OC and eudaimonic wellbeing measures. The fact that we found higher correlation between CC-AC and NC negatively predicting wellbeing and few of its indices , differs from what is typically observed in western researches. One reason that could explain higher correlation between AC-CC could be the nature of jobs and the policies that govern these jobs. All the participants were recruited from Government institutions. Such jobs are highly coveted and people tend to stay in the jobs because it offers security and benefits. The fact that turnover rate is negligible further affirms this assertion. It is also possible that recognition of such perks and security helps them forge emotional bonds with their organization later on . This needs further exploration because we believe that other organization/personally relevant variables could be playing a role in this kind of association as well . Also, studying OC and wellbeing in context with other variables like organizational structure and making a comparative study between public/private organizations in India would provide an interesting insight into the interplay of these variables.. Future researches could target these areas in OC-wellbeing that would help frame a theory to guide the explanation of results between commitment and wellbeing of which there is a distinct absence in organizational research.

## References

- Avey, J. B., Reichard, R. J.; Luthans, F., & Mhatre, K. H. (2011). Meta-analysis of the impact of positive psychological capital on employee attitudes, behaviors, and performance. *Human Resource Development Quarterly, Vol 22(2)*, 127-152. doi: [10.1002/hrdq.20070](https://doi.org/10.1002/hrdq.20070)
- Begley, T. M.; Czajka, J. M. ( 1993). Panel analysis of the moderating effects of commitment on job satisfaction, intent to quit, and health following organizational change. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 78(4)*, 552-556.
- Bradburn, N.M., & Norton, D. (1976). *Personal Destinies*. Princeton University Press, Princeton.
- Cheng , Y., & Margaret , S.S. (2003). The validity of the three-component model of organizational commitment in a chinese context. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour, 62(3)*, 465-489.
- Demerouti, E., Mostert, K., & Bakker, A. B. (2010). Burnout and work engagement: A thorough investigation of the independency of both constructs. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 5*, 209-222.
- Direndonck, D.V. (2005). The construct validity of Ryff's scales of psychological well-being and its extension with spiritual well-being. *Personality and Individual Differences, 36*, 629-643.
- Feather, N. T. and Rauter, K. A. (2004), Organizational citizenship behaviours in relation to job status , job insecurity, organizational commitment and identification, job satisfaction and work values. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 77*: 81–94. doi : 10 . 1348 / 096317904322915928 .

- Galais, N., & Moser, K. (2009). Organizational commitment and the well-being of temporary agency workers: A longitudinal study. *Human Relations*, 62, 589-620.
- Grawitch, M. J., Trares, S., & Kohler, J. M. (2007). Healthy workplace practices and employee outcomes. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 14, 275-293.
- Harris, G.E., & Cameron, J.E. (2012). Multiple dimensions of organizational identification and commitment as predictor of turnover intentions and psychological well-being. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Sciences*, 37(3), 159-169
- Kalliath, T.J., O' driscoll, M., & David, F.G. (1998). The relationship between burnout and organizational commitment in two samples of health professionals. *Work & Stress: An International Journal of Work, Health & Organizations*, 12(2), 179-185.
- Kanwar, Y.P.S.; Singh, A.K., & Kodwani, A.D. (2012). A study of job satisfaction, organizational commitment and turnover intent among the IT and ITES sector employees. *The Journal of Business Perspective*, 16, 127-35.
- Lee, V., & Henderson, M.C. (1996). Occupational stress and organizational commitment in nurse administrators. *Journal of Nurse Administration* 26(5), 21-28.
- Leong, C. S., Furnham, A., & Cooper, C. L. (1996). The moderating effect of organizational commitment on the occupational stress outcome relationship, *Human Relations*, 49, 1345-1363.
- Louison, C. P. (2007). *Convergent and discriminant validity of employee engagement*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Alliant International University, Los Angeles.
- Lum, L., Kervin, J., Clark, K., Reid, F. and Sirola, W. (1998), Explaining nursing turnover intent: job satisfaction, pay satisfaction, or organizational commitment?. *J. Organiz. Behav.*, 19: 305–320.
- Luthans, F., Norman, S.M., Avolio, B.J., & Avey, J.B. (in press). The mediating role of psychological capital in the supportive organizational climate-employee performance relationship. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, in press.
- Maltin, E. R. (2011). Workplace Commitment and Employee Well-Being. *Electronic Thesis and Dissertation Repository*. Paper 273. <http://ir.lib.uwo.ca/etd/273>
- Maltin, E. R. (2011a). Workplace Commitment and Employee Well-Being: A Meta-analysis and Study of Commitment Profiles". *Electronic Thesis and Dissertation Repository*. Paper 273. <http://ir.lib.uwo.ca/etd/273>
- Maltin, E. R. (2011b). Workplace Commitment and Employee Well-Being: Commitment profiles, need support and satisfaction, and employee wellbeing. *Electronic Thesis and Dissertation Repository*. Paper 273. <http://ir.lib.uwo.ca/etd/273>.
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1997). *Commitment in the workplace: Theory, research, and application*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Meyer, J.P., Becker, T.E., & Van Dick (2006). Social identities and commitments at work : Towards an integrative model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89, 991-1007.
- Meyer, J. P., & Maltin, E. R. (2010). Employee commitment and well-being: A critical review, theoretical framework and research agenda. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 77, 323-337.
- Meyer, J.P., Paunonen, S.V., Gellatly, I. R., Goffin, R.D., & Jackson, D.N. (1989). Organizational commitment and job performance : It's the nature of the commitment that counts. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74(1), 152-156.
- 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 Vocational Behavior*, 61, 20-52.
- Mueller, K., Hattrup, K., Spiess, S.O., & Lin-Hi, N. (2012). The effects of corporate social responsibility on employees' affective commitment : A cross-cultural investigation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 97(2), 465-477.

Panaccio, A., Vandenberghe, C. (2009). Perceived organizational support, organizational commitment, and				
Scales	Cronbach's Alpha	Total (N= 163)	Males (n= 92)	Females (n= 71)
psychological well-being: A longitudinal study. <i>Journal of Vocational Behavior</i> , 75, 224-236.				
Ryan, R., & Deci. E. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. <i>American Psychologist</i> , 55, 68- 78.				
Ryff, C.D. ( 1995). Psychological well-being in adult life. <i>Current Directions in Psychological Science</i> , 4(4), 99-104.				
Ryff, C., & Keyes, C. (1995). The structure of psychological well-being revisited. <i>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology</i> , 69, 719-727.				
Schmidt, K. (2007). Organizational commitment: A further moderator in the relationship between work stress and strain? <i>International Journal of Stress Management</i> , 14(1), 26- 40.				
Seligman, M.E.P., & Czikszentmihalyi, M. (2000). Positive Psychology : An introduction. <i>American Psychologist</i> , 55, 5-14.				
Siu, O. (2002). Occupational stressors and well-being among Chinese employees: The role of organisational commitment. <i>Applied Psychology: An International Review</i> , 51, 527-544.				
Siu, O-L. (2003). Job stress and job performance among employees in Hong Kong: The role of Chinese work values and organizational commitment. <i>International Journal of Psychology</i> , 38(6), 337-347.				
Siu, O.-L., & Cooper, C. L. (1998). A study of occupational stress, job satisfaction and quitting intention in Hong Kong firms: The role of locus of control and organizational commitment. <i>Stress Medicine</i> , 14, 55-66.				
Tan, D.S.K., & Akhtar, S. (1998). Organizational commitment and experienced burnout: An exploratory study from a Chinese cultural perspective. <i>International Journal of Organizational Behaviour</i> , 24, 251-270.				
Vandenberg , R. J., & Lance , C. E. (1992). Examining the causal order of job satisfaction and organizational commitment. <i>Journal of Management</i> , 18 (1), 153 -167.				
Waterman, A. S. (1993). Two conceptions of happiness: contrasts of personal expressiveness (eudaimonia) and hedonic enjoyment. <i>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology</i> , 64, 678-691.				
Wefald, Andrew J. (2008). <i>An examination of job engagement, transformational leadership, and related psychological constructs</i> . Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Kansas State University, Manhattan.				
Woods, S.A., Poole, R., & Zibarras, L.D. (2012). Employee absence and organizational commitment : Moderation effects of age. <i>Journal of Personnel Psychology</i> , 11(4), 199-203.				



		Mean	S.D	Mean	S.D	Mean	S.D
OC	0.863	86.34	18.61	89.16	18.45	82.69	18.31
AC	0.763	30.70	7.50	32.12	7.40	28.86	7.27
CC	0.846	27.07	8.82	27.88	8.48	26.01	9.19
NC	0.715	28.58	7.15	29.16	7.84	27.82	6.10
EW	0.928	195.41	32.78	198.49	34.46	191.42	30.23
Aut	0.596	25.59	5.21	26.59	5.13	24.30	5.06
EM	0.675	27.31	5.32	27.77	5.55	26.72	4.99
PG	0.699	32.32	6.62	32.90	6.76	31.56	6.42
PR	0.783	25.85	6.82	26.27	7.03	25.30	6.54
PL	0.823	29.93	5.94	29.96	6.37	29.90	5.36
SA	0.644	24.50	4.98	24.64	5.11	24.32	4.83

Table 1 : *Descriptive Statistics and Reliability*

Note : OC= Total organizational commitment, AC= Affective commitment, CC= Continuance commitment, NC = Normative Commitment ,Aut = Autonomy, EM = Environmental Mastery, PG = Personal Growth, PR = Positive relations, PL = Purpose in Life, SA = Self Acceptance , EW = Total Eudaimonic wellbeing

Table 2

*Correlations*

	OC	CC	NC	AC	Aut	EM	PG	PR	PL	SA	EW
OC		.80**	.845**	.736**	.278**	.383**	.332**	.277*	.378**	.315**	.40**
CC			.543**	.292**	.157*	.22**	.177*	.100	.183*	.117	.194*
NC				.508**	.166*	.266*	.148	.104	.314**	.239**	.248**
AC					.348**	.435**	.477**	.471**	.422**	.418**	.529**
Aut						.580**	.542**	.398**	.493**	.487**	.695**
EM							.608**	.541**	.690**	.688**	.877**
PG								.584**	.685**	.640**	.826**
PR									.564**	.582**	.760**
PL										.833**	.853**
SA											.846**
EW											

Note : \*\* Correlation significant at 0.01 level (2-tailed) , \* Correlation significant at 0.05 level (two tailed). OC= Total organizational commitment, AC= Affective commitment, CC= Continuance commitment, NC = Normative Commitment ,Aut = Autonomy, EM = Environmental Mastery, PG = Personal Growth, PR = Positive relations, PL = Purpose in Life, SA = Self Acceptance , EW = Total Eudaimonic wellbeing

Table 3 *Multie Regression Analysisp*

DV	IV	R <sup>2</sup> / R <sup>2</sup>	F	B	SE B	Collinearity Statistics	
						Tolerance	VIF
EW	Step 1						
	Gender	R <sup>2</sup> =.023	1.91	-6.79	5.15	.998	1.002
	Work Ex	(Step 1)		5.16	3.71	.998	1.002
EW	Step 2	R <sup>2</sup> =.141**					
	Gender	(Step 2)		-2.54	4.85	.970	1.031
	Work Ex		10.43**	2.47	3.48	.976	1.024
	OC			.68	.13	.949	1.054
EW	Step 1						
	Gender	R <sup>2</sup> = .023	1.91	-6.79	5.15	.998	1.002
	Work Ex	Step 1)		5.16	3.71	.998	1.002
EW	Step 2	R <sup>2</sup> =.266**					
	Gender	(Step 2)		.89	4.56	.949	1.054
	Work Ex			3.59	3.24	.972	1.029
	AC			2.38	.35	.713	1.402
	CC		12.8**	.25	.29	.700	1.428
	NC			-.34	.41	.566	1.766
Aut	Step 1						
	Gender	R <sup>2</sup> =.064**		-2.24	.80	.998	1.002
	Work Ex	(Step 1)	5.48**	.96	.58	.998	1.002
Aut	Step 2	R <sup>2</sup> =.094**					
	Gender	(Step 2)		-1.51	.79	.949	1.054
	Work Ex			.81	.56	.972	1.029
	AC		5.89**	.22	.06	.713	1.402
	CC			.04	.05	.700	1.428
	NC			-.05	.07	.566	1.766
EM	Step 1						
	Gender	R <sup>2</sup> =.028	2.308	-.997	.835	.998	1.002
	Work Ex	(Step 1)		1.04	.60	.998	1.002
EM	Step 2	R <sup>2</sup> = .18**					
	Gender	(Step 2)		.02	.78	.949	1.054
	Work Ex			.75	.55	.972	1.029
	AC		8..28**	.29	.06	.713	1.402
	CC			.06	.05	.700	1.428
	NC			-.003	.070	.566	1.766
PG	Step 1						

	Gender	R <sup>2</sup> =.011	.857	-1.33	1.05	.998	1.002	
	Work Ex	(Step 1)		.216	.754	.998	1.002	
PG	Step 2							
	Gender			.154	.946	.949	1.054	
	Work Ex			.001	.67	.972	1.029	
	AC	R <sup>2</sup> =.24**	10.48**	.48	.07	.713	1.402	
	CC	(Step 2)		.09	.06	.700	1.428	
	NC			-.18	.09	.566	1.766	
	Step 1							
PR	Gender	R <sup>2</sup> =.07	.43	-.99	1.082	.998	1.002	
	Work Ex	(Step 1)		-.18	.778	.998	1.002	
	Step 2	R <sup>2</sup> =.25**						
PR	Gender	(Step 2)		.51	.97	.949	1.054	
	Work Ex			-.31	.69	.972	1.029	
	AC		10.46**	.52	.07	.713	1.402	
	CC			.04	.06	.700	1.428	
	NC			-.19	.09	.566	1.766	
PL	Step 1							
	Gender	R <sup>2</sup> =.02		.01	.94	.998	1.002	
	Work Ex	(Step 1)	1.51	1.17	.67	.998	1.002	
	Step 2	R <sup>2</sup> =.19**						
PL	Gender			1.09	.87	.949	1.054	
	Work Ex			.80	.62	.972	1.029	
	AC		8.24**	.30	.07	.713	1.402	
	CC			.01	.06	.700	1.428	
	NC			.09	.08	.566	1.766	
SA	Step 1							
	Gender	R <sup>2</sup> =.02		-.27	.79	-.03	.998	1.002
	Work Ex	(Step 1)	1.43	.93	.56	.13	.998	1.002
	Step 2	R <sup>2</sup> =.17**						
SA	Gender			.62	.74	.06	.949	1.054
	Work Ex			.72	.52	.10	.972	1.029
	AC		7.35**	.28	.06	.42**	.713	1.402
	CC			-.02	.05	-.03	.700	1.428
	NC			.02	.07	.04	.566	1.766

Note: \*\*p < 0.01, \*p < 0.05. OC= Total organizational commitment, AC = Affective commitment, CC= Continuance commitment, NC = Normative Commitment, Aut = Autonomy, EM = Environmental Mastery, PG = Personal Growth, PR = Positive relations, PL = Purpose in Life, SA = Self Acceptance, EW = Total Eudaimonic wellbeing