

Impact On Affective Commitment Among HRM Professionals in the IT Sector

Ms. Shaba Amrin¹, Dr. M. D Ramyasri², Prof.Dr.P. Jegadeesan³

¹Ph.D. Research Scholar, Department of Commerce, VISTAS, Chennai – 600117.

²Assistant Professor, Department of Commerce, VISTAS, Pallavaram, Chennai- 600117.

³Professor and Head, Department of Commerce (General), VELS Institute of Science, Technology and Advanced Studies, Chennai-117.

Email ID: jagadeesansuba@gmail.com

Cite this paper as: Ms. Shaba Amrin, Dr. M. D Ramyasri, Prof.Dr.P. Jegadeesan, (2025) Impact On Affective Commitment Among HRM Professionals in the IT Sector. *Journal of Neonatal Surgery*, 14 (12s), 1124-1132.

ABSTRACT

In today's competitive and dynamic business environment, fostering employee commitment has become a strategic priority for organizations, especially in the Information Technology (IT) sector, which is characterized by high attrition rates and fast-paced change. This study explores the impact of various organizational and personal factors on affective commitment among Human Resource Management (HRM) professionals within the IT industry. Affective commitment, defined as the emotional attachment of employees to their organization, plays a critical role in influencing job satisfaction, retention, and organizational performance.

The study adopts a quantitative research methodology, utilizing a structured questionnaire based on the Meyer and Allen three-component model of commitment. The survey was conducted among 250 HR professionals working in mid-sized and large IT companies in India. Statistical tools such as correlation and regression analysis were used to examine the relationships between affective commitment and factors such as job satisfaction, perceived organizational support, leadership style, career growth opportunities, and work-life balance. Findings indicate that perceived organizational support and job satisfaction have the most significant positive influence on affective commitment. Leadership quality and career advancement opportunities also emerged as strong predictors. Interestingly, work-life balance showed a moderate impact, reflecting the complex nature of HR responsibilities in a 24/7 industry like IT.

Keywords: *Affective Commitment, HRM Professionals, IT Sector, Job Satisfaction, Organizational Support.*

1. 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

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

2. 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. Organizational Climate Factor (OCF),
 - b. Job Nature Factor (JNF),
2. **Organizational Commitment (OC)**
 - a. Recognition Factor (RF),
 - b. Engagement Factor (EF),
3. **Organization Citizenship Behavior (OCB)**
 - a. Directing Factor (DF),
 - b. Helping Factor (HF),
 - c. Adopting Factor (AF).

INFLUENCE OF PERSONAL PROFILES OF THE RESPONDENTS ON AND 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.

TABLE 1

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		R²= 0.381 Adjusted R²= 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

Table 3

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 that 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.

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	494.437	30.165
Residual	Residual	4819.004	294	16.391	
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

Recruitment Factor (RF)	0.283	0.128	0.120	2.218	0.027
Recognition 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 6 to 7 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 RESPONDENTS AND 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 Organizational 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	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized 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
Recruitment 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 12

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

Effect	Value	F	Hypothesis 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 Factor (RF)	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
	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.

3. CONCLUSION

The study on the *impact on affective commitment among HRM professionals in the IT sector* has revealed significant insights

into the emotional and psychological bonds that HR professionals develop with their organizations. Affective commitment, which denotes the degree of emotional attachment and identification an employee feels toward their organization, is especially important in the IT sector, where high turnover rates, job-related stress, and intense competition are prevalent.

The research findings clearly establish that perceived organizational support, job satisfaction, and career growth opportunities are the most influential factors contributing to affective commitment among HRM professionals. HR employees who feel valued, recognized, and supported by their organizations are more likely to exhibit strong emotional commitment and a desire to stay. The study also finds that leadership style, particularly transformational leadership, plays a crucial role in fostering a sense of belonging and motivation. Leaders who are approachable, visionary, and supportive positively influence the affective bond employee's form with the organization.

Although work-life balance emerged as a moderate factor, its impact cannot be overlooked, especially in the context of the demanding work schedules common in IT organizations. HR professionals often bear the dual burden of meeting organizational goals and addressing employee welfare, making their own affective engagement a cornerstone for broader organizational success. Furthermore, the study indicates that fostering affective commitment leads to numerous organizational benefits such as lower turnover intention, enhanced job performance, and improved morale. Given the strategic role HR professionals play in managing talent, designing policies, and maintaining organizational culture, their own commitment to the organization becomes a driving force behind effective human capital management.

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.
- [2] Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1997). *Commitment in the Workplace: Theory, Research, and Application*. Sage Publications.
- [3] Mowday, R. T., Steers, R. M., & Porter, L. W. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 14(2), 224–247.
- [4] Mathieu, J. E., & Zajac, D. M. (1990). A review and meta-analysis of the antecedents, correlates, and consequences of organizational commitment. *Psychological Bulletin*, 108(2), 171–194.
- [5] Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2019). *Organizational Behavior* (18th ed.). Pearson Education.
- [6] Kumar, D., & Jauhari, H. (2016). Impact of Human Resource Management Practices on Organizational Commitment. *Global Business Review*, 17(3), 665–679.
- [7] Rhoades, L., & Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived organizational support: A review of the literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(4), 698–714.
- [8] Saks, A. M. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21(7), 600–619.
- [9] Tansky, J. W., & Cohen, D. J. (2001). The relationship between organizational support, employee development, and organizational commitment. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 12(3), 285–300.
- [10] Cropanzano, R., & Mitchell, M. S. (2005). Social exchange theory: An interdisciplinary review. *Journal of Management*, 31(6), 874–900.
- [11] Aryee, S., Budhwar, P. S., & Chen, Z. X. (2002). Trust as a mediator of the relationship between organizational justice and work outcomes. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23(3), 267–285.
- [12] Singh, P. (2018). *Strategic Human Resource Management in India: Emerging Trends and Issues*. Springer.
- [13] Dessler, G. (2020). *Human Resource Management* (16th ed.). Pearson.
- [14] Srivastava, A. K., & Dhar, R. L. (2011). Impact of leader–member exchange, human resource management practices, and psychological empowerment on employee performance. *Journal of Indian Business Research*, 3(4), 251–269.
- [15] Ghosh, P., Rai, A., & Sinha, A. (2016). Organizational justice and employee engagement. *Personnel Review*, 45(6), 1216–1231.
- [16] Mohapatra, M., & Srivastava, A. K. (2003). Affective and continuance commitment among the employees of public sector and private sector organizations. *Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology*, 29(1–2), 97–102.
- [17] Chhabra, T. N. (2022). *Human Resource Management: Concepts and Issues*. Dhanpat Rai & Co.
- [18] Narayan, B. (2020). Work-life balance and its impact on employee performance in IT sector. *International Journal of Management*, 11(6), 34–40.
- [19] NASSCOM (2024). *Indian IT Industry Report 2023–24*. Retrieved from <https://nasscom.in>
- [20] Kumar, R. (2020). *Research Methodology: A Step-by-Step Guide for Beginners* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.