

## An investigation on relationship between employees' job satisfaction and organizational commitment

Hamzeh Samadi Miarkolaei<sup>a\*</sup> and Hossein Samadi Miarkolaei<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Ph.D. Student in Public Administration, Lecturer of Payam-e-Noor University, Member of Young Researcher Club, Qaemshahr, I. R. Iran

<sup>b</sup>Masters in Public Administration, Member of Young Researcher Club, Qaemshahr, I. R. Iran

---

### CHRONICLE

#### Article history:

Received July 28, 2013  
Received in revised format  
20 November 2013  
Accepted 14 January 2014  
Available online  
February 22 2014

#### Keywords:

Job Satisfaction  
Organizational Commitment  
Red Crescent Society's Textile  
Industries

### ABSTRACT

Job satisfaction is normally referred to cognitive, affective and evaluative reactions or attitude and state, which is a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or experience. Organizational commitment has been defined as the extent where an individual accepts, internalizes, and views his/her role based on organizational values and objectives. The purpose of present research is to investigate the relationship between employees' job satisfaction and organizational commitment of Red Crescent Society's Textile Industries of Islamic Republic of Iran. (N=180 and n=106). Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) and Allen and Meyer's Organizational Commitment Questionnaires are used for collecting data. There were significant relationships between employees' job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and their dimensions as described in results and conclusion.

© 2014 Growing Science Ltd. All rights reserved.

## 1. Introduction

Nowadays, employees' commitment towards their work and organization is one of the of managers' primary concerns. Organizations annually spend significant amount of investment on their human resources to reduce unnecessary expenses, to increase products' qualities and customers' satisfaction and finally to achieve the highest level of performance and productivity. Despite the fact that many organizations strive to have more committed and empowered employees, none of them has the ability to succeed in today's quite complex and competitive environment. Now, in addition to have satisfied, creative, innovative and powerful employees, committed human capital are the most important asset of an organization.

\*Corresponding author. Tel.: +981125322644; +989117402776  
E-mail addresses: [hamzeh\\_samadi@yahoo.com](mailto:hamzeh_samadi@yahoo.com) (H. S. Miarkolaei)

In today's competitive world, human resource management plays a very crucial role in developing organizations and its sustainability. The intense competition among the competitors and swift escalation of economy entirely changed the rhythm of the employees' performance, physical and mental development at the workplace. To figure out the current environment of various organizations, it is inevitable to respond to critical question regarding how workers' behaviors and attitudes influence psychological, individual and organizational factors (Allen & Meyer, 1997).

The study of behaviors within organizational setting has highlighted critical variables, which are supportive or detrimental to the performance of workforce. This notion holds true while concentrating on quality of human resources as a major factor, which contributes to the organizational success, significantly (Malik et al., 2010).

Much of the interest in analyzing job satisfaction and organizational commitment stems from concern for the behavioral consequences hypothesized to result of job satisfaction and/or organizational commitment. Among other issues, job satisfaction and/or organizational commitment have been shown or argued to be related to productivity, attendance at work, turnover, retirement, participation, labor militancy, sympathy for unions, and psychological withdrawal from work (Camp, 1993).

The literature suggests that individuals become committed to organizations for many reasons, including an affective attachment to the values of the organization, a realization of the costs involved with leaving the organization, and a sense of obligation to the organization (Allen & Meyer, 1997). The understanding of how employees become satisfied and committed to their organization, and to what degree various factors contribute to their level of commitment, is really important and significant enhancing their performance.

### *1.1. Job Satisfaction*

The concept of job satisfaction has been broadly studied in the literature, due to the fact that many experts, managers as well as researchers, believe it can influence on work productivity, employee turnover and employee retention (Weiss et al., 1967). In addition, job satisfaction has been the object of study by psychologists, anthropologists, and sociologists for many years. For the past few years, Locke compiled more than 3,300 articles on this topic and related issues (Locke, 1976; Carvajal & Hardigan, 2000).

There are different definitions for job satisfaction, some of which are contradictory in nature. Locke (1976) gave a comprehensive definition of job satisfaction as involving cognitive, affective and evaluative reactions or attitude and states that it is a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or experience (Locke, 1976; Clark, 1996). Spector (1997) defined job satisfaction as a cluster of evaluative feelings about the job and identified different factors of job satisfaction as pay, promotion, supervision, benefits, contingent, rewards, and communication. Spector (1997) referred to job satisfaction in terms of how people feel about their jobs. Job satisfaction is defined as "the extent to which people like (satisfaction) or dislike (dissatisfaction) their jobs". According to Weiss et al. (1967), satisfaction has been classified into three main classes of intrinsic, extrinsic, and total. Overall job satisfaction is actually a combination of intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction. Intrinsic job satisfaction occurs when workers consider only the kind of work they do. Extrinsic job satisfaction is when workers consider the conditions of work, such as their pay, co-workers, and supervisor (Nachimuthu, 2006).

### *1.2. Organizational Commitment*

Organizational commitment remains as one of the most widely studied phenomena in the organizational behavior literature and one of the central concepts in psychology (Addae & Parboteeah, 2008).

According to Armstrong (1998):

“As Guest, 1987 indicated, HRM pool ices are designed to “maximize organizational integration, employee commitment, flexibility and quality of work”. For the topic in question our focal interest refers to “Commitment” which can be described as attachment and loyalty. Individuals can display this attachment and loyalty at a variety of levels: the job, profession, department, boss or organization. Realistically then, commitment may therefore be diverse and divided between any of these. More specifically, organizational commitment has been defined by Mowday, 1992 as consisting of three components: identification with the goal’s and values of the organization, a desire to belong to the organization and a willingness to display effort on behalf of the organization”. (p. 319)

Like motivation, commitment has been a difficult concept to define. Meyer and Allen (1991) compiled a list of definitions and analyzed the similarities and differences. The similarities served as the basis for a definition of what they considered the “core essence” of commitment: Commitment is a force that binds an individual to a course of action that is of relevance to a particular target (Meyer & Allen, 1991; Meyer & Herscovitch, 2001; Meyer et al., 2004).

A committed member’s definite desire to maintain organizational membership would have a clear relationship to the motivation to participate. Willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization and the belief in acceptance of the organization’s objectives, in combination, have implications for the member’s motivation to produce for the organization- in accordance with explicit organizational mandates, as well as in terms of Katz’s (1964) spontaneous and innovative behaviors (Angle & Perry, 1981).

Allen and Meyer (1990; Meyer & Allen, 1991) initially developed their three-component model to address observed similarities and differences in existing multidimensional conceptualizations of organizational commitment. Common to all, they argued, was the belief that commitment binds an individual to an organization and thereby reduces the likelihood of turnover. The main differences were in the mindsets presumed to characterize the commitment. These mindsets reflected three distinguishable themes: affective attachment to the organization, obligation to remain, and perceived cost of leaving. To distinguish among commitments characterized by these different mindsets, Meyer and Allen labeled them “affective commitment,” “normative commitment,” and “continuance commitment,” respectively (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Meyer & Allen, 1991; Meyer, Becker, & Vandenberghe, 2004).

Meyer and Allen’s three-component model of organizational commitment (OC) has been the dominant framework for OC research during the past decade because it is based on a more comprehensive understanding of OC. The three-component model of OC consists of: (a) affirmative commitment (AC) is the emotional attachment to one’s organization; (b) continuance commitment (CC) is the attachment based on the accumulation of valued side bets such as pension, skill transferability, relocation, and self-investment that co-vary with organizational membership, and (c) normative commitment (NC) attachment that is based on motivation to conform to social norms regarding attachment (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Meyer & Allen, 1991; Meyer, Irving, & Allen, 1998).

A highly committed person will indicate a strong desire to remain a member of a particular organization, a willingness to express high level of effort on behalf of the organization, and a definite belief and acceptance of the values and objectives of the organization (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Jamal, 2011; Al-Hawajreh, 2011). OC is also identified to have significant relationships with job satisfaction, job involvement, stress, occupational commitment, and motivation (Marmaya, Hanisah, Zawawi, Hitam, & Mohd Jody, 2011).

### *1.3. Relationship between Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment*

Job Satisfaction and OC and their relationships have been widely studied factors in management literature. (e.g. Shore & Martin, 1989; Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch, & Topolnytsky, 2002; Wu & Norman, 2006; Paik, Parboteeah, & Shim, 2007; Ahmad, Ahmad, & Ali Shah, 2010; Gunlu, Aksarayli, & Sahin Percin, 2010; Azeem, 2010; Lumley, Coetzee, Tladinyane, & Ferreira, 2011; Emhan, 2012). It is typically assumed that job satisfaction will lead to organizational commitment. This assumption is based on the logic that the more satisfied employees are with their jobs, the more likely they are to develop the necessary attachment to the organization and develop a stronger commitment. Shore and Martin (1989) found that organizational commitment was more strongly related than job satisfaction with intentions for the tellers, but not for the professions. Job satisfaction was more strongly related than organizational commitment with supervisory rating of performance for both samples (Shore & Martin, 1989). Meyer et al. (2002) found that affective and normative commitment correlated positively with job satisfaction, in which high commitment was associated with high satisfaction, but continuance commitment correlated negatively. Wu and Norman (2006) found that there was a positive relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Wu & Norman, 2006). Ahmad et al. (2010) found there was no significant relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Paik et al. (2007) reported that only affective commitment was positively associated with job satisfaction and performance. Azeem (2010) reported a moderate significant positive relationship among job satisfaction facets and OC. Gunlu et al. (2010) reported that the extrinsic, intrinsic, and general job satisfaction had a significant impact on normative and affective commitment, but, the dimensions of job satisfaction do not had a significant effect on continuance commitment. Lumley et al. (2011) reported that there were significant positive relationship between job satisfaction with affective and normative commitment and total organizational commitment, but there was no significant relationship between job satisfaction and continuance commitment. Emhan (2012) stated that job satisfaction had a positive effect on affective commitment in only for-profit organizations, and it had a negative effect on normative commitment in only non-profit organizations.

In this paper, we investigate the relationship between employees' job satisfaction and organizational commitment of the Islamic Republic of Iran Red Crescent Society's Textile Industries. According to mentioned subjects, the study hypothesizes were including:

H<sub>1</sub>: There is a significant relationship between employees' Job Satisfaction with Organizational Commitment and its' components (Affective, Continuance, and Normative Commitment) in Red Crescent Society's Textile Industries.

H<sub>2</sub>: there is a significant relationship between employees' Intrinsic Job Satisfaction with Organizational Commitment and its' components (Affective, Continuance, and Normative Commitment) in Red Crescent Society's Textile Industries.

H<sub>3</sub>: there is a significant relationship between employees' Extrinsic Job Satisfaction with Organizational Commitment and its' components (Affective, Continuance, and Normative Commitment) in Red Crescent Society's Textile Industries.

## **2. Material and Methods**

In present study, the scale used for the measurement of Organizational Commitment is developed by Allen and Meyer (1990) describing three types of organizational commitment i.e., Affective, Normative and Continuance Commitment, and also used 20 items (short-form) Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) (Weiss et al., 1967) for the measurement of employees' Job Satisfaction. Statistical population of present study includes all of Red Crescent Society's Textile

Industries' employees ( $N=180$ ). In order to determination of statistical sample equal to statistical population, the Cochran' sample size formula was used ( $n=106$ ) (see the following formula).

$$n = \frac{N \times z_{\alpha/2}^2 \times p \times q}{\varepsilon^2 \times (N - 1) + z_{\alpha/2}^2 \times p \times q}, \quad (1)$$

where  $N$  is the population size,  $p=1-q$  represents the yes/no categories,  $z_{\alpha/2}$  is CDF of normal distribution and finally  $\varepsilon$  is the error term. Since we have  $p=0.5, z_{\alpha/2}=1.96$  and  $N=180$ , the number of sample size is calculated as  $n=106$ .

For content validity, questionnaires were distributed among 15 employees and then were gathered. In order to determination of measurement scale of reliability, there are various methods that one of them is the measurement of internal consistency. Internal consistency of measurement scale could measure by Cronbach's alpha coefficient (Cronbach, 1951; Churchill, 1979). This method has frequently been used in researches (Peterson, 1994). In the present study, Cronbach's alpha coefficient was utilized to examine the internal reliability of organizational commitment (0.82) and for job satisfaction was (0.93) indicating high internal consistency. Then, 106 questionnaires distributed among employees that all of them were returned. Data collected were analyzed by the application of statistical tests i.e., Pearson correlation and multiple regression using SPSS 19.

### 3. Results

#### 3.1. Descriptive Findings

The age of participants showed that 16 employees (15 %) were between 19 to 26 years old, 49 employees (46.2%) between 27 to 34 years old, 28 employees (26.4%) between 35 to 42 years old, 10 employees (9.4%) between 43 to 50 years old, and 3 employees (3 %) were more than 50 years old. The gender showed that 97 employees (91.5%) were men and 9 employees (8.5%) were women. The educational levels of participants showed that 42 employees (39.6%) were under diploma, 25 employees (23.6%) diploma, 21 employees (19.8%) undergraduates, 16 employees (15.1%) graduates, and 2 employees (1.9%) were postgraduates. The marital status of participants showed that 22 employees (21%) were single and 84 employees (79%) were married.

#### 3.2. Inferential Findings

##### 3.2.1. Correlation Analysis

In order to study the relationships between job satisfaction and its dimensions with organizational commitment and its components used the Pearson Correlation Test (PCT). Table 1 shows the Cronbach's  $\alpha$  (Cron.'s  $\alpha$ ), means, standard deviations (S.D.), and correlations among of all variables (see table 1). In order to test Hypothesizes, the correlation analysis was performed.

**Table 1**

The correlation matrix of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and their dimensions

Row	Variables	Mean	S.D.	Cron.'s $\alpha$	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	GJS	3.62	0.61	0.93	1						
2	IJS	3.98	0.73	0.86	.781**	1					
3	EJS	3.37	0.59	0.83	.734**	.667**	1				
4	OC	3.11	0.42	0.82	.373**	.360**	.353**	1			
5	AC	3.09	0.52	0.73	.261**	.254**	.245*	.780**	1		
6	CC	3.20	0.47	0.80	.235*	.233*	.216*	.812**	.449**	1	
7	NC	3.03	0.52	0.75	.400**	.377**	.385**	.819**	.473**	.488**	1

\*Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

\*\*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Notes: S.D.: Standard Deviation; Cron.'s  $\alpha$ : Cronbach's  $\alpha$ ; GJS= General Job Satisfaction; IJS: Intrinsic Job Satisfaction; EJS: Extrinsic Job Satisfaction; OC: Organizational Commitment; AC: Affective Commitment; CC: Continuance Commitment; NC: Normative Commitment.

First, Hypothesis 1 is related to relationship between general job satisfaction with organizational commitment and its' components (affective, continuance, and normative commitment). According to the correlation matrix, the analysis and computation of the data by SPSS, output shows that there is a significant and positive correlation between total scores of general job satisfaction with organizational commitment ( $r = 0.373^{**}$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ), affective commitment ( $r = 0.261^{**}$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ), continuance commitment ( $r = 0.235^*$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ), and normative commitment ( $r = 0.400^{**}$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ), indicating that the employees who are more satisfied with their job are also more committed to their organization (see table 1). Therefore, these results provide support for Hypothesis 1 ( $H_1$  is accepted). Second, Hypothesis 2 is related to relationship between intrinsic job satisfaction with organizational commitment and its' components (affective, continuance, and normative commitment). According to the correlation matrix, there is a significant and positive correlation between total scores of intrinsic job satisfaction with organizational commitment ( $r = 0.360^{**}$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ), affective commitment ( $r = 0.254^{**}$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ), continuance commitment ( $r = 0.233^*$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ), and normative commitment ( $r = 0.377^{**}$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ), indicating that the employees who are more satisfied with intrinsic status of their job are also more committed to their organization (see table 1). Therefore, these results provide support for Hypothesis 2 ( $H_2$  is accepted).

Third, Hypothesis 3 is related to relationship between extrinsic job satisfaction with organizational commitment and its' dimensions components (affective, continuance, and normative commitment). According to the correlation matrix, there is a significant and positive correlation between total scores of extrinsic job satisfaction with organizational commitment ( $r = 0.353^{**}$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ), affective commitment ( $r = 0.245^*$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ), continuance commitment ( $r = 0.216^*$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ), and normative commitment ( $r = 0.385^{**}$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ), indicating that the employees who are more satisfied with extrinsic status of their job are also more committed to their organization (see table 1). Therefore, these results provide support for Hypothesis 3 ( $H_3$  is accepted).

### 3.2.2. Regression Analysis

In order to prediction the effects and influences of job satisfaction and its dimensions on organizational commitment and its' components, the Regression Analysis (RA) is used. Organizational commitment was considered as a function of intrinsic, extrinsic and general satisfaction and served as the dependent variable in the regression analysis.

First, the results of the regression analysis (Table 2) indicated the predictive effects of employees' intrinsic job satisfaction ( $\beta = 0.36$ ,  $t = 3.93$ ,  $P = 0.001 < 0.05$ ), extrinsic job satisfaction ( $\beta = 0.35$ ,  $t = 3.84$ ,  $P = 0.001 < 0.05$ ), and general job satisfaction ( $\beta = 0.37$ ,  $t = 4.10$ ,  $P = 0.001 < 0.05$ ) on organizational commitment. The results of the analysis indicated that organizational commitment was function of independent variables (intrinsic, extrinsic, and general job satisfaction). As seen in table 2, the regression coefficients had positive values indicating that as job satisfaction levels increased, organizational commitment increased as well (see Table 2).

**Table 2**

The regression analysis for predicting effect of intrinsic, extrinsic and general job satisfaction on organizational commitment

Organizational Commitment	T-Statistic	Standard error	Beta	B	Sig	R	R <sup>2</sup>	F
Constant	11.05	0.21		2.34	0.001	0.337	0.139	16.86
General Job Satisfaction	4.10	0.05	0.37	0.23	0.001			
Constant	12.18	0.19		2.43	0.001	0.360	0.129	15.45
Intrinsic Job Satisfaction	3.93	0.04	0.36	0.19	0.001			
Constant	11.63	0.20		2.41	0.001	0.353	0.124	14.78
Extrinsic Job Satisfaction	3.84	0.06	0.35	0.23	0.001			

Second, the results of the regression analysis (table 3) indicated the predictive effects of employees' intrinsic job satisfaction ( $\beta = 0.25$ ,  $t = 2.62$ ,  $P = 0.001 < 0.05$ ), extrinsic job satisfaction ( $\beta = 0.24$ ,  $t = 2.57$ ,  $P = 0.001 < 0.05$ ), and general job satisfaction ( $\beta = 0.27$ ,  $t = 2.76$ ,  $P = 0.001 < 0.05$ ) on affective commitment. The results of the analysis indicated that affective commitment was function of intrinsic, extrinsic, and general job satisfaction. As seen in table 3, the regression coefficients had positive values indicating that as job satisfaction levels increased, affective commitment increased as well (see Table 3).

**Table 3**

The regression analysis for predicting effect of intrinsic, extrinsic and general satisfaction on affective commitment

Affective Commitment	T-Statistic	Standard error	Beta	B	Sig	R	R <sup>2</sup>	F
Constant	9.71	0.25		2.47	0.001	0.261	0.06	7.62
General Job Satisfaction	2.76	0.07	0.27	0.19	0.001			
Constant	10.63	0.23		2.53	0.001	0.254	0.06	7.15
Intrinsic Job Satisfaction	2.67	0.05	0.25	0.15	0.001			
Constant	10.22	0.24		2.55	0.001	0.245	0.06	6.65
Extrinsic Job Satisfaction	2.57	0.07	0.24	0.18	0.001			

Third, the results of the regression analysis (table 4) indicated the predictive effects of employees' intrinsic job satisfaction ( $\beta = 0.24$ ,  $t = 2.44$ ,  $P = 0.001 < 0.05$ ), extrinsic job satisfaction ( $\beta = 0.21$ ,  $t = 2.25$ ,  $P = 0.001 < 0.05$ ), and general job satisfaction ( $\beta = 0.23$ ,  $t = 2.46$ ,  $P = 0.001 < 0.05$ ) on continuance commitment. The results of the analysis indicated that continuance commitment was function of intrinsic, extrinsic, and general job satisfaction. As seen in table 4, the regression coefficients had positive values indicating that as job satisfaction levels increased, continuance commitment increased as well (see Table 4).

**Table 4**

The regression analysis for predicting effect of intrinsic, extrinsic and general satisfaction on continuance commitment

Continuance Commitment	T-Statistic	Standard error	Beta	B	Sig	R	R <sup>2</sup>	F
Constant	9.14	0.28		2.60	0.001	0.235	0.05	6.07
General Job Satisfaction	2.46	0.07	0.23	0.19	0.001			
Constant	9.96	0.27		2.65	0.001	0.233	0.05	5.99
Intrinsic Job Satisfaction	2.44	0.06	0.24	0.16	0.001			
Constant	9.64	0.27		2.67	0.001	0.216	0.04	5.10
Extrinsic Job Satisfaction	2.25	0.08	0.21	0.18	0.001			

Forth, the results of the regression analysis (Table 5) indicated the predictive effects of employees' intrinsic job satisfaction ( $\beta = 0.37$ ,  $t = 4.14$ ,  $P = 0.001 < 0.05$ ), extrinsic job satisfaction ( $\beta = 0.38$ ,  $t = 4.25$ ,  $P = 0.001 < 0.05$ ), and general job satisfaction ( $\beta = 0.32$ ,  $t = 4.45$ ,  $P = 0.001 < 0.05$ ) on normative commitment. The results of the analysis indicated that normative commitment was function of intrinsic, extrinsic, and general job satisfaction. As seen in table 5, the regression coefficients had positive values indicating that as job satisfaction levels increased, normative commitment increased as well (see Table 5).

**Table 5**

The regression analysis for predicting effect of intrinsic, extrinsic and general satisfaction on normative commitment

Normative Commitment	T-Statistic	Standard error	Beta	B	Sig	R	R <sup>2</sup>	F
Constant	7.21	0.27		1.95	0.001	0.400	0.160	19.80
General Job Satisfaction	4.45	0.07	0.40	0.32	0.001			
Constant	8.19	0.25		2.09	0.001	0.377	0.142	17.178
Intrinsic Job Satisfaction	4.14	0.06	0.37	0.26	0.001			
Constant	7.68	0.26		2.03	0.001	0.385	0.148	18.12
Extrinsic Job Satisfaction	4.25	0.07	0.38	0.32	0.001			

#### 4. Discussion and Conclusion

The purpose of the present research was to investigate the relationship between employees' job satisfaction and organizational commitment of Red Crescent Society's Textile Industries. The results of the correlation test have indicated that there was a significant and positive relationship between job satisfaction with organizational commitment. The results are consistent with other results (Shore & Martin, 1989; Wu & Norman, 2006; Azeem, 2010; Malik et al., 2010; Gunlu et al., 2010; Lumley et al., 2011). However, the results are inconsistent with Ahmad et al. (2010). In terms of affective commitment, the results are consistent with some other results (e.g. Meyer et al., 2002; Paik et al., 2007; Gunlu et al., 2010; Lumley et al., 2011; Emhan, 2012). In terms of continuance commitment, the results are inconsistent with some studies (Meyer et al., 2002; Gunlu et al., 2010; Lumley et al., 2011). In terms of normative commitment, the results are consistent with some results (Meyer et al., 2002; Gunlu et al., 2010; Lumley et al., 2011) and inconsistent with Emhan (2012). In addition, there were significant and positive relationship between dimensions of job satisfaction and organizational commitment and between components of organizational commitment and dimensions of job satisfaction.

Nowadays, to improve the performance and productivity, organizations have to employ committed employees to reach their objectives. Because, employees with higher level of commitment to their organizations' objectives have higher job involvement, higher level of personal satisfaction, create better relationships with co-workers, maintain lower level of absenteeism, personal turnover, sabotages, counterproductive and withdrawal behaviors, and perform their jobs better than employees with lower level commitment.

One of the best ways to promote employee's commitment is to increase their involvement in organization affairs and issues. Involvement creates ownership, which increases loyalty and commitment and increases accountability. Involved employees generally are happy employees, and happy employees contribute to the success of the organization and we have to make sure the employees understand the "assignment" and the extent of their involvement.

#### References

- Addae, H. M., Parboteeah, K. P., & Velinor, N. (2008). Role stressors and organizational commitment: public sector employment in St Lucia. *International Journal of Manpower*, 29(6), 567-582.
- Ahmad, H., Ahmad, K., & Ali Shah, A. (2010). Relationship between Job Satisfaction, Job Performance Attitude towards Work and Organizational Commitment. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 18(2), 257-267.
- Al-Hawajreh, K. (2011). Exploring the Relationship between Occupational Stress and Organizational Commitment among Nurses in Selected Jordanian Hospitals. *An-Najah Univ. J. Res. (Humanities)*, 25(7), 1932-1975.
- 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, 1-18.
- Angle, H. L., & Perry, J. L. (1981). An Empirical Assessment of Organizational Commitment and Organizational Effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 26(1), 1-14.
- Armstrong, M. (1998). *A handbook of Personnel Management Practice* (1<sup>st</sup> ed.). London: Kogan Page Limited.
- Camp, S. D. (1993). Assessing the Effects of Organizational Commitment and Job Satisfaction on Turnover: An Event History Approach. *The Prison Journal* 74(3), 279-305.
- Carvajal, M. J., & Hardigan, P. C. (2000). Pharmacists' Sources of Job Satisfaction: Inter-Gender Differences in Response, *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, 64, 420-425.



- Churchill, G. A. (1979). A paradigm for developing better measures of marketing constructs. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 16, 64–73.
- Clark, A. E. (1996). Job Satisfaction in British. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 189–217.
- Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of test. *Psychometrika*, 16, 297–334.
- Emhan, A. (2012). Relationship among Managerial Support, Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment: A Comparative Study of Nonprofit, For-Profit and Public Sectors in Turkey. *International Journal of Business, Humanities and Technology*, 2(5), 179–190.
- Gunlu, E., Aksarayli, M., & Sahin Percin, N. (2010). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment of hotel managers in Turkey. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 22(5), 693–717.
- Jamal, M. (2011). Job Stress, Job Performance and Organizational Commitment in a Multinational Company: An Empirical Study in two Countries. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 2(20), 20–29.
- Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction, In M. D. Dunnette (ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology*, (1297–1349), Chicago IL, Rand Nally.
- Lumley, E. J., Coetzee, M., Tladinyane, R., & Ferreira, N. (2011). Exploring the job satisfaction and organizational commitment of employees in the information technology environment. *Southern African Business Review*, 15(1), 100–118.
- Malik, M. E., Nawab, S., Naeem, B., & Danish, R. Q. (2010). Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment of University Teachers in Public Sector of Pakistan. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 5(6), 17–26.
- Marmaya, N. Hanisah, B., Zawawi, N., Hitam, M., & Mohd Jody, J. (2011). *Organizational Commitment and Job Burnout among Employees in Malaysia*. Paper presented at the Proceedings of the 2011 International Conference on Business and Economics Research, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, pp: 185–187. Retrieved from <http://www.ipedr.net/vol1/40-B10039.pdf>
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1(1), 61–89.
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1997). *Commitment in the Workplace: Theory, Research, and application* (1<sup>st</sup> ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Meyer, J. P., Becker, T. E., & Vandenberghe, C. (2004). Employee Commitment and Motivation: A Conceptual Analysis and Integrative Model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(6), 991–1007.
- Meyer, P. J., & Herscovitch, L. (2001). Commitment in the workplace: Toward a general model. *Human Resource Management Review*, 11(3), 299–326.
- Meyer, J. P., Irving, P. G., & Allen, N. J. (1998). Examination of the Combined Effects of Work Values and Early Work Experiences on Organizational Commitment. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 19(1), 29–52.
- Meyer, J. P., Stanley, D. J., Herscovitch, L., & Topolnytsky, L. (2002). Affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 61, 20–52.
- Nachimuthu, P. (2006). A Study of Job Satisfaction among Male and Female Police Personnel. *The Indian Police Journal*, LIII(2), 93–101.
- Paik, Y., Parboteeah, K. P., & Shim, W. (2007). The relationship between perceived compensation, organizational commitment and job satisfaction: the case of Mexican workers in the Korean Maquiladoras. *Int. J. of Human Resource Management* 18, 1768–1781.
- Peterson, R. A. (1994). A Meta-analysis of Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha. *Consumer Research*, 21, 381–391.
- Shore, L. M., & Martin, H. J. (1989). Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment in Relation to Work Performance and Turnover Intentions. *Human Relations*, 42(7), 625–638.
- Spector, P. (1997). *Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, causes and consequences*. Sage Publication Inc., Thousand Oaks, CA.

- Weiss, D. J., Dawis, R. V., England, G. W., & Lofquist, L. H. (1967). *Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire*. © Copyright 1967 by the Work Adjustment Project Industrial Relations Center University of Minnesota.
- Wu, L., & Norman, I. J. (2006). An investigation of job satisfaction, organizational commitment and role conflict and ambiguity in a sample of Chinese undergraduate nursing students. *Nurse Education Today*, 26, 304–314.