Information Technology in Human Resource Management

Dr.S.Thangamayan

Associate Professor, Head Department of Research and Development Saveetha School of Law SIMATS.

Abstract

The present study focused on the global economic slowdown has impacted organizations across the world, creating a scenario where uncertainty, job losses, hiring and salary freezes have become the norm. The slowdown forced many providers to consolidate their operations by focusing on productivity, efficiency and optimal utilization of resources, both human and hardware. The value proposition has shifted from labour arbitrage to skill availability, transformational objectives, innovation and non-linear models for growth. The recent downturn notwithstanding, India's success has given rise to competition from low cost economies which has encouraged bigger players to add offerings, move towards full service offerings with wider geo-diversity in their delivery models. The present study is analytical in nature and has adopted survey method for its findings. This study is based mainly on the primary data collected from the employees working in Information sector employees the through a well-designed and well-structured questionnaire. Random sampling method was adopted for collecting primary data. A total of 350 questionnaires were issued and the respondents were given sufficient time for filling the questionnaire. 324 of the issued questionnaires were received back from the respondents. Using version 21 of SPSS, the primary data collected were subjected to various statistical analyses. The Multiple Regression Analysis has been applied to study the significance of influence of personal profiles of the respondents and human resource practice factors on job satisfaction. Multivariate Analysis of General Linear Model has been applied to study the impact of personal profiles of respondents and Human Resource Practices (HRP) factors on their Organisational Commitment (OC) factors and the results.

Keywords

INTRODUCTION

The manpower situation is undergoing a major change as IT-BPO Company's deal with the slowing global economy. The dynamic marketplace is also pushing HR within companies to evolve a new and more important role for itself. The global economic slowdown has impacted organizations across the world, creating a scenario where uncertainty, job losses, hiring and salary freezes have become the norm. In this situation, the role of HR within organizations is undergoing a significant change as well. From managing the expectations of employees and guiding them towards their performance goals, to preparing staff for cost cutting and surviving the economic crises, HR has to transform itself and take a fresh look at organizational goals and how employees can meet them. The role of HR itself is becoming more critical for companies

today, as they bank on these specialized professionals to steer them through the slowdown. Not only do HR professionals have to communicate information about the economic slowdown and its impact on their companies to employees accurately and honestly, they also have to come up with 'people's' strategies that will enable their organizations to hold on to existing valuable talent without hiking their wage bills. In a number of organizations, HR is devising unique and innovative ways to enhance employee productivity and efficiency, while maintaining headcount. Strategies such as flexi-timings and 'work-from- home' are emerging on the radars of companies, alongside the traditional freezes on annual increments and hiring from B-level campuses. The slowdown forced many providers to consolidate their operations by focusing on productivity, efficiency and optimal utilization of resources, both human and hardware. Emergence of new disruptive technologies like cloud computing and sustainability and Green-IT have entered the mainstream dialogue. The value proposition has shifted from labour arbitrage to skill availability, transformational objectives, innovation and non-linear models for growth. The recent downturn notwithstanding, India's success has given rise to competition from low cost economies which has encouraged bigger players to add offerings, move towards full service offerings with wider geo-diversity in their delivery models.

Objectives of the Study
To Study the influence of personal profiles of the respondents and Human Resource Practice factors (HRPF) on Job Satisfaction (JS).
To find out the influence of personal profiles of the respondents and Human Resource Practice factors (HRPF) on Organisational Commitment (OC).
To identify the influence of personal profiles of the respondents and Human Resource Practice factors (HRPF) on Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB).

METHODOLOGY

The present study is analytical in nature and has adopted survey method for its findings. This study is based mainly on the primary data collected from the employees working in Information sector employees the through a well-designed and well-structured questionnaire. However, efforts were also taken to collect information from all available published data, especially from websites, newspapers, magazines and journals.

Sampling Size and Design
Random sampling method was adopted for collecting primary data. A total of 350 questionnaires were issued and the respondents were given sufficient time for filling the questionnaire. 324 of the issued questionnaires were received back from the respondents. On scrutiny of these 24 of them were found to be incompletely filled. So, they were rejected and the remaining 300 was taken for the study.

Analysis of Data
Using version 21 of SPSS, the primary data collected were subjected to various statistical analyses as follows:
1. The percentage analysis has been applied to study various personal profiles which were measured on nominal scales.
2. Factor analysis has been applied to examine the underlying dominant dimensions in Human Resource Practices (HRP) and Human Resource Outcome (HRO) variables.
3. Multiple Regression analysis has been used to study the influence of personal Profiles of the respondents and HRP Factors on their total Human Resource Outcomes (HRO) separately.
4. Multivariate Analysis and Univariate Analysis of General Linear Model have been applied to study the impact of the personal profiles of the respondents and HRP factors on HRO factors.
5. The scale reliability of the HRP and HRO variables were ascertained by subjecting them to Cronbach's alpha test.

Dominant Dimensions of Human Resource Outcomes:

1. Job Satisfaction (JS)
a. Organisational Climate Factor (OCF),
b. Job Nature Factor (JNF),
2. Organisational Commitment (OC)
a. Recognition Factor (RF),
b. Engagement Factor (EF),
3. Organisation Citizenship Behavior (OCB)
a. Directing Factor (DF),
b. Helping Factor (HF),
c. Adopting Factor (AF).

Influence of Personal Profiles of the Respondents Onand Human Resource Practice Factors (Hrpf) On Total Job Satisfaction (Js)
The Multiple Regression Analysis has been applied to study the significance of influence of personal profiles of the respondents and human resource practice factors on job satisfaction and the results are shown in Table 1 to 3.

TABLE1. ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF INFLUENCE OF PERSONAL PROFILES AND HUMAN RESOURCE PRACTICE FACTORS ON JOB SATISFACTION

Sources of Variance	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	D.f	F	P – Value
Regression	Regression	4151.101	5	830.220	36.190
Residual	Residual	6744.445	294	22.940	
Total	Total	10895.547	299		
R = 0.617		R^2= 0.381 Adjusted R^2= 0.370		Std. Error of the Estimate = 4.789	

TABLE 2. PERSONAL PROFILES AND HRPF SIGNIFICANTLY INFLUENCING THE JOB SATISFACTION

Predictors	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t – Value	P - Value
	Beta	**Std. Error**	**Beta**		
(Constant)	10.561	2.176		4.855	**0.000**
Job Enrichment Factor (JEF)	0.695	0.178	0.226	3.898	**0.000**
Controlling Factor (CF)	0.317	0.107	0.177	2.979	**0.003**
Social Security Factor (SSF)	0.475	0.166	0.159	2.867	**0.004**
Procurement Factor (PF)	0.215	0.090	0.146	2.385	**0.018**
Recognition Factor (RF)	0.497	0.222	0.116	2.235	**0.026**

Table3. PERSONAL PROFILES AND HRPF NOT INFLUENCING THE TOTAL JOB SATISFACTION

Excluded variables	Beta In	T	Sig.	Partial Correlation	Collinearity Statistics
					Tolerance
Gender	0.035	0.736	0.462	0.043	0.958
Age	-0.017	-0.358	0.720	-0.021	0.978
educational qualification	0.077	1.660	0.098	0.097	0.983
Number of years of experience	0.041	0.879	0.380	0.051	0.986
Experience in current organization	0.045	0.958	0.339	0.056	0.957
Level of Employment	-0.031	-0.664	0.508	-0.039	0.978
monthly income	0.032	0.689	0.492	0.040	0.963
Monetary Benefits Factor (MBF)	0.078	1.310	0.191	0.076	0.595
Executive Development Factor (EDF)	0.070	1.164	0.245	0.068	0.581
Recruitment Factor (RF)	0.018	0.345	0.730	0.020	0.774
Counseling Factor (CF)	-0.017	-0.339	0.735	-0.020	0.826

The Tables 1 to 3 reveals that OLS Model has a goodness of fit for multiple regression analysis and the linear combination of Job Enrichment Factor (JEF), Controlling Factor (CF), Social Security Factor (SSF), Procurement Factor (PF), Recognition Factor (RCF) and Counseling Factor (CF) was significantly related to Job Satisfaction, {F = 36.190, p<0.001}. The multiple correlation coefficient is 0.617, indicating that 38% of the variance of the respondents' Job Satisfaction can be accounted for by linear combination of Job Enrichment Factor (JEF), Controlling Factor (CF), Social Security Factor (SSF), Procurement Factor (PF), Recognition Factor (RCF) and Counseling Factor (CF). From all these it could be said thatJob Enrichment Factor (JEF), Controlling Factor (CF), Social Security Factor (SSF), Procurement Factor (PF), Recognition Factor (RCF) and Counseling Factor (CF) are significantly and positively influence Job Satisfaction of the respondents in the order of their influence whereas Gender, Age, educational qualification, Number of years of experience, Experience in current organisation, Level of Employment, monthly income, Monetary

Benefits Factor (MBF), Executive Development Factor (EDF), Recruitment Factor (RF) and Counseling Factor (CF) have no significant influence on Job Satisfaction of the respondents.

Influence of Personal Profiles of the Respondents On And Human Resource Practice Factors (Hrpf) On Total Organisational Commitment (Oc)

The Multiple Regression Analysis has been applied to study the significance of influence of personal profiles of the respondents and human resource practice factors on Organisational Commitment and the results are shown in Table 4 to 6.

Table 4. Analysis Of Variance of Influence of Personal Profiles and Human Resource Practice Factors on Organizational Commitment

Sources of Variance	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	Df	F	P – Value
Regression	Regression	2472.183	5		
Residual	Residual	4819.004	294	494.437 16.391	30.165
Total	Total	7291.187	299		
R = 0.582		**R²= 0.339** Adjusted **R²**= 0.328		**Std. Error of the Estimate** = 4.048	

TABLE 5.PERSONAL PROFILES AND HRPF SIGNIFICANTLY INFLUENCING THE ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT

Predictors	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t – Value	P - Value
	Beta	**Std. Error**	**Beta**		
(Constant)	9.110	1.844		4.940	**0.000**
Controlling Factor (CF)	0.373	0.088	0.255	4.240	**0.000**
Procurement Factor (PF)	0.285	0.072	0.236	3.983	**0.000**
uitment Factor (RF)	0.283	0.128	0.120	2.218	**0.027**
gnition Factor (RCF)	0.464	0.182	0.133	2.552	**0.011**
Educational Qualification	0.561	0.254	0.106	2.210	**0.028**

TABLE 6.PERSONAL PROFILES AND HRPF NOT INFLUENCING THE TOTAL
ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT

Excluded variables	Beta In	T	Sig.	Partial Correlation	Collinearity Statistics
					Tolerance
Gender	-0.023	-0.477	0.634	-0.028	0.958
Age	0.044	0.880	0.380	0.051	0.913
Number of years of experience	0.001	0.015	0.988	0.001	0.925
Experience in Current organisation	0.017	0.347	0.728	0.020	0.975
Level of Employment	-0.012	-0.237	0.813	-0.014	0.920
Monthly Family Income	-0.024	-0.467	0.641	-0.027	0.870
Monetary Benefits Factor(MBF)	0.081	1.360	0.175	0.079	0.635
Executive Development Factor (EDF)	0.114	1.860	0.064	0.108	0.590
Job Enrichment Factor (JEF)	0.093	1.549	0.123	0.090	0.621
Social Security Factor (SSF)	0.062	1.079	0.281	0.063	0.679
Counseling Factor (CF)	0.088	1.683	0.093	0.098	0.813

The Tables 5.4 to 5.6 reveals that OLS Model has a goodness of fit for multiple regression analysis and the linear combination of Controlling Factor (CF), Procurement Factor (PF), Recruitment Factor (RF), Recognition Factor (RCF) and Educational Qualification was significantly related to Organizational Commitment, {F = 30.165, p<0.001}. The multiple correlation coefficient is 0.582, indicating that 34% of the variance of the respondents' Organisational Commitment can be accounted for by linear combination of Controlling Factor (CF), Procurement Factor (PF), Recruitment Factor (RF), Recognition Factor (RCF) and Educational Qualification. From all these it could be said that Controlling Factor (CF), Procurement Factor (PF), Recruitment Factor (RF), Recognition Factor (RCF) and Educational Qualification are significantly and positively influence Organisational Commitment of the respondents in the order of their influence whereas Gender, Age, Number of years of experience, Experience in Current organisation, Level of Employment, Monthly Family Income, Monetary Benefits Factor(MBF), Executive Development Factor (EDF), Job Enrichment Factor (JEF), Social Security Factor (SSF) and Counseling Factor (CF) have no significant influence Organisational Commitment of the respondents.

Influence of Personal Profiles of the Respondentsand Human Resource Practice Factors (Hrpf) On Total Organisational Citizenship Behavior (Ocb)
The Multiple Regression Analysis has been applied to study the significance of influence of personal profiles of the respondents and human resource practice factors on Organisational Citizenship Behavior and the results are shown in Table 7 to 9.

TABLE 7. ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF INFLUENCE OF PERSONAL PROFILES AND HUMAN
RESOURCE PRACTICE FACTORS ON ORGANISATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR

Sources of Variance	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	Df	F	P – Value
Regression	Regression	1668.290	3	556.097	27.287
Residual	Residual	6032.377	296	20.380	

Total	Total	7700.667	299		
R = 0.465		**R²**= 0.217 **Adjusted R²**= 0.209		**Std. Error of the Estimate** = 4.514	

TABLE 8. PERSONAL PROFILES AND HRPF SIGNIFICANTLY INFLUENCING THE ORGANISATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR

Predictors	Unstandardised Coefficients		Standardised Coefficients	t – Value	P - Value
	Beta	**Std. Error**	**Beta**		
(Constant)	26.665	1.931		13.810	**0.000**
Executive Development Factor (EDF)	0.491	0.119	0.254	4.108	**0.000**
Monetary Benefits Factor (MBF)	0.424	0.142	0.181	2.977	**0.003**
uitment Factor (RF)	0.382	0.136	0.157	2.805	**0.005**

Impact of Personal Profiles of Respondents and Human Resource Practices (Hrp) Factors On Their Organisational Commitment (Oc) Factors
Multivariate Analysis of General Linear Model has been applied to study the impact of personal profiles of respondents and Human Resource Practices (HRP) factors on their Organisational Commitment (OC) factors and the results are shown in Table 12.

TABLE 9. MULTIVARIATE TEST OF PERSONAL PROFILES AND EFFECTIVENESS OF HUMAN RESOURCE PRACTICES ON ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT

Effect		Value	F	othesis df	Error df	P-Value	Inference
Intercept	Pillai's Trace	0.063	9.135[b]	2.000	271.000	**0.000**	**S**
	Wilks' Lambda	0.937	9.135[b]	2.000	271.000	**0.000**	**S**
	Hotelling's Trace	0.067	9.135[b]	2.000	271.000	**0.000**	**S**
	Roy's Largest Root	0.067	9.135[b]	2.000	271.000	**0.000**	**S**
Gender	Pillai's Trace	0.005	0.660[b]	2.000	271.000	0.518	NS
	Wilks' Lambda	0.995	0.660[b]	2.000	271.000	0.518	NS
	Hotelling's Trace	0.005	0.660[b]	2.000	271.000	0.518	NS
	Roy's Largest Root	0.005	0.660[b]	2.000	271.000	0.518	NS
Age	Pillai's Trace	0.015	0.689	6.000	544.000	0.659	NS
	Wilks' Lambda	0.985	0.688[b]	6.000	542.000	0.659	NS
	Hotelling's Trace	0.015	0.687	6.000	540.000	0.660	NS

	Roy's Largest Root	0.014	1.262[c]	3.000	272.000	0.288	NS
Educational Qualification	Pillai's Trace	0.031	1.438	6.000	544.000	0.198	NS
	Wilks' Lambda	0.969	1.439[b]	6.000	542.000	0.198	NS
	Hotelling's Trace	0.032	1.439	6.000	540.000	0.198	NS
	Roy's Largest Root	0.027	2.482[c]	3.000	272.000	0.061	NS
Total Experience	Pillai's Trace	0.031	1.413	6.000	544.000	0.207	NS
	Wilks' Lambda	0.969	1.417[b]	6.000	542.000	0.206	NS
	Hotelling's Trace	0.032	1.421	6.000	540.000	0.204	NS
	Roy's Largest Root	0.030	2.718[c]	3.000	272.000	**0.045**	**S**
Experience in Current Organisation	Pillai's Trace	0.021	0.953	6.000	544.000	0.456	NS
	Wilks' Lambda	0.979	0.955[b]	6.000	542.000	0.455	NS
	Hotelling's Trace	0.021	0.956	6.000	540.000	0.454	NS
	Roy's Largest Root	0.021	1.913[c]	3.000	272.000	0.128	NS
Level of Employment	Pillai's Trace	0.019	1.273	4.000	544.000	0.279	NS
	Wilks' Lambda	0.981	1.271[b]	4.000	542.000	0.280	NS
	Hotelling's Trace	0.019	1.269	4.000	540.000	0.281	NS
	Roy's Largest Root	0.016	2.137[c]	2.000	272.000	0.120	NS
Monthly Income	Pillai's Trace	0.024	1.080	6.000	544.000	0.373	NS
	Wilks' Lambda	0.977	1.078[b]	6.000	542.000	0.374	NS
	Hotelling's Trace	0.024	1.077	6.000	540.000	0.375	NS
	Roy's Largest Root	0.019	1.743[c]	3.000	272.000	0.159	NS
Procurement Factor (PF)	Pillai's Trace	0.035	4.932[b]	2.000	271.000	**0.008**	**S**
	Wilks' Lambda	0.965	4.932[b]	2.000	271.000	**0.008**	**S**
	Hotelling's Trace	0.036	4.932[b]	2.000	271.000	**0.008**	**S**
	Roy's Largest Root	0.036	4.932[b]	2.000	271.000	**0.008**	**S**
Controlling Factor (CF)	Pillai's Trace	0.035	4.970[b]	2.000	271.000	**0.008**	**S**
	Wilks' Lambda	0.965	4.970[b]	2.000	271.000	**0.008**	**S**
	Hotelling's Trace	0.037	4.970[b]	2.000	271.000	**0.008**	**S**

	Roy's Largest Root	0.037	4.970[b]	2.000	271.000	**0.008**	**S**
Monetary Benefits Factor (MBF)	Pillai's Trace	0.012	1.617[b]	2.000	271.000	0.200	NS
	Wilks' Lambda	0.988	1.617[b]	2.000	271.000	0.200	NS
	Hotelling's Trace	0.012	1.617[b]	2.000	271.000	0.200	NS
	Roy's Largest Root	0.012	1.617[b]	2.000	271.000	0.200	NS
Executive Development Factor (EDF)	Pillai's Trace	0.019	2.688[b]	2.000	271.000	0.070	NS
	Wilks' Lambda	0.981	2.688[b]	2.000	271.000	0.070	NS
	Hotelling's Trace	0.020	2.688[b]	2.000	271.000	0.070	NS
	Roy's Largest Root	0.020	2.688[b]	2.000	271.000	0.070	NS
Recruitment	Pillai's Trace	0.014	1.888[b]	2.000	271.000	0.153	NS
	Wilks' Lambda	0.986	1.888[b]	2.000	271.000	0.153	NS
Factor (RF)	Hotelling's Trace	0.014	1.888[b]	2.000	271.000	0.153	NS
	Roy's Largest Root	0.014	1.888[b]	2.000	271.000	0.153	NS
Job Enrichment Factor (JEF)	Pillai's Trace	0.005	0.720[b]	2.000	271.000	0.488	NS
	Wilks' Lambda	0.995	0.720[b]	2.000	271.000	0.488	NS
	Hotelling's Trace	0.005	0.720[b]	2.000	271.000	0.488	NS
	Roy's Largest Root	0.005	0.720[b]	2.000	271.000	0.488	NS
Social Security Factor (SSF)	Pillai's Trace	0.002	0.311[b]	2.000	271.000	0.733	NS
	Wilks' Lambda	0.998	0.311[b]	2.000	271.000	0.733	NS
	Hotelling's Trace	0.002	0.311[b]	2.000	271.000	0.733	NS
	Roy's Largest Root	0.002	0.311[b]	2.000	271.000	0.733	NS
Appreciation Factor (AF)	Pillai's Trace	0.017	2.334[b]	2.000	271.000	0.099	NS
	Wilks' Lambda	0.983	2.334[b]	2.000	271.000	0.099	NS
	Hotelling's Trace	0.017	2.334[b]	2.000	271.000	0.099	NS
	Roy's Largest Root	0.017	2.334[b]	2.000	271.000	0.099	NS
Counseling Factor (CF)	Pillai's Trace	0.010	1.425[b]	2.000	271.000	0.242	NS
	Wilks' Lambda	0.990	1.425[b]	2.000	271.000	0.242	NS
	Hotelling's Trace	0.011	1.425[b]	2.000	271.000	0.242	NS

	Roy's Largest Root	0.011	1.425[b]	2.000	271.000	0.242	NS

*S = Significant, Ns = Not Significant.
Table 12 reveals that Procurement Factor (PF) and Controlling Factor (CF) have significant impact on both Organisational Commitment (OC) Factors. Whereas, Gender, Age, Educational qualification, Total years' of experience, experience in current organisation, level of employment, Monthly Family Income, Monetary Benefits Factors (MBF), Executive Development Factor (EDF), Recruitment Factor (RF) Recognition Factor (RGF), Social Security Factor (SSF), Appreciation Factor (AF) and Counseling Factor (CSF) have no significant impact on both organizational commitment (OC) Factors.

Findings of the Study
Nine independent factors have been extracted out of 31 HRP variables of which Procurement Factor (PF) is the most dominant one, followed by Controlling Factor (CF), Monetary Benefits Factor (MBF), Executive Development Factor (EDF), Recruitment Factor (RF), Job Enrichment Factor (JEF), Social Security Factor (SSF), Appreciation Factor (RF) and Counseling Factor (CF) in the order of dominance and all the factors together explaining 58.362% of variance.
Two independent factors have been extracted out of 10JS variables of which the Organisational Climate factor (OCF) is the most dominant one, followed by Job Nature factor (JNF) and all the factors together explaining 51.834% of variance.
Two independent factors have been extracted out of 8OC variables of which the Recognition factor (RF) is the most dominant one, followed by Engagement factor (EF) and all the factors together explaining 57.147% of variance.
Three independent factors have been extracted out of 12OCB variables of which the Directing factor (DF) is the most dominant one, followed by Helping Factor (HF) and Adopting Factor (AF) and all the factors together explaining 48.749% of variance.
Job Enrichment Factor (JEF), Controlling Factor (CF), Social Security Factor (SSF), Procurement Factor (PF), Recognition Factor (RCF) and Counseling Factor (CF) are significantly and positively influence Job Satisfaction of the respondents in the order of their influence whereas Gender, Age, educational qualification, Number of years of experience, Experience in current organisation, Level of Employment, monthly income, Monetary Benefits Factor (MBF), Executive Development Factor (EDF), Recruitment Factor (RF) and Counseling Factor (CF)   have no significant influence on Job Satisfaction of the respondents.

CONCLUSIONS

This study examined the human resource practices dimensions and human resource outcomes dimensions among the IT employees in Chennai City. The result reveals that procurement factors, controlling factor, monetary benefits factor, executive benefits factor, recruitment factor, job enrichment factor, social security facto, appreciation factor and counseling factor are the underlying dominant dimensions of human resource practices effectiveness among IT employees. Human resource outcomes are classified into three categories namely; job satisfaction, organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior and organizational climate factor, job nature factor, recognition factor, engagement factor, directing factor, helping factor and adopting factor are the underlying dominant dimensions of human resource outcomes among IT employees in Chennai City. Also an Attempt has been made to study the influence of human resource practices factor on human resource outcomes, and findings proven that Controlling factor, procurement factor, recruitment factor, recognition factor have significant influence on human resource outcomes. Finally, organizations are suggested to adopt effective recruitment and procurement policies to creat larger application pool with larger potential employees. Management should link organization development with individual needs for better engagement and executive development of employees.

Management should provide monetary benefits and non-monetary benefits to enhance the human resource outcomes. Human resource managers also play a vital role in human resource outcomes.

REFERENCES

Barney,J. B. & P. M. Wright (1997). On Becoming a Strategic Partner: The role of Human Resources in Gaining Competitive Advantage. Working Paper.

Noe, R. A., Hollenbeck, J. R., Gerhart, B., and Wright, P. M. (2007), Human resource management: Gaining a competitive advantage, McGraw-Hill, USA.

Sheldon, M.E. (1971) 'Investments and Involvements as Mechanisms Producing Commitment to the Organization', Administrative Science Quarterly, 16: 142–50.

Porter, L.W., Steers, R.M., Mowday, R.T. and Boulian, P.V. (1974) 'Organizational Commitment, Job Satisfaction and Turnover among Psychiatric Technicians', Journal of Applied Psychology.

Romzek, B.S. (1989) 'Personal consequences of employee commitment', Academy of Management Journal, 32: 649–61.

Saxena and Tiwari(2009): " Human Resource Management Practices of IT Industry: A Comprehensive review; Pakistan Business Review, January 2012