

Organizational Commitment and Job Satisfaction

¹Javad Eslami and ²Davood Gharakhani

¹Department of Industrial Management, Abhar branch, Islamic Azad University (IAU), Abhar, Iran

²Department of Industrial Management, Qazvin branch, Islamic Azad University (IAU), Qazvin, Iran

E-Mail: Davoodgharakhany@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this paper is to examine the role Job satisfaction on Organizational commitments. In this study, Data collected from 280 Iranian employees. The present study employs a questionnaire survey approach to collect data for testing the research hypotheses. Relevant statistical analytical techniques including regression for analysis was then used. The results indicate that all three factors of Job satisfaction (Promotions, Personal relationships, and Favorable conditions of work) have positive and significant effects on Organizational commitments. The main contribution of the paper is to provide empirical evidence about the impact of Job satisfaction on Organizational commitments. Also the findings of the study are important for both practitioners and academics.

Keywords: *organizational commitment, Job satisfaction, affective commitment, normative commitment, continuance commitment.*

1. INTRODUCTION

In the past, organizational commitment has concentrated on individuals' affective attachment to the organization, even though it has a number of facets that influence organizational outcomes. Meyer and Allen propose that three components of commitment: affective (wanting to stay with an organization as a result of the "emotional attachment to, identification with and involvement in the organization" (p. 11), normative (feeling a moral obligation to stay with the organization) and continuance ("feeling stuck" and staying because it is too costly to leave) can develop from the way HRM practices are perceived. Commitment is a construct that seeks to explain consistencies involving attitudes, beliefs and behavior and "involves behavioral choices and implies a rejection of feasible alternative courses of action" (Hulin, 1991, p. 488). Thus, these consistencies are usually seen as behavioral choices devoted to the pursuit of a common goal or goals (Hulin, 1991). With the development of the concept of commitment, an associated critical literature has arisen (see, for instance, Griffin and Bateman, 1986; Mathieu and Zajac, 1990; Meyer and Allen, 1991; Mowday *et al.*, 1982; Salancik, 1977; Staw, 1977).

Organizational commitment has been studied extensively in terms of its components, antecedents, correlates, and consequences (Mathieu and Zajac, 1990). Meyer and Allen (1997) have found that organizational commitment consists of affective, continuance, and normative commitment. Affective commitment shows the extent to which the individual identifies with the organization (identification, involvement, and emotional attachment). Normative commitment described the extent to which an employee believes he/she should be committed to an organization and may be influenced by social norms. Continuance commitment describes an individual's need to continue working for the organization based on the perceived costs associated with leaving (Allen and Meyer, 1990; Meyer and Allen, 1991, 1997). These three dimensions suggest that people stay with their organization because they want to (affective commitment); because they feel they ought to (normative commitment); and because they need to (continuance commitment). Meyer and Allen (1991) have found these are components of commitment can be experienced simultaneously to

varying degrees. Empirical evidence suggests that levels of commitment may improve (Sturges *et al.*, 2005) or decrease (Bambacas and Bordia, 2009) with the advent of career self-management. Mathieu and Zajac (1990) suggest that differences in commitment levels may result from individual differences. In other words, commitment to the organization depends on individuals and the value they place on organizational offerings. For example, career opportunities offered by organizations, such as career development or opportunity for continuous improvement, if valued by individuals (as they enhance future career prospects) will enhance their levels of commitment. Organizational commitment is critical to retain and attract well-qualified personnel. In recent years, organizational commitment in schools has become a major pre-occupation throughout many countries. This has led to a considerable increase in the number of public policies and programs aimed at addressing the problem as well as many empirical studies of such. Popoola (2006) found that personal factors like age, sex, marital status, religion, length of service and level of education affect the organizational commitment of records management personnel in Nigerian state universities. In the same vein, studies carried out by Angle and Perry (1981) and Opayemi (2004) indicated that a significant relationship existed between gender and organizational commitment of workers in public sector organizations; and that women were more committed to their organizations than men. However, Ahmad and Abubakar (2003) submitted that gender has no significant correlation with organizational commitment among white workers in Malaysia. Personal variables of employees such as age, gender, job tenure, marital status, job status, salary and education have been found to be significantly related to the organizational commitment of workers in industrial organizations (Becker, 1992; Becker and Billings, 1993; Hunt and Morgan, 1994; Ellemers *et al.*, 1998). Employee job satisfaction is an important attribute that organizations desire of their staff (Oshagbemi, 2003). Job satisfaction may be linked to performance, organizational productivity and other issues, including labour turnover. However, dissatisfied employees are prone to absenteeism and excessive turnover (Chen *et al.*, 2006; Lee *et al.*, 1999).

<http://www.ejournalofscience.org>

Accordingly, the purpose of this paper is to examine the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment. The paper is organized into five sections including the Introduction. The next section presents the literature review and sets out the hypotheses of this study. A section that describes the research methodology follows this. The fourth section presents the Analysis and results and finally, the fifth section concludes the study.

2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND HYPOTHESES

2.1. Organizational commitment

The construct of organizational commitment (OC) has been conceptualized in a variety of fashions. The bulk of research related to OC can be viewed in terms of attitudinal versus behavioral conceptualizations. Porter *et al.* (1974) defined organizational commitment as “the relative strength of an individual’s identification with and involvement in a particular organization” (Porter *et al.*, 1974). Meyer and Allen (1984) later used the term affective commitment (AC) to describe an employee’s emotional attachment to an organization because of a belief and identification with the organization’s goals. The concept of organizational commitment has been treated as a variable of interest in its own right and a variety of definitions and measures have been proposed (Mowday *et al.*, 1982; Meyer *et al.*, 1998). The concept has attracted more attention recently from organizational scientists, perhaps due to changes taking place in employment practices that have arisen from the international employment marketplace and increased alternatives for skilled employees in a global economy (Sullivan and Arthur, 2006).

Organizational commitment has received a great deal of attention from organizational behaviorists (e.g. Allen and Meyer, 1990; Mowday, 1998). In sales and marketing it is considered an important central construct in understanding salesperson behavior (Brown and Peterson, 1993; Singh *et al.*, 1996). By understanding commitment, practitioners will be in a better position to anticipate the impact of a particular policy or practice on the organization (Meyer and Allen, 1997; Bergmann *et al.*, 2000). OC is a subjective measure that captures employees’ perceptions of their identification with their organizations’ core values, their intent to stay with their organization, and their willingness to exert more effort than expected by their organization (Mowday *et al.*, 1979). Continuance commitment refers to the commitment employees experience towards the organization because of investments they have made or because of the costs associated with leaving the organization (Dipboye *et al.*, 1994; Mathieu and Zajac, 1990). This form of commitment develops when employees realize that they have accumulated investments they would lose if they left the organization or because their alternatives are limited. The difference between affective commitment and continuance commitment is that employees high in affective commitment stay with the organization because they want to, while employees high in continuance commitment stay because they have to (Meyer *et al.*,

1990). Meyer and Allen (1991) have identified a third dimension of organizational commitment, which they describe as normative commitment. This form of commitment concerns a feeling of (moral) obligation to remain in the organization. What these three dimensions have in common is that they all indicate the extent to which employees are willing to remain in an organization. Organizational commitment is essential for reaching such challenging goals (Klein *et al.*, 1999) as these goals require more effort and typically have lower chances of success than are easy goals (Latham, 2007). Organizational commitment has been conceptualized as a psychological state or mindset that binds individuals to a course of action relevant to one or more targets, and a willingness to persist in a course of action (Cooper-Hakim and Viswesvaran, 2005). Porter *et al.* (1974) defined commitment as a strong belief in and acceptance of the organizational goals, willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization and a desire to maintain organizational membership. As such, commitment is different from motivation in that commitment influences behavior independently of other motives and attitudes, and may lead to persistence to a course of action even if this conflicts with motives (Meyer *et al.*, 2004; Meyer and Herscovitch, 2001). One aspect of commitment consideration is rooted in terms of exchange or reward-cost notions where the emphasis is on the bargaining between the individual and the organization: the more favorable the exchange, the greater the individuals’ commitment to the organization (Becker, 1960). Interest in organizational commitment has been stimulated largely by its demonstrated positive relationship to work behaviors such as job satisfaction, high productivity, and low turnover (Cohen, 2003), but the field has not conducted enough studies outside the Western countries (Lee *et al.*, 2001; Meyer *et al.*, 2002). Herscovitch and Meyer (2002) defined organizational commitment as the degree to which an employee identifies with the goals and values of the organization and is willing to exert effort to help it succeed. The issue of organizational commitment within both private and public sector organizations has, generally, received significant research focus over the past 25 years (Meyer and Allen, 1997; Mowday, 1998; Hope, 2003). In addition, organizational commitment is viewed as an attitude of attachment to the organization by an employee, which leads to particular job-related behaviours such as work absenteeism, job satisfaction, turnover intentions, organizational citizen behaviours, work motivation and work performance.

OC is an exchange agreement between individuals and the organization (Coopey, 1995). OC is an essential element of employees’ PC, which may be understood within the motivational processes of social exchange theory and the norm of reciprocity. Organizational commitment is of considerable interest to psychologists because there is strong evidence of links between high levels of commitment and favorable organizational outcomes. It is a form of psychological contract, which employees make in response to the benefits provided by the organization (Angle and Perry, 1983).

2.2. Job satisfaction

The concept of job satisfaction has been broadly studied in literature, due to the fact that many experts, managers as well as researchers, believe its trends can affect and influence work productivity, employee turnover and employee retention. Satisfaction has been classified into three main classes: intrinsic, extrinsic, and total (Weiss *et al.*, 1967). According to Rose (2001), an employee is intrinsically satisfied if he receives no apparent reward except the activity itself, while extrinsic satisfaction is defined as the opposite concept (that is, an employee is extrinsically satisfied if he receives monetary compensation or other material rewards to modify his behavior). As a consequence of the importance of this concept, it emerges that also the main antecedents of job satisfaction have not to be ignored. Job satisfaction is a pleasurable emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job as achieving or facilitating the achievement of one's job values (Locke, 1968). Job satisfaction has been found to significantly influence absenteeism, turnover, job performance, and psychological distress (Chen *et al.*, 2006; Spector, 1997). Lee (1988) also revealed that job dissatisfaction is among the best predictors of turnover. Additionally, Williams (1995) found that employee benefits affect their job satisfaction. Nevertheless, several antecedents of job satisfaction have been studied over the years including compensation, opportunity for advancement, leadership style, work environment, organizational structure and climate (Testa, 1999).

Job satisfaction in a narrow context might be accepted as: [. . .] the feelings or a general attitude of the employees in relation with their jobs and the job components such as the working environment, working conditions, equitable rewards, and communication with the colleagues (Glisson and Durick, 1988; Kim *et al.*, 2005). Locke (1969) defined job satisfaction and dissatisfaction as "that job satisfaction is the pleasurable emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job as achieving or facilitating one's job values (Schwepker, 2001)". Job dissatisfaction is "the unpleasurable emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job as frustrating or blocking the attainment of one's values".

Job satisfaction is defined as "the extent to which people like (satisfaction) or dislike (dissatisfaction) their jobs" (Spector, 1997). This definition suggests that job satisfaction is a general or global affective reaction that individuals hold about their job. On the other hand, Locke (1969) defined job satisfaction as a positive emotional feeling, a result of one's evaluation towards his or her job experience by comparing between what he or she expects from his or her job and what he or she actually gets from it. Researchers in the past suggested that a person's job satisfaction comes from how he or she feels is more important than the fulfilment or unfulfilment of his or her needs (Locke, 1976). Several determinants of job satisfaction have been established in past researches, such as organizational reward systems, power distribution, individual differences, self esteem, locus of control etc. (e.g. Chen and Silverthorne, 2008). When employees are not satisfied, they tend to shift and look for satisfaction elsewhere.

2.3. Organizational commitment and Job satisfaction

Most of the research has treated job satisfaction as an independent and organizational commitment as a dependent variable (Gaertner, 1999; Jernigan *et al.*, 2002; Lok and Crawford, 2001; Mowday *et al.*, 1982). As Mowday *et al.* (1982) suggest, commitment and job satisfaction may be seen in several ways. Job satisfaction is a kind of response to a specific job or job-related issues; whereas, commitment is a more global response to an organization. Therefore, commitment should be more consistent than job satisfaction over time and takes longer after one is satisfied with his/her job (Feinstein and Vondrasek, 2001, p. 6). Feinstein and Vondrasek (2001) analyzed the effects of job satisfaction on organizational commitment among the restaurant employees and the findings proved that satisfaction level would predict their commitment to the organization. Gaertner (1999, p. 491) also analyzed the determinants (pay workload, distributive justice, promotional chances, supervisory support, etc.) of job satisfaction and organizational commitment.

Based on the literature review and research objectives, the following hypotheses were derived:

Hypothesis1. Components of job satisfaction are positively related to affective commitment.

Hypothesis2. Components of job satisfaction are positively related to normative commitment.

Hypothesis3. Components of job satisfaction are positively related to Continuance commitment.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1. Data collection and sample

The present study employs a questionnaire survey approach to collect data for testing the research hypotheses. All independent and dependent variables require five-point Likert style responses ranging from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree". A survey is conducted on 280 Iranian Employees in a firm of Services. Data are analyzed using principal components analysis and relationships are tested using linear regression.

3.2 Assessing reliability

The reliability of the measurements in the survey was tested using Cronbach's alpha (α). Hair *et al.* (1998) stated that a value of 0.70 and higher is often "considered the criterion for internally consistent established factors. The Cronbach's alpha coefficients in parentheses indicating the internal consistency reliability of the measures in the six factors are all above the suggested value of 0.70 (Hair *et al.*, 1998).

4. ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

This study attempts to understand the relationships among job satisfaction and organizational commitments. Table-1 displays the means, standard deviations, and correlations of all variables. Table-2 presents the results of regression analysis regarding the effects of job satisfaction on organizational commitments.

<http://www.ejournalofscience.org>

Coefficients of Promotions, Personal relationships and Favorable conditions of work are positive and significant for affective commitment ($p < 0.01$, $p < 0.05$, and $p < 0.05$, respectively). These findings indicate that Employees would achieve a higher level of affective commitment if company has well- improved Promotions, Personal relationships and Favorable conditions of work. Accordingly, the results moderately support Hypothesis 1, which states that Components of job satisfaction are positively related to affective commitment.

Coefficients of Promotions, Personal relationships and Favorable conditions of work are positive and significant for normative commitment ($p < 0.01$, $p < 0.01$, and $p < 0.05$, respectively). These findings indicate that Employees would achieve a higher level of normative commitment if company has well- improved Promotions, Personal relationships and Favorable conditions of work.

Accordingly, the results moderately support Hypothesis 2, which states that Components of job satisfaction are positively related to normative commitment.

Coefficients of Promotions, Personal relationships and Favorable conditions of work are positive and significant for Continuance commitment ($p < 0.01$, $p < 0.01$, and $p < 0.01$, respectively). These findings indicate that Employees would achieve a higher level of Continuance commitment if company has well- improved Promotions, Personal relationships and Favorable conditions of work. Accordingly, the results moderately support Hypothesis 3, which states that Components of job satisfaction are positively related to Continuance commitment. In summary, all three Components of job satisfaction have the expected signs and also have significant effects on organizational commitment. Accordingly, the results support all of Hypotheses.

Table-1. Means, standard deviations, and correlations.

The Variables	Mean	S.D.	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Promotions	4.36	0.93	1.00					
2. Personal relationships	4.85	0.89	0.25*	1.00				
3. Favorable conditions of work	4.48	1.11	0.28*	0.19*	1.00			
4. affective commitment	5.16	0.69	0.21*	0.21*	0.56**	1.00		
5. normative commitment	4.32	0.78	0.53**	0.52**	0.22*	0.24*	1.00	
6. Continuance commitment	5.35	0.84	0.47**	0.51**	0.45**	0.18*	0.41**	1.00
* $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$								

Table-2. Results of regression analyses of organizational commitments.

Variables	organizational commitments		
	Affective commitment	Normative commitment	Continuance commitment
Components of job satisfaction			
Promotions	0.43**	0.53**	0.43**
Personal relationships	0.21*	0.45**	0.47**
Favorable conditions of work	0.18*	0.20*	0.51**
<i>R</i> ²	0.42	0.38	0.40
<i>F</i>	11.22**	13.64**	15.28**
(Two-tailed test). Standardized coefficients are reported. * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$			

5. DISCUSSIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

This study examines the role of job satisfaction on organizational commitments. Our results indicate that job satisfaction have positive and significant effects on organizational commitments. These findings highlight the critical roles of Components of job satisfaction in organizational commitments. The practical implication of the results is that managers need to actively improve their firm's job satisfaction to Employees would achieve a higher level of organizational commitments. Furthermore, research suggests appropriate investments in job satisfaction can enhance organizational commitments. This study has some limitations. The first limitation is the number of responses obtained from the survey was rather

small. A larger number of responses would probably yield a more accurate finding and so, future research could replicate this study, with the hope that more employees have implemented OC. In addition, since this study only investigates Iranian employees, hence, the findings and conclusions drawn from this research are representative of the Iranian employees, and the findings may not generalize to other geographic regions or cultures. Future studies can also examine the proposed relationships in other countries.

<http://www.ejournalofscience.org>**REFERENCE**

- Ahmad K.Z. and Abubakar R. 2003. The association between training and organizational commitment among white workers in Malaysia. *International Journal of Training and Development*. 7(3): 166-85.
- Allen N. and Meyer J. 1990. The measurement and antecedents of affirmative, continuance and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*. (63): 1-18.
- Angle H.L. and Perry J. 1981. An empirical assessment of organizational commitment and organizational effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*. 26: 1-13.
- Angle H. and Perry J. 1983. Organizational commitment: individual and organizational influences. *Work and Occupation*. 10(1983): 123-46.
- Bambacas M. and Bordia P. 2009. Predicting different commitment components: the relative effects of how career development HRM practices are perceived. *Journal of Management and Organization*. 15(2): 224-40.
- Becker H.S. 1960. Notes on the concept of commitment. *American Journal of Sociology*. 66(1): 32-40.
- Bergmann T.J., Lester S.W., De Meuse K.P. and Grahm J.L. 2000. Integrating the three domains of employee commitment: an exploratory study. *Journal of Applied Business Research*. 16(4): 15-26.
- Chen J.C. and Silverthorne C. 2008. The impact of locus of control on job stress, job performance and job satisfaction in Taiwan. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*. 29(7): 572-82.
- Chen S.H., Yang C.C., Shiau J.Y. and Wang H.H. 2006. The development of an employee satisfaction model for higher education. *The TQM Magazine*. 18(5): 484-500.
- Cohen A. 2003. *Multiple Commitments in the Workplace: An Integrative Approach*, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Mahwah, NJ.
- Cooper-Hakim A. and Viswesvaran C. 2005. The construct of work commitment: testing an integrative framework. *Psychological Bulletin*. 131(2): 241-59.
- Coopey J. 1995. Managerial culture and the stillbirth of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Journal*. 5(3): 56-76.
- Dipboye R.L., Smith C.S. and Howell W.C. 1994. *Understanding an Industrial and Integrated Organizational Approach Psychology*, Harcourt Brace College Publishers, Fort Worth, TX.
- Ellemers N., Gilder D. and Hevvel H. 1998. Career-oriented versus team-oriented commitment and behaviour at work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 33(5): 717-30.
- Feinstein A.H. and Vondrasek D. 2001. A study of relationships between job satisfaction and organizational commitment among restaurant employees. *Journal of Hospitality, Tourism, and Leisure Science*, available at: <http://hotel.unlv.edu/pdf/jobSatisfaction.pdf> (accessed April 15, 2007).
- Gaertner S. 1999. Structural determinants of job satisfaction and organizational commitment in turnover models. *Human Resource Management Review*. 9(4): 479-93.
- Griffin R.W. and Bateman T.S. 1986. Job satisfaction and organizational commitment. In Cooper, C.L. and Robertson, I. (Eds), *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, Wiley, New York, NY. pp. 157-88.
- Hair J.F., Anderson R.E., Tatham R.L. and Black W.C. 1998. *Multivariate Data Analysis*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
- Herscovitch L. and Meyer J.P. 2002. Commitment to organizational change: extension of a three-component model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 87: 474-87.
- Hope K.R. 2003. Employee perception of leadership and performance management in Botswana public service. *Public Personnel Management*. 32: 301-13.
- Hulin C. 1991. Adaptation, persistence, and commitment in organizations. In Dunnette, M.D. and Hough, L.M. (Eds), *Handbook of Industrial and Organisational Psychology*, Vol. 2, Consulting Psychologists Press, Palo Alto, CA.
- Hunt S.D. and Morgan R.M. 1994. Organizational commitment: one of many commitments or key mediating constructs? *Academy of Management Journal*. 37(6): 1568-87.
- Jernigan I.E., Beggs J.M. and Kohut G.F. 2002. Dimensions of work satisfaction as predictors of commitment type. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*. 17(7): 564-79.
- Klein H., Wesson M., Hollenbeck J. and Alge B. 1999. Goal commitment and the goal-setting process: conceptual clarification and empirical synthesis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 84: 885-96.
- Kim W.G., Leong J.K. and Lee Y. 2005. Effect of service orientation on job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and intention of leaving in a casual dining chain restaurant. *Hospitality Management*. 24: 171-93.
- Latham G.P. 2007. *Work Motivation: History, Theory, Research, and Practice*, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.

<http://www.ejournalofscience.org>

- Lee K., Allen N.J., Meyer J.P. and Rhee K.-Y. 2001. The three-component model of organizational commitment: an application to South Korea. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*. 50(4): 596-614.
- Lee T. 1988. How job dissatisfaction leads to turnover. *Journal of Business and Psychology*. 2: 263-71.
- Locke E.A. 1976. The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In Dunnette, M.D. (Ed.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, Rand McNally, Chicago, IL. pp. 1297-349.
- Locke E.A. 1969. What is job satisfaction? *Organizational Behaviour and Human Performance*. 4: 309-36.
- Lok P. and Crawford J. 2001. Antecedents of organizational commitment and the mediating role of job satisfaction. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*. 16(8): 594-613.
- Mathieu J. and Zajac D. 1990. Review and meta-analysis of the antecedents, correlates and consequences of organisational commitment. *Psychological Bulletin*. 108: 171-94.
- Meyer J.P. and Herscovitch L. 2001. Commitment in the workplace: toward a general model. *Human Resource Management Review*. 11(3): 299-326.
- Meyer J.P., Becker T.E. and Vandenberghe C. 2004. Employee commitment and motivation: a conceptual analysis and integrative model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 89(6): 991-1007.
- Meyer J.P., Irving P.G. and 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. and Allen N.J. 1984. Testing the 'side-bet' theory of organizational commitment: some methodological considerations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 69: 372-8.
- Meyer J.P. and Allen N.J. 1991. A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resources Management Review*. 1(1): 61-89.
- Meyer J.P., Allen N.J. and Gellatly I.R. 1990. Affective and continuance commitment to the organization: evaluation of measures and analysis of concurrent and time-lagged relations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 6: 710-20.
- Mowday R., Steers R. and Porter L. 1979. The measure of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*. 14(2): 224-7.
- Mowday R., Porter L. and Steers R. 1982. *Employee-organization Linkages: The Psychology of Commitment, Absenteeism, and Turnover*, Academic Press, New York, NY.
- Opayemi A.S. 2004. Personal attributes and organizational commitment among Nigerian police officers. *African Journal for the Psychological Study of Social Issues*. 7(2): 251-63.
- Oshagbemi T. 2003. Personal correlates of job satisfaction: empirical evidence from UK universities. *International Journal of Social Economics*. 30(12): 1210-32.
- Popoola S.O. 2006. Personal factors affecting organizational commitment of records management personnel in Nigerian State Universities. *Ife Psychologia*. 14(1): 183-97.
- Porter L.W., Steers R.M., Mowday R.T. and Boulian P.V. 1974. Organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover among psychiatric technicians. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 59(5): 603-9.
- Rose M. 2001. Disparate measures in the workplace quantifying overall job satisfaction. Paper presented at the 2001 BHPS Research Conference, Colchester.
- Salancik G.R. 1977. Commitment and the control of organizational behavior and belief. In Staw, B.M. and Salancik, G.R. (Eds), *New Directions in Organizational Behavior*, St Press, Chicago, IL.
- Schwepker C.H. 2001. Ethical climate's relationship to job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intention in the sales force. *Journal of Business Research*. 54: 39-52.
- Singh J., Verbeke W. and Rhoads G.K. 1996. Do organizational practices matter in role stress processes? A study of direct and moderating effects for market-oriented boundary spanners. *Journal of Marketing*. 60(3): 69-76.
- Spector P. 1997. *Job Satisfaction*, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Staw B.M. 1977. Two sides of commitment. Paper presented at the National Meeting of the Academy of Management, Orlando, FL, August 15.
- Sturges J., Conway N., Guest D. and Liefooghe A. 2005. Managing the career deal: the psychological contract as a framework for understanding career management, organizational commitment and work behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. 26(7): 821-38.
- Sullivan S.E. and Arthur M.B. 2006. The evolution of the boundary less career concept: examining physical and psychological mobility. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*. 69(1): 19-29.
- Testa M.R. 1999. Satisfaction with organizational vision, job satisfaction and service efforts: an empirical investigation. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*. 20(3): 154-61.

<http://www.ejournalofscience.org>

Weiss D.J., Dawis R.V., England G.W. and Lofquist L.H. 1967. Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (Minnesota Studies in Vocational Rehabilitation No. 22), Industrial Relations Center, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN.

Williams M.L. 1995. Antecedents of employee benefit level satisfaction: a test of a model. *Journal of Management*. 21: 1097-128.