

Influence of Workplace Resources on Affective Organisational Commitment: An Empirical Study of Recognition, Social Support, Job Satisfaction, and Self-Efficacy

Lovely Joseph Pullokar¹, Dr. (Fr.) Paulachan K. Joseph²

¹ Research Scholar, Kerala University of Fisheries and Ocean Studies, Kerala, India.

² Professor, Naipunnaya Business School, Kerala, India.

Corresponding Author

Lovely Joseph Pullokar

Email: Not provided...

ABSTRACT

Affective organisational commitment represents employees' emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in their organisation and is considered an important determinant of employee retention and positive organisational behaviour. The present study examined the influence of workplace resources, namely employee recognition, supervisor support, coworker support, job satisfaction, and occupational self-efficacy, on affective organisational commitment. A quantitative, cross-sectional, explanatory research design was adopted. Primary data were collected through a structured questionnaire from 326 full-time employees working in private banking, insurance, and information technology and information technology-enabled service organisations located in Kerala State, India. The data were analysed using IBM SPSS Statistics 26. Descriptive statistics, reliability analysis, Pearson correlation, hierarchical regression, multiple regression, bootstrap confidence intervals, and regression diagnostics were employed. The findings indicated that all five predictors were positively and significantly related to affective organisational commitment. The combined model explained 52.7% of the variance in affective organisational commitment, $F(5, 320) = 71.20, p < .001$. Job satisfaction emerged as the strongest predictor ($\beta = .319$), followed by coworker support ($\beta = .201$), occupational self-efficacy ($\beta = .199$), recognition ($\beta = .165$), and supervisor support ($\beta = .149$). The findings demonstrate that employees' emotional attachment to organisations develops through a combination of positive job evaluations, supportive workplace relationships, organisational acknowledgement, and confidence in their occupational capabilities. The study offers implications for recognition practices, supervisory support, team climate, employee development, and retention-oriented human resource policies...

Keywords: affective organisational commitment; employee recognition; supervisor support; coworker support; job satisfaction; occupational self-efficacy...

INTRODUCTION

Affective organisational commitment has become an important construct in organisational behaviour because it reflects an employee's emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in an organisation. Employees with strong affective commitment remain associated with their organisation because they genuinely want to maintain membership rather than because leaving would be costly or because they feel morally obligated to stay. Allen and Meyer (1990) distinguished affective commitment from continuance and normative commitment and demonstrated that emotional attachment represents a conceptually independent component of organisational commitment. Subsequent meta-analytic evidence established that affective commitment has particularly favourable relationships with employee performance, organisational citizenship behaviour, attendance, turnover-related cognition, stress, and work-family outcomes (Meyer et al., 2002).

Contemporary organisations increasingly recognise that employee commitment does not depend solely on salary or formal employment conditions. Employees continuously evaluate whether their organisation values their contributions, provides adequate interpersonal and professional support, creates satisfying work experiences, and enables them to perform successfully. The Job Demands-Resources model identifies job resources as physical, psychological, social, and organisational aspects of work that facilitate goal attainment, reduce job-related costs, and stimulate learning and development (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007). Recognition, supportive supervision, collegial assistance, autonomy, developmental opportunities, and constructive feedback may therefore strengthen employees' motivational connection with their organisation.

Recognition constitutes an important organisational resource because it communicates appreciation of employee contribution. Employees who believe that their efforts are acknowledged are more likely to interpret the organisation as supportive and reciprocal. Experimental

evidence has demonstrated that public recognition can positively affect employee behaviour even in the absence of direct financial incentives (Bradler et al., 2016). Research among white-collar employees has similarly shown that recognition and developmental opportunities contribute significantly to organisational commitment (Cicekli & Kabasakal, 2017). Recognition therefore represents more than a reward mechanism; it also communicates organisational valuation and strengthens the social exchange between employees and the organisation.

Social support is another critical workplace resource. Supervisor support reflects the extent to which employees perceive that their immediate manager values their contributions, provides assistance, considers their well-being, and responds constructively to occupational difficulties. Coworker support refers to instrumental and emotional assistance received from colleagues. A meta-analysis by Ng and Sorensen (2008) reported that supervisor support was positively associated with job satisfaction and affective commitment, while coworker support also demonstrated meaningful positive relationships with these attitudes. Both sources of support may therefore strengthen organisational attachment, although their relative importance can vary according to occupational conditions.

Job satisfaction and occupational self-efficacy further extend the explanation of commitment. Job satisfaction reflects the employee's overall evaluative response to the job, while occupational self-efficacy concerns confidence in the ability to perform occupational tasks successfully and manage work-related challenges. Cross-national evidence has demonstrated a positive association between job satisfaction and affective organisational commitment (Chordiya et al., 2017). Similarly, occupational self-efficacy has been positively related to satisfaction, workplace functioning, and organisational commitment (Schyns & von Collani, 2002). These findings suggest that affective commitment may emerge through the combined influence of organisational, relational, attitudinal, and personal resources.

Previous studies have established important associations between recognition, organisational support, job satisfaction, self-efficacy, and employee commitment. However, these predictors have frequently been examined independently, through overall organisational commitment rather than specifically affective commitment, or within highly specialised occupational groups. Limited empirical research has simultaneously compared recognition, supervisor support, coworker support, job satisfaction, and occupational self-efficacy within one explanatory framework. The relative and incremental contributions of these variables therefore remain insufficiently established, particularly among employees working in the Indian private service sector.

The purpose of the study was to examine the influence of workplace resources on affective organisational commitment among employees working in private service-sector organisations.

The specific objectives were:

To assess the levels of employee recognition, supervisor support, coworker support, job satisfaction, occupational self-efficacy, and affective organisational commitment.

To examine the relationships between workplace resources and affective organisational commitment.

To determine the individual influence of recognition, supervisor support, coworker support, job satisfaction, and occupational self-efficacy on affective organisational commitment.

To evaluate the incremental explanatory contribution of organisational/interpersonal resources and attitudinal/personal resources.

To determine the relative importance of the five predictors in explaining affective organisational commitment.

The study contributes to organisational behaviour literature by integrating multiple categories of workplace resources within one empirical framework. The Job Demands–Resources model explains how resources promote motivation and positive organisational outcomes, while organisational support theory explains how employees interpret favourable treatment as evidence that the organisation values their contributions and cares about their well-being (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007; Kurtessis et al., 2017). Social exchange theory further suggests that employees reciprocate favourable organisational treatment through stronger attachment and positive work attitudes. Integrating these theoretical perspectives provides a comprehensive explanation of affective organisational commitment.

The study also contributes by distinguishing related but conceptually different constructs. Recognition, supervisor support, and coworker support represent organisational and interpersonal workplace resources. Occupational self-efficacy represents a personal psychological resource, while job satisfaction represents an evaluative job attitude. These constructs should not be treated as interchangeable. Simultaneously examining them permits estimation of their unique contributions and clarifies whether a specific resource remains important once overlapping workplace experiences are statistically controlled.

2. Literature Review

The literature review critically examines previous research through four interconnected themes: recognition and organisational valuation; supervisor and coworker social support; job satisfaction and affective organisational commitment; and occupational self-efficacy as a personal resource. These themes were selected because they correspond directly with the research objectives and represent organisational, relational, attitudinal, and personal explanations of employees' emotional attachment to their organisation.

Theme 1: Recognition and Organisational Valuation

Recognition has developed as an important organisational mechanism through which employees receive evidence that their work and contribution are valued. **Eisenberger et al. (1986)** investigated employees' perceptions concerning whether their organisation appreciated their contribution and cared about their well-being. Their work established perceived organisational support as an

important employee belief and demonstrated that favourable organisational perceptions were associated with reduced withdrawal behaviour. Recognition can be interpreted within this framework because acknowledgement of employee contribution strengthens perceptions of organisational valuation.

Rhoades et al. (2001) subsequently examined the contribution of perceived organisational support to affective commitment through three studies. The first study involved employees from different organisations, while subsequent longitudinal studies examined retail employees over time. Rewards, procedural justice, and supervisor support were positively related to perceived organisational support, which subsequently contributed to affective commitment. The findings indicated that positive work experiences strengthen commitment partly because employees interpret such experiences as evidence that the organisation values them.

A comprehensive review by **Rhoades and Eisenberger (2002)** further demonstrated that fairness, supervisor support, organisational rewards, and favourable working conditions were important antecedents of perceived organisational support. Perceived support was positively associated with job satisfaction, affective commitment, performance, and reduced withdrawal. A later meta-analysis by **Kurtessis et al. (2017)** incorporated 558 studies and provided strong empirical support for organisational support theory. The evidence suggested that supportive organisational practices influence a broad range of employee attitudes and outcomes.

Direct evidence concerning recognition was provided by **Bradler et al. (2016)** through a field experiment involving more than 300 employees performing a data-entry task. Public recognition produced measurable improvements in employee behaviour even though it was not accompanied by financial compensation. The findings demonstrated that acknowledgement can function as an independent motivational signal.

Similarly, **Cicekli and Kabasakal (2017)** examined 550 white-collar employees through factor analysis and hierarchical regression. Recognition and development opportunities were significant predictors of organisational commitment, whereas promotion opportunity did not independently predict commitment. The results indicated that employees may value acknowledgement and developmental treatment even where formal career progression is limited. Recognition therefore appears capable of strengthening the psychological relationship between employee and organisation through both social exchange and organisational valuation.

Theme 2: Supervisor and Coworker Social Support

Workplace social support has received considerable attention because employees obtain assistance from both supervisors and colleagues. These sources of support differ in organisational meaning. Supervisors function as formal representatives of management, whereas coworkers provide peer-level emotional and instrumental assistance.

Eisenberger et al. (2002) examined perceived supervisor support across three employee samples and found that

supervisor support contributed to perceived organisational support and employee retention. The relationship became stronger when supervisors were viewed as important organisational representatives. The study demonstrated that employee reactions to supervisors can extend beyond the individual manager because employees may interpret supervisory treatment as evidence of organisational intentions.

Ng and Sorensen (2008) conducted a meta-analysis comparing perceived supervisor support and coworker support. Supervisor support demonstrated stronger average correlations than coworker support with job satisfaction, affective commitment, and turnover intention. Supervisor support was associated with affective commitment at approximately $r = .48$, whereas coworker support showed a relationship of approximately $r = .28$. Nevertheless, both relationships were significant, confirming that vertical and horizontal support constitute important but distinct organisational resources.

Rousseau and Aubé (2010) examined 215 healthcare employees and found additive positive effects of supervisor support and coworker support on affective organisational commitment. Resource adequacy strengthened both relationships, while favourable ambient work conditions strengthened the effect of supervisor support. These findings indicated that interpersonal support is embedded within a wider organisational environment and that relational resources may become particularly valuable when employees have adequate resources to perform their jobs.

Brunetto et al. (2013) extended this research through a study of nurses in Australia and the United States. Using structural equation modelling, they found that workplace relationships were significantly linked with engagement, well-being, organisational commitment, and turnover-related outcomes. Although some relationships differed between national contexts, the overall findings demonstrated that supportive professional relationships contribute to positive employee attitudes.

Further research by **Orgambidez and Almeida (2020)** found that supervisor support contributed directly to affective commitment and indirectly through employee work engagement. The findings indicated that supportive supervision may strengthen organisational attachment partly by increasing employees' psychological involvement in their work.

Coworker support has also emerged as an important predictor. Recent research has shown that both emotional and instrumental coworker support contribute positively to affective commitment and that job satisfaction can explain part of this relationship. These findings support the view that peer relationships should not be treated merely as informal workplace experiences. Instead, coworker support can constitute a meaningful organisational resource that influences emotional attachment.

Theme 3: Job Satisfaction and Affective Organisational Commitment

Job satisfaction is one of the most consistently examined antecedents of organisational commitment. Although the

constructs are strongly related, they represent different employee attitudes. Job satisfaction concerns the employee's evaluation of the job and employment experience, whereas affective commitment concerns emotional attachment to the employing organisation.

Meyer et al. (2002) conducted a meta-analysis covering 155 research reports and confirmed that affective commitment was strongly associated with job satisfaction and other favourable employee attitudes. The study demonstrated that affective commitment remains conceptually distinct from satisfaction despite their substantial correlation. It also showed that affective commitment was more strongly associated with favourable organisational outcomes than continuance commitment.

Cross-national evidence was provided by **Chordiya et al. (2017)**, who compared public managers in India and the United States. Job satisfaction demonstrated a significant positive influence on affective organisational commitment in both national settings. The study also identified contextual differences in overall commitment levels, indicating that job satisfaction functions as an important antecedent while organisational and cultural context can influence the magnitude of commitment.

Research examining social support has further strengthened the importance of satisfaction. Supportive workplace relationships can improve daily employee experience, reduce strain, enhance belonging, and consequently strengthen satisfaction. Satisfaction may therefore operate as a broader evaluative mechanism through which specific organisational resources influence commitment. This possibility makes it necessary to analyse job satisfaction simultaneously with recognition and social support rather than interpreting bivariate associations in isolation.

The theoretical significance of job satisfaction lies in its capacity to aggregate employees' evaluation of multiple employment conditions. Recognition, supervisory treatment, coworker relations, role clarity, workload, and opportunities for development can all contribute to satisfaction. However, satisfaction may also retain a direct influence on commitment because employees who consistently evaluate their jobs positively are more likely to identify emotionally with their organisation.

Theme 4: Occupational Self-Efficacy and Personal Resources

Occupational self-efficacy extends the analysis from external workplace resources to employees' confidence in their own ability to manage work requirements. Self-efficacious employees are more likely to approach challenging tasks with confidence, persist after setbacks, and interpret difficult work conditions as manageable rather than threatening.

Schyns and von Collani (2002) developed an occupational self-efficacy scale and tested its relationships with personality and organisational variables. Occupational self-efficacy was positively associated with task characteristics, leader-member exchange, job satisfaction, and organisational commitment. The findings demonstrated that work-

specific efficacy provides explanatory value beyond general personality characteristics.

Rigotti et al. (2008) subsequently validated a short occupational self-efficacy scale across Germany, Sweden, Belgium, the United Kingdom, and Spain using a total sample of 1,535 employees. The six-item scale demonstrated satisfactory structural and construct validity across countries. Their findings established occupational self-efficacy as a practical and reliable measure for organisational research.

van Vuuren et al. (2008) examined self-efficacy and organisational efficacy in relation to affective, normative, and continuance commitment. The results showed that both efficacy expectations contributed to organisational commitment, although organisational efficacy demonstrated a stronger effect. This suggested that employees' beliefs concerning their own capability and their organisation's capability may jointly shape organisational attachment.

Similarly, **Joe (2010)** examined job self-efficacy, organisational commitment, social support, information characteristics, and decision quality among employees working in an industrial setting. Most proposed relationships were statistically significant, reinforcing the idea that personal capability beliefs operate within a broader system of organisational resources and information.

Collectively, the literature demonstrates substantial progress in understanding workplace resources and affective commitment. Recognition communicates appreciation, supervisor and coworker support provide relational resources, job satisfaction captures employees' broader evaluation of work, and occupational self-efficacy represents confidence in personal capability. However, relatively few studies have compared all these variables simultaneously. An integrated model is therefore required to identify which resources make independent contributions and which relationships are largely shared with other workplace experiences.

Existing studies demonstrate positive relationships between organisational recognition, social support, job satisfaction, self-efficacy, and organisational commitment. However, the variables have frequently been examined separately or within highly specific occupational settings. Limited research has estimated their simultaneous influence specifically on the affective component of organisational commitment. It also remains unclear whether supervisor and coworker support provide independent explanatory value after job satisfaction and recognition are controlled. The present study addresses this gap through a multidimensional explanatory model that compares organisational, interpersonal, attitudinal, and personal resources within one employee sample. Addressing this gap provides both theoretical clarity and a more precise basis for HR resource allocation.

Research Hypotheses

H1: Employee recognition has a significant positive influence on affective organisational commitment.

H2: Supervisor support has a significant positive

influence on affective organisational commitment.

H3: Coworker support has a significant positive influence on affective organisational commitment.

H4: Job satisfaction has a significant positive influence on affective organisational commitment.

H5: Occupational self-efficacy has a significant positive influence on affective organisational commitment.

H6: Recognition, supervisor support, coworker support, job satisfaction, and occupational self-efficacy jointly explain a significant proportion of variance in affective organisational commitment.

3. Research Methodology

3.1 Research Design

The study adopted a quantitative, cross-sectional, explanatory research design. The design was considered

appropriate because the study aimed to measure employees' perceptions of workplace resources and determine their statistical influence on affective organisational commitment without manipulating organisational conditions. The individual employee constituted the unit of analysis.

The research was conducted among employees working in private banking, insurance, and information technology/information technology-enabled service organisations in Kerala State, India. These service-sector settings were selected because interpersonal relationships, supervisory practices, knowledge-intensive work, employee recognition, and employee retention constitute important organisational concerns within these industries.

Primary data were collected through one structured, self-administered questionnaire. No secondary dataset, organisational record, interview data, or supervisor rating was incorporated into the principal analysis.

Table 1. Research Design and Data Collection Protocol

Element	Specification
Research approach	Quantitative
Research design	Cross-sectional explanatory survey
Unit of analysis	Individual full-time employee
Study setting	Private service-sector organisations in Kerala State, India
Service sectors	Banking, insurance, and IT/ITES
Geographic coverage	Thiruvananthapuram, Ernakulam, Kozhikode, and Thrissur
Data source	Primary employee responses
Data collection method	Structured self-administered questionnaire
Final sample	326 employees
Sampling procedure	Multistage proportionate stratified sampling
Dependent variable	Affective organisational commitment
Independent variables	Recognition, supervisor support, coworker support, job satisfaction, occupational self-efficacy
Control variables	Gender, age, organisational tenure, and service subsector
Response scale	Five-point Likert-type agreement scale
Data-analysis software	IBM SPSS Statistics 26
Statistical significance	$\alpha = .05$, two-tailed
Principal analyses	Descriptive statistics, reliability, Pearson correlation, hierarchical regression, multiple regression, bootstrap confidence intervals, regression diagnostics

3.2 Population, Sampling, and Data Collection

The target population consisted of full-time employees working in selected private banking, insurance, and IT/ITES organisations in Kerala State. Multistage proportionate stratified sampling was used to obtain representation across cities and service subsectors. Organisations were first classified according to location and subsector. Participating organisations were subsequently approached, and eligible employees were selected from available departmental employee lists.

Employees were eligible when they had completed at least six months of employment in their current organisation and were engaged in regular professional, administrative, technical, or customer-service responsibilities. Temporary interns, outsourced personnel without direct organisational employment, and employees on extended leave during the data-collection period were excluded.

Questionnaires were administered during approved workplace periods and through sealed distribution packets. Respondents were informed about the academic purpose of the research, voluntary participation, confidentiality, and anonymous reporting. A total of 354 questionnaires were distributed. Of these, 337 were returned, producing a gross response rate of 95.2%. Eleven questionnaires were excluded because of substantial missing values or patterned responses. The final analytical sample therefore comprised 326 employees.

3.3 Measurement of Variables

Employee recognition was measured through four items assessing the extent to which employees perceived that good performance, contribution, effort, and achievement were acknowledged by the organisation. The scale was conceptually informed by organisational recognition and support literature.

Supervisor support was assessed using four items measuring the availability, concern, feedback, and assistance provided by the immediate supervisor. Coworker support was assessed through four parallel items measuring instrumental and emotional assistance received from colleagues.

Job satisfaction was measured through five global items derived from the conceptual tradition of Brayfield and Rothe (1951). Higher scores reflected more favourable overall evaluation of the job.

Occupational self-efficacy was assessed through six items consistent with the short occupational self-efficacy framework validated by Rigotti et al. (2008). Higher scores represented stronger confidence in dealing successfully with occupational tasks and work-related challenges.

Affective organisational commitment was measured using six items consistent with the affective commitment component developed by Meyer et al. (1993). Higher values represented stronger emotional attachment, identification, and desire to remain associated with the organisation.

3.4 Data Analysis

Data were coded and analysed using IBM SPSS Statistics 26. Initial screening involved missing-value inspection, response-range checks, identification of patterned responses, and examination of composite distributions.

Frequency and percentage analysis described the demographic profile. Means, standard deviations, skewness, and kurtosis were used to describe the principal constructs. Cronbach's alpha assessed internal consistency.

Pearson correlations were calculated to examine bivariate relationships. Multiple regression estimated the unique effect of each workplace resource after simultaneous statistical control of the remaining predictors. Hierarchical regression examined incremental explanatory power after demographic controls. Bootstrap confidence intervals were estimated using 2,000 resamples. Tolerance, variance inflation factor, Durbin-Watson statistics, standardised residuals, and Cook's distance were examined as regression diagnostics.

4. RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

4.1 Respondent Profile

Table 2. Demographic Characteristics of Respondents (N = 326)

Characteristic	Category	n	%
Gender	Male	179	54.9
	Female	147	45.1
Age	21–30 years	91	27.9
	31–40 years	126	38.7
	41–50 years	77	23.6
	51 years and above	32	9.8
Organisational tenure	Less than 3 years	72	22.1
	3–7 years	118	36.2

	8–12 years	79	24.2
	More than 12 years	57	17.5
Service subsector	Banking	118	36.2
	Insurance	86	26.4
	IT/ITES	122	37.4
Education	Bachelor's degree	139	42.6
	Master's degree	156	47.9
	Professional/other	31	9.5

Note. IT/ITES = information technology/information technology-enabled services.

Table 2 shows considerable demographic variation in the sample. Male employees constituted 54.9% of respondents, while female employees represented 45.1%. Employees aged 31–40 years formed the largest age group at 38.7%, followed by employees aged 21–30 years at 27.9%. The distribution indicates substantial representation of early- and middle-career employees.

Organisational tenure was also distributed across categories. Employees with three to seven years of service represented the largest group at 36.2%, while 41.7% had

eight or more years of organisational tenure. Banking and IT/ITES contributed comparable proportions of respondents, while insurance employees accounted for 26.4%. Almost half of the respondents possessed a master's degree. The sample therefore included employees with diverse professional backgrounds and lengths of organisational experience, providing an appropriate basis for examining workplace resources and organisational commitment.

4.2 Descriptive Statistics and Reliability

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics and Reliability of Study Constructs

Construct	Items	M	SD	Skewness	Kurtosis	Cronbach's α
Recognition	4	3.439	1.010	−.380	−.660	.845
Supervisor support	4	3.353	1.023	−.350	−.694	.857
Coworker support	4	3.415	.989	−.379	−.609	.843
Job satisfaction	5	3.494	.993	−.497	−.508	.873
Occupational self-efficacy	6	3.600	.942	−.436	−.552	.894
Affective organisational commitment	6	3.449	.927	−.401	−.351	.886

Note. M = mean; SD = standard deviation

Occupational self-efficacy recorded the highest mean value ($M = 3.600$), suggesting that respondents generally possessed confidence in their ability to manage occupational responsibilities. Job satisfaction also recorded a comparatively favourable mean of 3.494. Supervisor support showed the lowest mean ($M = 3.353$), suggesting relatively greater scope for improvement in managerial assistance and responsiveness.

Affective organisational commitment recorded a mean of 3.449, indicating moderately positive emotional

attachment to the organisation. Standard deviations ranged from .927 to 1.023, demonstrating sufficient variation across respondents.

Cronbach's alpha values ranged from .843 to .894 and therefore exceeded the commonly accepted .70 threshold. Occupational self-efficacy demonstrated the highest reliability coefficient, followed by affective organisational commitment. The results confirmed satisfactory internal consistency of the study measures and supported use of composite construct scores in subsequent statistical analyses.

4.3 Measurement Adequacy

Table 4. Measurement and Common-Method Diagnostics

Indicator	Result
Total measurement items	29
Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin statistic	.926
Bartlett’s test	$\chi^2(406) = 4,853.84, p < .001$
Components with eigenvalues >1	6
Variance explained by first unrotated component	33.72%
Intended constructs	6
Cronbach’s alpha range	.843–.894

Note. The first unrotated component was examined as a preliminary common-method diagnostic.

The KMO value of .926 demonstrated excellent sampling adequacy for assessment of the item correlation structure. Bartlett’s test of sphericity was statistically significant, $\chi^2(406) = 4,853.84, p < .001$, confirming that inter-item correlations were sufficiently strong for construct-level analysis.

Six components produced eigenvalues greater than one, corresponding with the six principal constructs in the study. The first unrotated component explained 33.72% of total variance. No single factor therefore accounted for the majority of item variance. This result reduced concern that

the observed relationships were dominated by one general response tendency.

The combination of high internal reliability, adequate factorability, and the six-component pattern provided sufficient empirical support for proceeding with composite-variable analysis. Nevertheless, the results were interpreted together with the theoretical distinction among recognition, supervisor support, coworker support, job satisfaction, self-efficacy, and affective organisational commitment.

4.4 Correlation Analysis

Table 5. Correlations among Study Variables

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Recognition	1.000					
2. Supervisor support	.351***	1.000				
3. Coworker support	.353***	.339***	1.000			
4. Job satisfaction	.392***	.441***	.355***	1.000		
5. Occupational self-efficacy	.302***	.337***	.309***	.332***	1.000	
6. Affective organisational commitment	.473***	.482***	.484***	.587***	.466***	1.000

Note. *** $p < .001$, two-tailed.

All five predictor variables were positively and significantly correlated with affective organisational commitment. Job satisfaction demonstrated the strongest bivariate relationship with commitment, $r = .587, p < .001$. This indicates that employees reporting favourable job evaluations were also considerably more likely to report stronger emotional attachment to their organisation.

Coworker support and supervisor support were similarly associated with affective commitment at $r = .484$ and $r = .482$, respectively. Recognition also demonstrated a substantial positive relationship, $r = .473$, while

occupational self-efficacy correlated with commitment at $r = .466$.

Correlations among predictors ranged between .302 and .441. These relationships demonstrate that the workplace resources were related but not redundant. The moderate intercorrelations justified simultaneous regression analysis because each construct represented a distinguishable aspect of employees’ workplace experience or psychological resources.

4.5 Overall Regression Model

Table 6. Multiple Regression Model Summary

Indicator	Value
R	.726
R ²	.527
Adjusted R ²	.519
Standard error of estimate	.643
F	71.20
df	5, 320
p	< .001

Note. Dependent variable = affective organisational commitment.

The multiple regression model was statistically significant, $F(5, 320) = 71.20$, $p < .001$. The multiple

correlation coefficient was .726, demonstrating a strong relationship between the combined workplace-resource predictors and affective organisational commitment.

The model explained 52.7% of the variance in affective organisational commitment. The adjusted R² remained high at .519, indicating that model performance remained stable after accounting for the number of predictors.

The results therefore provide strong support for H6. Recognition, supervisor support, coworker support, job satisfaction, and occupational self-efficacy collectively explained a substantial proportion of employees' emotional attachment to the organisation.

The remaining 47.3% of variance may be associated with other factors including leadership style, distributive and procedural justice, career opportunities, compensation, organisational culture, meaningful work, work-life balance, and personality characteristics.

4.6 Individual Predictor Effects

Table 7. Regression Coefficients Predicting Affective Organisational Commitment

Predictor	B	SE	β	t	p	95% CI	Decision
Recognition	.151	.041	.165	3.73	< .001	[.071, .231]	H1 supported
Supervisor support	.135	.041	.149	3.29	.001	[.054, .215]	H2 supported
Coworker support	.188	.041	.201	4.60	< .001	[.108, .269]	H3 supported
Job satisfaction	.298	.043	.319	6.96	< .001	[.214, .383]	H4 supported
Occupational self-efficacy	.196	.042	.199	4.64	< .001	[.113, .279]	H5 supported

Note. B = unstandardised regression coefficient; β = standardised coefficient.

All five predictors independently contributed significantly to affective organisational commitment. Job satisfaction emerged as the strongest predictor, $\beta = .319$, $p < .001$. Employees who evaluated their jobs more positively therefore demonstrated stronger emotional attachment to their organisation even after other resources were statistically controlled.

Coworker support was the second strongest predictor, $\beta = .201$, followed closely by occupational self-efficacy, $\beta = .199$. Recognition also contributed significantly, $\beta = .165$,

while supervisor support demonstrated the smallest but still statistically meaningful unique effect, $\beta = .149$.

The results supported H1, H2, H3, H4, and H5. Importantly, each predictor retained significance in the simultaneous model. Recognition therefore contributed beyond supervisor support and satisfaction, while coworker support remained influential even after formal supervisory support was considered. The results support a multidimensional explanation of affective organisational commitment.

4.7 Incremental Explanatory Power

Table 8. Hierarchical Regression Analysis

Model	Variables entered	R ²	Adjusted R ²	ΔR^2	F Change	p
1	Gender, age, tenure, service subsector	.015	-.001	.015	—	.440
2	Model 1 + recognition + supervisor support + coworker support	.415	.400	.400	72.20	< .001
3	Model 2 + job satisfaction + occupational self-efficacy	.529	.514	.114	38.28	< .001

Note. ΔR^2 = incremental change in explained variance

Demographic and occupational control variables explained only 1.5% of variance and did not produce a significant first-step model. Employee gender, age, tenure, and service subsector therefore contributed relatively little to affective commitment when considered collectively.

The addition of recognition, supervisor support, and coworker support increased R^2 from .015 to .415. These organisational and relational resources therefore added 40.0 percentage points of explanatory power, $F_{change} = 72.20$, $p < .001$.

Job satisfaction and occupational self-efficacy further increased R^2 to .529, contributing an additional 11.4 percentage points after organisational and interpersonal resources had already been considered.

The results demonstrate that employees' emotional attachment is more strongly explained by their workplace experiences and psychological resources than by demographic characteristics. They also show that attitudinal and personal resources provide additional explanatory value beyond organisational treatment.

4.8 Bootstrap Robustness Analysis

Table 9. Bootstrap Confidence Intervals for Regression Coefficients

Predictor	B	Bootstrap SE	LLCI	ULCI
Recognition	.151	.044	.066	.239
Supervisor support	.135	.046	.042	.224
Coworker support	.188	.043	.107	.270
Job satisfaction	.298	.043	.212	.381
Occupational self-efficacy	.196	.045	.108	.284

Note. Bootstrap results were based on 2,000 resamples. LLCI = lower-limit confidence interval; ULCI = upper-limit confidence interval.

Bootstrap confidence intervals for all five predictors remained entirely above zero. This finding supports the stability of the positive regression relationships observed in the principal model.

Job satisfaction retained the largest coefficient and a comparatively narrow confidence interval. Coworker support and occupational self-efficacy also showed stable positive estimates. Recognition remained significant with a lower confidence boundary of .066, while supervisor support retained a positive lower boundary of .042.

The bootstrap analysis therefore provided additional confirmation that the significant predictor effects were not dependent exclusively on conventional standard-error assumptions. The results reinforce the conclusion that

each workplace resource independently contributes to affective organisational commitment.

4.9 Regression Diagnostics

Table 10. Regression Diagnostics

Predictor	Tolerance	VIF
Recognition	.759	1.318
Supervisor support	.725	1.380
Coworker support	.778	1.285
Job satisfaction	.702	1.423
Occupational self-efficacy	.806	1.241
Model Diagnostic		Value
Durbin–Watson		1.975
Minimum standardised residual		−2.753
Maximum standardised residual		3.272
Maximum Cook's distance		.048

Note. VIF = variance inflation factor.

Multicollinearity was not problematic because all VIF values remained substantially below commonly used thresholds and tolerance values remained high. Job satisfaction produced the highest VIF at 1.423, which remained well within acceptable limits.

The Durbin–Watson statistic of 1.975 was close to 2.00 and therefore indicated no meaningful residual autocorrelation. Standardised residuals were generally contained within approximately three standard deviations. Cook's distance reached a maximum of .048, indicating that no individual observation exercised excessive influence over the regression estimates.

These diagnostic findings support the statistical adequacy of the multiple regression model and strengthen confidence in the interpretation of individual predictor coefficients.

4.10 Relative Importance of Workplace Resources

Table 11. Relative Importance of Predictors

Rank	Predictor	Standardised β	Unique ΔR^2
1	Job satisfaction	.319	.072
2	Coworker support	.201	.031
3	Occupational self-efficacy	.199	.032
4	Recognition	.165	.021
5	Supervisor support	.149	.016

Note. Unique ΔR^2 represents the reduction in model R^2 when the predictor was removed while all other variables were retained.

Job satisfaction emerged as the most influential predictor and uniquely explained approximately 7.2% of variance in affective commitment after the remaining predictors were retained in the model.

Coworker support and occupational self-efficacy made similar independent contributions. This result is theoretically important because it demonstrates that an interpersonal workplace resource and a personal psychological resource can provide comparable explanatory value.

Recognition uniquely explained approximately 2.1% of the variance, confirming that organisational acknowledgement contributes to emotional attachment independently of satisfaction and social support.

Supervisor support demonstrated the smallest unique contribution, although its coefficient remained significant. Part of the association between supervisor support and commitment was therefore shared with broader satisfaction and other favourable workplace experiences.

The ranking supports a portfolio approach to commitment management rather than reliance on any single HR practice.

4.11 Hypothesis Decisions

Table 12. Summary of Hypothesis Testing

Hypothesis	Statistical Evidence	Decision
H1: Recognition → affective commitment	$\beta = .165, p < .001$	Supported
H2: Supervisor support → affective commitment	$\beta = .149, p = .001$	Supported
H3: Coworker support → affective commitment	$\beta = .201, p < .001$	Supported
H4: Job satisfaction → affective commitment	$\beta = .319, p < .001$	Supported
H5: Self-efficacy → affective commitment	$\beta = .199, p < .001$	Supported
H6: Combined workplace-resource model	$R^2 = .527, F(5, 320) = 71.20, p < .001$	Supported

The hypothesis-testing results demonstrate consistent support for the proposed research model. Recognition, supervisor support, coworker support, job satisfaction, and occupational self-efficacy were each significant predictors of affective organisational commitment.

The findings also reveal differences in the magnitude of predictor effects. Job satisfaction showed the strongest independent contribution, while coworker support and

occupational self-efficacy produced intermediate effects. Recognition and supervisor support produced smaller but still statistically significant contributions.

The simultaneous significance of all five predictors supports the argument that affective commitment develops from multiple dimensions of employees' organisational experience rather than from one dominant workplace factor.

5. Discussion and Policy Implications

The findings demonstrate that workplace resources have a substantial influence on affective organisational commitment. Recognition, supervisor support, coworker support, job satisfaction, and occupational self-efficacy were all positively and significantly related to employees' emotional attachment to their organisation. Collectively, these variables explained 52.7% of the variance in affective commitment. Job satisfaction emerged as the strongest predictor, while coworker support and occupational self-efficacy made similar intermediate contributions. Recognition and supervisor support also retained statistically significant independent effects. These findings provide empirical support for all six research hypotheses and reinforce the multidimensional nature of organisational commitment.

The strong influence of job satisfaction is consistent with previous organisational commitment research. Meyer et al. (2002) found substantial associations between affective commitment and favourable job attitudes while demonstrating that satisfaction and commitment remain conceptually distinct. Chordiya et al. (2017) similarly identified a significant positive relationship between job satisfaction and affective commitment in both Indian and American public-sector contexts. The present findings extend this evidence by demonstrating that job satisfaction remained the strongest predictor after recognition, two sources of social support, and occupational self-efficacy were controlled. This suggests that employees' broader evaluation of their job represents a particularly important foundation for emotional attachment to the organisation.

The recognition results support organisational support and social exchange explanations of affective commitment. Recognition communicates that employee effort and achievement are noticed and valued. Rhoades et al. (2001) found that organisational rewards and favourable workplace experiences contribute to affective commitment partly because employees interpret them as indicators of organisational support. Cicekli and Kabasakal (2017) similarly reported that recognition opportunities predicted organisational commitment among white-collar employees. The present results demonstrate that recognition retained an independent effect even after satisfaction and support were statistically controlled. Recognition should therefore not be interpreted merely as an indirect component of employee satisfaction. It functions as an independent organisational signal concerning employee value and reciprocity.

The findings concerning social support provide further insight into workplace relationships. Supervisor support and coworker support both contributed significantly to

affective commitment. This broadly supports Ng and Sorensen (2008), who found positive relationships between both forms of support and employee work attitudes. However, coworker support produced a somewhat stronger unique effect than supervisor support in the present study. This pattern may reflect the nature of service-sector work, where employees regularly depend on colleagues for information, problem solving, coordination, customer handling, emotional reassurance, and assistance during workload fluctuations.

Rousseau and Aubé (2010) similarly demonstrated additive effects of supervisor and coworker support on affective commitment. Their research showed that different support sources contribute simultaneously rather than substituting for each other. The current findings reinforce this distinction. Supervisor support reflects employees' relationship with formal authority and management, whereas coworker support represents everyday peer interaction. Employees therefore appear to form affective commitment through both vertical and horizontal workplace relationships.

Occupational self-efficacy also made an important contribution. Employees reporting greater confidence in their occupational capabilities demonstrated stronger affective organisational commitment even after organisational resources were controlled. This finding is consistent with Schyns and von Collani (2002), who found that occupational self-efficacy was positively associated with job satisfaction and organisational variables. It also supports van Vuuren et al. (2008), who demonstrated that efficacy expectations contribute to different organisational commitment dimensions.

The self-efficacy result suggests that affective commitment depends not only on how the organisation treats employees but also on whether employees perceive themselves as capable of succeeding within the occupational environment. Employees who experience repeated mastery and confidence may develop a stronger sense of fit, effectiveness, and professional identity within their organisation. However, the results also demonstrate that self-efficacy does not replace organisational responsibility. Even confident employees remained responsive to recognition, social support, and job satisfaction.

The findings have important implications for human resource policy. Organisations should avoid treating employee commitment as an outcome of isolated engagement activities. Instead, affective commitment should be managed through an integrated workplace-resource framework. Recognition systems should be systematic, timely, transparent, and linked with meaningful employee contributions. Recognition need not always involve financial rewards. Verbal acknowledgement, public appreciation, developmental opportunities, peer recognition, and formal performance appreciation can all communicate organisational valuation.

Recognition practices should also include less visible employee contributions. Collaborative assistance, mentoring, knowledge sharing, problem resolution, customer recovery, process improvement, and emotional

labour can remain unnoticed when organisations focus only on highly measurable outcomes. Broader recognition criteria can therefore increase perceived fairness while reinforcing behaviours that contribute to organisational functioning.

Supervisor-support policy should focus on everyday managerial behaviour. Supervisors should receive training in constructive feedback, developmental coaching, workload discussion, conflict resolution, listening, employee voice, and psychological support. Eisenberger et al. (2002) demonstrated that supervisors can be interpreted as organisational representatives. Consequently, employees may generalise supportive or unsupportive managerial behaviour to the organisation as a whole.

Organisations should therefore include employee-support indicators in managerial performance assessment. Regular one-to-one meetings, workload reviews, developmental discussions, and transparent escalation systems can provide structural mechanisms through which supervisory support becomes consistent rather than dependent solely on individual managerial personality.

Coworker support should also become an explicit component of organisational policy. HR systems often concentrate heavily on leadership while assuming that peer relationships develop naturally. The present results suggest that this assumption may underestimate an important source of commitment. Team onboarding, peer mentoring, cross-functional collaboration, knowledge-sharing forums, collaborative performance objectives, and psychologically safe team practices can strengthen horizontal support.

The strong contribution of job satisfaction indicates that commitment cannot be sustained through recognition and supportive communication if fundamental job conditions remain unfavourable. Organisations should therefore monitor workload, autonomy, role clarity, career development, fairness, compensation, work-life compatibility, and opportunities to use skills. Employee surveys should measure these dimensions independently rather than combining satisfaction, engagement, and commitment into one broad employee-experience score.

Occupational self-efficacy findings support greater investment in learning and development. Employees should receive opportunities for training, structured feedback, mentoring, developmental assignments, and progressive responsibility. Mastery experiences can strengthen occupational confidence and may indirectly support both job satisfaction and organisational attachment.

The theoretical contribution of the study lies in demonstrating that organisational, interpersonal, attitudinal, and personal resources simultaneously explain affective commitment. The Job Demands-Resources model suggests that resources facilitate motivation and development, while organisational support theory explains how employees interpret favourable organisational treatment. Social exchange theory further suggests that valued treatment creates reciprocal positive attitudes toward the organisation. The present findings

demonstrate that these explanations are complementary rather than competing.

The hierarchical results further indicate that demographic characteristics provide relatively little explanatory value once workplace experiences are included. This finding has practical importance because commitment interventions should not be based primarily on broad demographic assumptions. Employees of different ages, genders, and tenure levels may develop strong commitment when workplace resources are favourable. Organisational policies should therefore concentrate on changeable features of the employment environment.

Several limitations should be considered when interpreting the findings. The cross-sectional design limits causal interpretation because predictor and outcome variables were measured during the same period. Although regression identifies statistically significant influence within the proposed explanatory model, longitudinal research would provide stronger evidence concerning temporal ordering. The use of self-report measures may also create common-method and social-desirability effects, although the measurement diagnostics did not indicate dominance by a single common factor.

The sample was restricted to private service-sector organisations in Kerala State. Generalisation to manufacturing, public administration, healthcare, education, and other regional contexts should therefore be undertaken cautiously. Employees were also nested within different organisations, whereas the principal regression model treated observations at the employee level. Organisation-level leadership, HR systems, and culture may explain additional variance.

Future research should therefore use longitudinal and multilevel designs. Structural equation modelling could examine whether job satisfaction mediates relationships between recognition, social support, and affective commitment. Self-efficacy may also function as a moderator by strengthening employees' ability to use available workplace resources. Future studies could distinguish formal from informal recognition, emotional from instrumental coworker support, and developmental from socioemotional supervisor support.

The model should also be replicated across other sectors and regions. Such replication would determine whether job satisfaction consistently remains the strongest predictor or whether recognition and social support assume greater importance under different employment conditions. Combining survey responses with supervisor evaluations, retention records, absenteeism, or actual turnover data would provide additional evidence regarding the behavioural consequences of affective organisational commitment.

6. CONCLUSION

The study examined the influence of recognition, supervisor support, coworker support, job satisfaction, and occupational self-efficacy on affective organisational commitment among private service-sector employees. The findings demonstrated that all five variables contributed positively and significantly to employees'

emotional attachment to their organisation.

Job satisfaction emerged as the strongest predictor, followed by coworker support, occupational self-efficacy, recognition, and supervisor support. Collectively, the workplace-resource model explained more than half of the variance in affective organisational commitment. The results therefore demonstrate that emotional organisational attachment develops through a combination of favourable job evaluation, supportive workplace relationships, organisational acknowledgement, and confidence in occupational capability.

The findings support a portfolio-based approach to employee commitment. Organisations should improve the fundamental quality of employees' work while simultaneously strengthening recognition, supervisory support, peer cooperation, and opportunities for professional mastery. From a theoretical perspective, the findings integrate job-resource, organisational-support, social-exchange, and personal-resource explanations of commitment. From a managerial perspective, they demonstrate that employees become more emotionally committed when they experience their organisation as supportive, satisfying, appreciative, and conducive to professional success..

REFERENCES

1. Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63(1), 1–18. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8325.1990.tb00506.x>
2. Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The Job Demands–Resources model: State of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22(3), 309–328. <http://doi.org/10.1108/02683940710733115>
3. Bradler, C., Dur, R., Neckermann, S., & Non, A. (2016). Employee recognition and performance: A field experiment. *Management Science*, 62(11), 3085–3099. <http://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.2015.2291>
4. Brayfield, A. H., & Rothe, H. F. (1951). An index of job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 35(5), 307–311. <http://doi.org/10.1037/h0055617>
5. Brunetto, Y., Shriberg, A., Farr-Wharton, R., Shacklock, K., Newman, S., & Dienger, J. (2013). The importance of supervisor–nurse relationships, teamwork, wellbeing, affective commitment and retention of North American nurses. *Journal of Nursing Management*, 21(6), 827–837. <http://doi.org/10.1111/jonm.12111>
6. Brunetto, Y., Xerri, M., Shriberg, A., Farr-Wharton, R., Shacklock, K., Newman, S., & Dienger, J. (2013). The impact of workplace relationships on engagement, well-being, commitment and turnover for nurses in Australia and the USA. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 69(12), 2786–2799. <http://doi.org/10.1111/jan.12165>
7. Chordiya, R., Sabharwal, M., & Goodman, D. (2017). Affective organizational commitment and job satisfaction: A cross-national comparative study. *Public*

- How to cite : Lovely Joseph Pullokan, Dr. (Fr.) Paulachan K. Joseph , Influence of Workplace Resources on Affective Organisational Commitment: An Empirical Study of Recognition, Social Support, Job Satisfaction, and Self-Efficacy. *Advances in Consumer Research*. 2026;3(10): 9-22
- Administration, 95(1), 178–195. <http://doi.org/10.1111/padm.12306>
8. Cicekli, E., & Kabasakal, H. (2017). The opportunity model of organizational commitment: Evidence from white-collar employees in Turkey. *International Journal of Manpower*, 38(2), 259–273. <http://doi.org/10.1108/IJM-06-2015-0086>
 9. Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(3), 500–507. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.71.3.500>
 10. Eisenberger, R., Stinglhamber, F., Vandenberghe, C., Sucharski, I. L., & Rhoades, L. (2002). Perceived supervisor support: Contributions to perceived organizational support and employee retention. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(3), 565–573. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.3.565>
 11. Joe, S.-W. (2010). Assessing job self-efficacy and organizational commitment considering a mediating role of information asymmetry. *The Social Science Journal*, 47(3), 541–559. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.soscij.2010.01.011>
 12. Kurtessis, J. N., Eisenberger, R., Ford, M. T., Buffardi, L. C., Stewart, K. A., & Adis, C. S. (2017). Perceived organizational support: A meta-analytic evaluation of organizational support theory. *Journal of Management*, 43(6), 1854–1884. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0149206315575554>
 13. Meyer, J. P., Allen, N. J., & Smith, C. A. (1993). Commitment to organizations and occupations: Extension and test of a three-component conceptualization. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78(4), 538–551. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.78.4.538>
 14. 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(1), 20–52. <http://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.2001.1842>
 15. Ng, T. W. H., & Sorensen, K. L. (2008). Toward a further understanding of the relationships between perceptions of support and work attitudes: A meta-analysis. *Group & Organization Management*, 33(3), 243–268. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1059601107313307>
 16. Orgambidez, A., & Almeida, H. (2020). Supervisor support and affective organizational commitment: The mediator role of work engagement. *Western Journal of Nursing Research*, 42(3), 187–193. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0193945919852426>
 17. Rhoades, L., & Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived organizational support: A review of the literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(4), 698–714. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.4.698>
 18. Rhoades, L., Eisenberger, R., & Armeli, S. (2001). Affective commitment to the organization: The contribution of perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(5), 825–836. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.5.825>
 19. Rigotti, T., Schyns, B., & Mohr, G. (2008). A short version of the occupational self-efficacy scale: Structural and construct validity across five countries. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 16(2), 238–255. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1069072707305763>
 20. Rousseau, V., & Aubé, C. (2010). Social support at work and affective commitment to the organization: The moderating effect of job resource adequacy and ambient conditions. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 150(4), 321–340. <http://doi.org/10.1080/00224540903365380>
 21. Schyns, B., & von Collani, G. (2002). A new occupational self-efficacy scale and its relation to personality constructs and organizational variables. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 11(2), 219–241. <http://doi.org/10.1080/13594320244000148>
 22. van Vuuren, M., de Jong, M. D. T., & Seydel, E. R. (2008). Contributions of self and organisational efficacy expectations to commitment: A fourfold typology. *Employee Relations*, 30(2), 142–155. <http://doi.org/10.1108/01425450810843339>
- ...
- .