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Abstract
The article analyses current research trends on job satisfaction, organizational commitment and positive psychological capital. It also presents some results of the study on the mentioned constructs that were surveyed in various Lithuanian organizations (n=92). The subjects of the study were 44 (47.83 %) men and 48 (52.17 %) women. The methodology used in this survey: to assess personal job satisfaction (Job Satisfaction Survey, Spector, 1985), organizational commitment (Organizational Commitment Questionnaire, Mowday et al., 2000) and positive psychological capital (Psychological Capital Questionnaire, Luthans et al., 2007). It was found that job satisfaction, organizational commitment and positive psychological capital are related constructs. The study also showed statistically significant differences between these constructs and some socio-demographic characteristics. The data of this study revealed that salary is still one of the major motivational factors in Lithuania. The article also discusses what additional studies are essential for further development of research base on organizational and management effectiveness.
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1. Introduction
Organizational effectiveness is one of the continuous goals and intermediate outcomes of professional management. For many decades researchers have been exploring the factors contributing to organizational effectiveness, but the results varied across the different cultures and economic systems (Suki, 2011). Recent research has revealed universal constructs that can be applied to any given organizational context. This implies employees’ job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Garg and Rastogi, 2009; Kumar and Giri, 2009; Narimawati, 2007; Tayyab, 2006; Meyer et al., 2008). A lot of studies have demonstrated that fully committed employees lead to organizational success and thriving in today's dynamic organizational contexts (Yucel, 2012; Lumley, 2011; Suki, 2011). Moreover, a specific construct of psychological capital was introduced to forecast the results of management in a certain group (Luthans, 2007).
Although the importance of well being at work has been given attention through the years, only recently it has been proposed as a new lens to focus study on organizational behavior (Luthans & Youssef, 2007; Luthans, Youssef, & Avolio, 2007; Nelson & Cooper, 2007), and these new trends are discussed in this article. The article also presents the results of research which aimed to study the relationship between organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and positive psychological capital in Lithuanian organizations (n=92).

2. **Research on Positive Organizational Behavior**

Right around the turn of the last century, the field of organizational behavior, rather than centering on errors in management, began to place greater importance on analysis what was correct with managers and employees as well as what contributes to human and organizational flourishing (Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000; Sheldon & King, 2001; Snyder & Lopez, 2002). The positive focus extended to the workplace by focusing on both the value of micro-oriented positivity in individuals as well as macro-oriented positivity in organizations (Luthans, 2002a, 2002b; Luthans, Youssef, & Avolio, 2007; Nelson & Cooper, 2007; Wright, 2003; Cameron & Caza, 2004; Cameron, Dutton, & Quinn, 2003; Roberts, 2006; Spreitzer & Sonenshein, 2004). Positive organizational behavior for the first time was defined as "the study and application of positively oriented human resource strengths and psychological capacities that can be measured, developed, and effectively managed for performance improvement in today’s workplace" (Luthans, 2002). Positive resources such as hope or resilience, some time ago considered to be “a quality of gifted individuals” (Garmezy, 1974), now got empirical support that they could be developed (Masten & Reed, 2002; Snyder, 2000) as well as other faculties universally recognized in the field of organizational behavior, such as efficacy (Bandura, 1997; Stajkovic & Luthans, 1998) and optimism (Seligman, 1998).

3. **Research On Psychological Capital (PsyCap) and Related Constructs**

The author of psychological capital (PsyCap) construct is Fred Luthans (born in 1939). He is University and George Holmes Distinguished Professor of Management at the University of Nebraska, U.S.A. The former President of the Academy of Management, he received the Academy’s Distinguished Educator Award. F. Luthans currently is an editor of *Journal of World Business, Organizational Dynamics, and Journal of Leadership and Organization Studies*. He is the author of several well-known books and numerous research articles on positive organizational behavior and psychological capital. His textbook *Organizational Behavior* is now in its 12th edition (McGraw Hills, 2012) and his latest book is *Psychological Capital* (Oxford University Press, 2007). His investigations in recent years have been focused on the theory construction, measurement, and performance impact of this positive approach. F. Luthans conceptualize Psychological capital as an individual's positive state of development that is characterized by: (1) having confidence (self-efficacy) to take on and put in the necessary effort to succeed at challenging tasks; (2) making a positive attribution (optimism) about succeeding now and in the future; (3) persevering toward goals and, when necessary, redirecting paths to goals (hope) in order to succeed; and (4) when beset by problems and adversity, sustaining and bouncing back and even beyond (resiliency) to attain success (Luthans, Youssef, et al., 2007, p. 3).

Psychological capital is seen as a resource that goes beyond human capital (experience, knowledge, skills and abilities) and social capital (relationships, networks). It deals with “who you are here and now”, and “who you can become” in the proximal future if your resources are developed and nurtured in the workplace (Luthans, Youssef, & Luthans, 2004). In terms of measurement, a valid and reliable PsyCap questionnaire has been developed (Luthans, Youssef et al., 2007) and empirically validated (Luthans, Avolio et al., 2007). The items used in it were originally drawn from published validated scales. These individual scales have also been used in previous studies in the workplace (e.g., Peterson & Luthans, 2003, Luthans et al., 2005; Youssef & Luthans, 2007). Six items in this questionnaire represent each of the four components that make up PsyCap: (1.) Hope (Snyder et al., 1996); (2.) Resilience (Wagnild & Young, 1993); (3.) Optimism (Scheier & Carver, 1985); and (4.) Efficacy (Parker, 1998).

A growing number of studies have clearly demonstrated that it has impact on desired outcomes in the workplace. For example, in one major study, PsyCap was shown to be positively related to employee satisfaction (Luthans, Avolio, et al., 2007). There is also increasing evidence that PsyCap is significantly related to desired employee behaviors (and negatively to undesired behaviors), attitudes (e.g., satisfaction and commitment), and performance (Luthans, Avolio et al., 2007).
Research studies evidently demonstrate the impact that PsyCap may have on satisfaction and/or commitment (Larson & Luthans, 2006; Luthans, Avolio et al., 2007; Luthans, Norman et al., 2008; Youssef & Luthans, 2007) and absenteeism (Avey, Patera, & West, 2006). Although PsyCap predominately focuses on positivity at the individual level, expanding research has also demonstrated positive relations between collective PsyCap and team performance (Clapp-Smith, Vogelgesang, & Avey, 2009; Peterson & Zhang, 2011; Walumbwa, Luthans, Avey, & Oke, 2011). A recent meta-analysis has provided further evidence of significant, positive relationships between PsyCap and job satisfaction, organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behaviors and job performance and negative relationships with turnover intent, cynicism, job stress and deviance (Avey, Reichard, Luthans, & Mhatre, 2011). However, some studies indicate there might be cultural differences in importance of various constructs contributing to organizational efficiency. Therefore, a study was conducted to evaluate the relationship between organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and positive psychological capital in Lithuanian organizations. Based on the theory building and research to date on psychological capital and the related constructs we have hypothesized that there would be statistically significant relationship between constructs of organizational commitment, job satisfaction and psychological capital in Lithuanian organizations, however, the results may vary depending on respondents’ socio- demographic characteristics.

4. Methods
This study used a test design utilizing a heterogeneous random sample of 92 working adults representing a wide cross-section of Lithuanian organizations including service and government. Participants were sent an e-mail by the researchers or asked to participate in the study via website www.apklausos.lt. The subjects of the study were 44 (47.83 %) men and 48 (52.17 %) women. Employees’ age ranges from 20 to 63 years and experience in organization ranges from 1 to 40 years. Additional demographics of the sample included a mean age of 37 years and average job tenure of 6 years. The majority of the participants had bachelor degree or higher (68.6 %). The measures used in this study included: Job Satisfaction Survey (to assess personal job satisfaction, Spector, 1985), Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (to assess organizational commitment, Mowday et al., 2000), Psychological Capital Questionnaire (to assess positive psychological capital, Luthans et al., 2007). Some sample items for PsyCap subscales include the following: “I feel confident helping to set targets/goals in my work area” (efficacy); “If I should find myself in a jam at work, I could think of many ways to get out of it” (hope); “I always look on the bright side of things regarding my job” (optimism); and “I usually manage difficulties one way or another at work” (resiliency). All responses for the questionnaires were anchored on a 6-point Likert scale: 1 - strongly disagree, 2 - disagree, 3 - not sure, 4 - agree, 5 - strongly agree. Each questionnaire demonstrated acceptable reliability in this study: Job Satisfaction Cronbach α =0,92, Organizational Commitment Cronbach α =0,90, Psychological Capital Cronbach α = 0,86.

5. Results
The results of the study are shown in Table 1. Given the focus of the study, correlation analysis was determined to be the appropriate statistical technique. The results demonstrate statistically significant strong relationship between organizational commitment and job satisfaction (r=0,76, p<0,01), psychological capital and job satisfaction (r=0,47, p<0,01), psychological capital and organizational commitment (r=0,52, p<0,01).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>Job satisfaction</th>
<th>Organizational commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational commitment</td>
<td>0,76*</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological capital</td>
<td>0,47*</td>
<td>0,52*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p < 0,01.

In order to determine the relationship between organizational commitment and psychological capital (dependent variable was job satisfaction), we used linear regression analysis procedure (Enter model). The results of regression analysis are presented in Table 2.
Table 2. Linear regression analysis of organizational commitment and psychological capital in Lithuanian organizations (n=92)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components of the model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R^2</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Non Standardized coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Multicolinearity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>β</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tolerance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constanta</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8.46</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Commitment</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>8.99</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td></td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Capital</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td></td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Dependent variable: job satisfaction; p < 0.01; VIF < 4; Tolerance > 0.25.

As it can be seen in Table 2, the regression is statistically significant (p = 0.00), and coefficient of Pearson shows strong relationship of variables (R = 0.77). Coefficient of regression analysis explains that in linear regression model the relationship found between dependent and independent variables is stronger than medium (R^2 = 0.59). In other words, even 59% independent variables (organizational commitment and psychological capital) prognosticate the dependent variable (job satisfaction). The independent variables VIF = 1.38, tolerance coefficients are 0.73, and it fulfills the condition of multicolinearity of independent variables. Linear regression analysis focus on dependent and independent variables in regard to job satisfaction and organizational (β = 0.71; p = 0.00). Therefore, this linear regression analysis implies that the higher organizational commitment leads to higher job satisfaction (t = 8.99; p = 0.00).

In order to determine the relationship between job satisfaction and psychological capital (dependent variable was organizational commitment), we also used linear regression analysis procedure (Enter model). The results of regression analysis are presented in Table 3.

Table 3. Linear regression analysis of job satisfaction and psychological capital in Lithuanian organizations (n=92)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components of the model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R^2</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Non Standardized coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Multicolinearity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>β</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tolerance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constanta</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td></td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Capital</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td></td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Dependent variable: organizational commitment; p < 0.01; VIF < 4; Tolerance > 0.25.

As it can be seen in Table 3, the regression is statistically significant (p = 0.00), and coefficient of Pearson shows strong relationship of variables (R = 0.79). Coefficient of regression analysis explains that in linear regression model the relationship found between dependent and independent variables is stronger than medium (R^2 = 0.62). In other words, even 62% independent variables (job satisfaction and psychological capital) prognosticate the dependent variable (organizational commitment). The independent variables VIF = 1.28, tolerance coefficients are 0.78, and it fulfills the condition of multicolinearity of independent variables. Linear regression analysis focus on dependent and independent variables in regard to job satisfaction and organizational (β = 0.71; p = 0.00). Therefore, this linear regression analysis implies that the higher organizational commitment leads to higher job satisfaction (t = 8.99; p = 0.00). Coefficient of regression analysis demonstrates that dependent variable organizational commitment is statistically significantly related to independent variables: job satisfaction (β = 0.03; p = 0.00) and psychological capital (β = 0.06; p = 0.05). In regard to β coefficients, psychological capital is mostly related to organizational commitment.
This implies that the rates of organizational commitment heightens in regard to the rates of job satisfaction (t = 1.14; p = 0.00) and psychological capital (t = 2.90; p = 0.00). To sum up, job satisfaction, organizational commitment and psychological capital are statistically significantly related in the group of respondents from different Lithuanian organizations.

In order to explore the relations between some socio-demographic characteristics and constructs of job satisfaction, organizational commitment and psychological capital, some additional statistical procedures were performed. The results are presented in Table 4.

**Table 4.** Relations between socio-demographic characteristics and constructs of job satisfaction, organizational commitment and psychological capital in Lithuanian organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale / scale</th>
<th>Age (Min. 20 yrs.; max. 63 yrs.)</th>
<th>Job experience (Min. 1 yrs.; max. 40 yrs.)</th>
<th>Salary</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Marital status</th>
<th>Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job satisfaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wage</td>
<td>-0.24*</td>
<td>-0.29**</td>
<td>0.26*</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>-0.29**</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.25*</td>
<td>0.32**</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional benefits</td>
<td>-0.39</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team evaluation</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.24*</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work conditions</td>
<td>-0.27*</td>
<td>-0.23*</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.24*</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleagues</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.30**</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work environment</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.35**</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.26*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.26**</td>
<td>0.24*</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job satisfaction</strong></td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>0.30**</td>
<td>0.22*</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational commitment</th>
<th>-0.10</th>
<th>-0.13</th>
<th>0.20</th>
<th>-0.07</th>
<th>0.02</th>
<th>0.06</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive psychological capital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.26*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.23*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resiliency</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>0.24*</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.32**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimism</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.21*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological capital</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.31**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. ** < 0.01; * < 0.05.

As it can be seen in Table 4, there are some statistically significant relations between socio-demographic factors and constructs of job satisfaction, organizational commitment and psychological capital. The data reveals that salary is still one of the major motivational factors in Lithuania.

6. Discussion and Conclusions

This study confirmed the hypothesis that job satisfaction, organizational commitment and positive psychological capital are related constructs, and this Lithuanian research complements the previous studies done in various countries (Aydogdu, Asikgil, 2011; Avey et al., 2011; Gallato et al., 2012; Garg, Rastogi, 2009; Gomes, 2009; Fernando et al., 2007, cit. pagal Iqbal, 2012; Yucel, 2012; Kumar & Giri, 2009; Lumley et al., 2011; Luthans et al., 2007; Luthans et al., 2008c; Malik et al., 2010; Nagar, 2012; O’Reilly, Chatman, 1986; Salami, 2008; Seyal, Afzaal, 2013; Syauta et al., 2012; Spector, 1997b; Sušnaj, Johopec, 2012; Tayyab, 2006; Unal, 2012). Moreover, the study showed the statistically significant differences between these psychological constructs and some socio-demographic characteristics. The data of this study revealed that wage is still one of the major motivational factors, affecting the psychological constructs mentioned above. Nonetheless, supplementary research is needed to test further whether psychological capital can be developed via the training as well as to determine its impact on individual performance (Luthans, Avey et al., 2006; Luthans, Avey, & Patera, 2008; Luthans, 2010). This would have added value to research on organizational and management effectiveness.
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