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INTRODUCTION

Nowadays, employees’ commitment to their work and organization is one of the inconveniences of managers. Organizations annually expend many amounts to their human resources by which reduce expenditures, increase products’ qualities and customers’ satisfaction and finally, achieve the highest level of performance and productivity. In exception of organizations that put more committed and empowered employees to use, none of them has ability to success 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.

Human resources of today organizations find a key position in the priorities agenda of all concerns. Irrespective of the sales volume, budget or the manufacturing the processes and other organizational processes and properties, the central element and property which performs the work and gives its final shape is the human resources (Greenberg, 1990).

In today’s competitive world, human resource management played 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 different organizations, it is become inevitable to respond to critical question regarding how workers’ behaviors and attitudes influences psychological, individual and organizational factors (Allen and Meyer, 1997).

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

Much of the interest in analyzing job satisfaction and organizational commitment stems from concern for the behavioral consequences that are hypothesized to result from job satisfaction and/or organizational
commitment. Among other topics, 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 a variety of 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 and 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.

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’ tends can affect and influence work productivity, employee turnover and employee retention (Weiss et al., 1967).

Job satisfaction has been the object of study by psychologists, anthropologists, and sociologists for many years. Almost a quarter of a century ago, Locke compiled more than 3,300 articles on this topic and related issues. The number of publications has continued to grow since then, as job satisfaction has been linked to workers’ productivity, absenteeism, turnover, and organizational effectiveness (Locke, 1976; Carvajal and Hardigan, 2000).

There are a plethora of definitions of 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 identifies factors job satisfaction as pay, promotion, supervision, benefits, contingent, rewards, and communication. Spector (1997) refers 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” (Spector, 1997).

According to Schermerhorn (1996), job satisfaction defines as an affective or emotional response towards various aspects of an employee’s work. The author emphasizes that likely causes of job satisfaction include status, supervision, co-worker relationships, job content, remuneration and extrinsic rewards, promotion and physical conditions of the work environment, as well as organizational structure (Schermerhorn, 1996).

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. several antecedents of job satisfaction have been studied over the years including compensation, opportunity for advancement, leadership style, work environment, organizational and climate (Eslami and Gharakhani, 2012), working conditions, equitable rewards and compensation, and communication with the colleagues that seen to affect and influence on job satisfaction.

Satisfaction has been classified into three main classes: intrinsic, extrinsic, and total (Weiss et al., 1967).

Overall job satisfaction is actually a combination of intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction. Intrinsic job satisfaction is when workers consider only the kind of work they do, the tasks that make up the job. Extrinsic job satisfaction is when workers consider the conditions of work, such as their pay, co-workers, and supervisor (Nuchimuthu, 2010).

Intrinsic sources of job satisfaction primarily come from within the individual and essentially longer lasting that the extrinsic sources (Atchison, 1999).

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) (Eslami and Gharakhani, 2012).

In order to evaluate intrinsic job satisfaction, these should be some important key factors to be addressed such as ability utilization, achievement, activity, advancement, compensation, co-workers, creativity, independence, moral values, social service, social status, and working conditions. For extrinsic job satisfaction these factors are authority, company policies and practices, recognition, responsibility, remuneration security, and variety. In addition to intrinsic and extrinsic dimensions, there is a general job satisfaction facet in which there are two more factors such as supervision human-relations, supervision technical. When intrinsic, extrinsic and these two factors are summed up, then general job satisfaction is formed (Weiss et al., 1967).

Consequences of Job Satisfaction:

Satisfaction on the job influences many other organizational variables. These include not only work variables such as performance or turnover, but also personal or non-work variables such as health and satisfaction with life. The topic of job satisfaction is important because of its implications for job-related
variables such as motivation, job involvement, organizational citizenship behavior, organizational commitment, life satisfaction, mental health, job performance (Nuchimuthu, 2010). Also, job satisfaction can affect and influence on other individual and organizational crucial variables such as: absenteeism, burnout/exhaustion, work motivation, job and occupational stress, psychological distress, withdrawal behaviors, counterproductive behaviors, employee retention, job involvement, and enhancing performance and productivity of both of organization and its members that each of them have more influences on organizational effectiveness and performance.

Organizational Commitment:

Armstrong (1998) stated: “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)

Research on organizational commitment spans over four decades and remains an area of interest to both researchers and practitioners (WeiBo et al., 2010).

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

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 and Allen, 1991; Meyer and 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 goals, in combination, have implications for the individual’s goals, in combination, have implications for the organization, a desire to belong to the organization and a willingness to display effort on behalf of the organization”. (p. 319)

OC consists of three components: (a) affective 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-occur with organizational membership, and (c) normative commitment (NC) attachment that is based on motivation to conform to social norms regarding attachment (Allen and Meyer, 1990; Meyer and Allen, 1991; Meyer et al., 1998).

Mowday, Steers, and Porter (1982) stated:

“An individual becomes committed to an organization when (a) they internalize the goals and values of the organization; (b) they are willing to exert effort in the attainment of the organization’s goals, and (c) they have a strong desire to remain in the organization”. (p. 27)
A highly committed person will indicate a strong desire to remain a member of a particular organization, a willingness to exert high level of effort on behalf of the organization, and a definite belief and acceptance of the values and goals of the organization (Allen and Meyer, 1990; Jamal, 2011; Al-Hawajreh, 2011).

Organizational commitment had been identified to have significant relationships with job satisfaction, job involvement, stress, occupational commitment, and motivation (Marmaya et al., 2011).

Several researchers evaluated the theory of organizational commitment by linking this concept with such factors as: (1) turnover (e.g. Ben-Bakr et al., 1994; Curriivan, 1999; Shore and Martin, 1989; Geurts et al., 1999; Huselid and Day, 1991); (2) absenteeism (e.g. Geurts et al., 1999); (3) job involvement (e.g. Uygur and Kilic, 2009; Huselid and Day, 1991); (4) organizational citizenship behaviour (e.g. Feather and Rauter, 2004; Yilmaz and Cokluk-Bokeoglu, 2008; Gautam et al., 2005; Zeinabadi, 2010); (5) job performance (e.g. Paik et al., 2007; Shore and Martin, 1989; Ricetta, 2002), and (6) Effectiveness (Angle and Perry, 1981).

**Literature Review:**

**Relationship between Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment:**

The Importance of employing committed individuals had shown high significance when scholars began exploring the factors which influenced employees’ organizational commitment (Fadzilla et al., 2013). Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment are widely studied factors in management literature. Also, relationships between Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment are widely studied by authors (e.g. Shore and Martin, 1989; Curriivan, 1999; Al-Ameri, 2000; Meyer et al., 2002; Wu and Norman, 2006; Chughtai and Zafar, 2006; Paik et al. 2007; Lok et al., 2007; Al-Hussami, 2008; Warsi et al., 2009; Malik et al., 2010; Ahmad et al., 2010; Gunlu et al., 2010; Azeem, 2010; Lumley et al., 2011; Eslami and Gharakhani, 2012; 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 and Martin, 1989).

In 1999, Curriivan studied four possible models of the causal relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment in models of employee turnover: (1) satisfaction precedes commitment, (2) commitment precedes satisfaction, (3) satisfaction and commitment have a reciprocal relationship, and (4) satisfaction and commitment have no significant relationship. Structural equation models with two-wave panel data revealed no significant effects between satisfaction and commitment, and the overall fit for each of the four alternative models in virtually identical (Curriivan, 1999).

Al-Ameri (2000) studied relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment for nurses, and the means and standard deviations showed that nurses were satisfied with their jobs to some extent, and they were slightly committed to their hospitals. A strong positive correlation between job satisfaction and organizational commitment was found at 0.59 (p<.01). Also, it found that satisfied nurses tend to have a higher degree of commitment than less satisfied ones (Al-Ameri, 2000).

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 (Meyer et al., 2002).

Wu and Norman (2006) found that there was a positive relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Wu and Norman, 2006).

A recent study (Chughtai and Zafar, 2006) found that facets of job satisfaction were significantly related to organizational commitment (Chughtai and Zafar, 2006).

Paik et al. (2007) found that only affective commitment was positively related to job satisfaction and performance (Paik et al., 2007).

One study (Lok et al., 2007) found that there was a positive relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Lok et al., 2007).

AL-Hussami (2008) studied relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment, and found that there was a positive relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment (AL-Hussami, 2008).

One study (Warsi et al., 2009) found that there was a positive and significant relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Warsi et al., 2009).

One study (Azeem, 2010) found that a moderate significant positive relationship was found among job satisfaction facets and organizational commitment (Azeem, 2010).

Malik et al. (2010) found that the satisfaction with work itself, quality of supervision and pay satisfaction, had significant positive influence on organizational commitment of faculty members (Malik et al., 2010).
One study (Ahmad et al., 2010) found there was no significant relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Ahmad et al., 2010).

Gunlu et al., (2010) found that the extrinsic, intrinsic, and general job satisfaction had a significant effect on normative and affective commitment, but, the dimensions of job satisfaction do not had a significant effect on continuance commitment (Gunlu et al., 2010).

One study (Lumley et al., 2011) found 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 (Lumley et al., 2011).

Eslami and Gharakhani (2012) found that three factors of job satisfaction (promotions, personal relationships, and favorable conditions of work) had positive and significant effects on organizational commitment (Eslami and Gharakhani, 2012).

A recent study (Emhan, 2012) indicates 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 (Emhan, 2012).

**Biographical Characteristics’ Effect on Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment:**

Empirical evidence has been produced whose relationships between Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment with biographical characteristics are widely studied, such as:

1. Age (Angle and Perry, 1981; Clark, 1996; Clark et al., 1996; Al-Ameri, 2000; Alavi and Askaripur, 2003; Bender et al., 2005; Chuhtai and Zafar, 2006; Azeeem, 2010; Gunlu et al., 2010; Iqbal, 2010);
2. Gender (Angle and Perry, 1981; Clark, 1996; Alavi and Askaripur, 2003; Bender et al., 2005; Nachimuthu, 2006; Bender and Heywood, 2006; Mohd Suki and Mohd Suki, 2011);
3. Tenure (Al-Ameri, 2000; Bedeian et al., 1992; Alavi and Askaripur, 2003; Bender et al., 2005; Bender and Heywood, 2006; Chuhtai and Zafar, 2006; Azeeem, 2010; Iqbal, 2010);
4. Educational level (Clark, 1996; Alavi and Askaripur, 2003; Bender et al., 2005; Chuhtai and Zafar, 2006; Gunlu et al., 2010; Iqbal, 2010; Bakan et al., 2011);
5. Marital status (Al-Ameri, 2000; Alavi and Askaripur, 2003; Md Dawal et al., 2003; Chuhtai and Zafar, 2006; Azalea et al., 2009); and

Above research results were inconsistent with each other. Some studies found that there was no significant relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment with biographical characteristics (age, gender, tenure, educational level, marital status, and number of dependents). Others showed that there was significant relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment with biographical characteristics (either positive or negative (inverse)). Thus, in this section, we would say some of them as following:

Angle and Perry (1981) found that a significant relationship existed between gender and organizational commitment of worker in public sector organizations, and that women were more committed to their organizations than men, and also age was positively related to organizational commitment (Angle and Perry, 1981).

One study (Al-Ameri, 2000) found that age was significantly correlated with satisfaction and commitment, experience was correlated only with the commitment, and also Analysis of variance showed that nurses differed in their degree of commitment in terms of their marital status (Al-Ameri, 2000).

A recent study (Chuhtai and Zafar, 2006) found that none of the four demographic variables (age, tenure, marital status, and level of education) were found to be significantly related to organizational commitment (Chuhtai and Zafar, 2006).

A recent study (Lin, 2009) indicates that the age and organizational tenure had a significant positive relationship with continuance commitment, and also indicates that educational level was not significantly correlated with continuance commitment, and that differences in marital status resulted in different levels of continuance commitment (Lin, 2009).

One study (Azeeem, 2010) found that a moderate significant positive relationship was found among job satisfaction facets, demographical factors (age and tenure), and organizational commitment (Azeeem, 2010).

Gunlu et al., (2010) found that the characteristics such as age and education had a significant relationship with extrinsic job satisfaction (Gunlu et al., 2010).

Iqbal (2010) studied relationship between demographical factors and organizational commitment, and found that length of service (tenure) was significantly associated with organizational commitment, whereas, educational level was negatively correlated with organizational commitment. Furthermore, no significant was found between organizational commitment and age (Iqbal, 2010).

Bakan et al., (2011) found that the educational level had a significant relationship with affective, continuance, and normative commitment (Bakan et al., 2011).
Objectives:

In this paper, we investigate the relationship between Biographical Characteristics, Job Satisfaction, and Organizational Commitment of Mazandaran Fishery and Marine Organization’s employees in Islamic Republic of Iran. According to mentioned subjects, the study hypothesizes were including:

$H_1$: there is a significant relationship between Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment of Mazandaran Fishery and Marine Organization’s employees.

$H_2$: there is a significant relationship between Intrinsic Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment of Mazandaran Fishery and Marine Organization’s employees.

$H_3$: there is a significant relationship between Extrinsic Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment of Mazandaran Fishery and Marine Organization’s employees.

$H_4$: there is a significant relationship between Job Satisfaction and Affective Commitment of Mazandaran Fishery and Marine Organization’s employees.

$H_5$: there is a significant relationship between Intrinsic Job Satisfaction and Affective Commitment of Mazandaran Fishery and Marine Organization’s employees.

$H_6$: there is a significant relationship between Extrinsic Job Satisfaction and Affective Commitment of Mazandaran Fishery and Marine Organization’s employees.

$H_7$: there is a significant relationship between Job Satisfaction and Continuance Commitment of Mazandaran Fishery and Marine Organization’s employees.

$H_8$: there is a significant relationship between Intrinsic Job Satisfaction and Continuance Commitment of Mazandaran Fishery and Marine Organization’s employees.

$H_9$: there is a significant relationship between Extrinsic Job Satisfaction and Continuance Commitment of Mazandaran Fishery and Marine Organization’s employees.

$H_{10}$: there is a significant relationship between Job Satisfaction and Normative Commitment of Mazandaran Fishery and Marine Organization’s employees.

$H_{11}$: there is a significant relationship between Intrinsic Job Satisfaction and Normative Commitment of Mazandaran Fishery and Marine Organization’s employees.

$H_{12}$: there is a significant relationship between Extrinsic Job Satisfaction and Normative Commitment of Mazandaran Fishery and Marine Organization’s employees.

$H_{13}$: there is a significant relationship between Biographical Characteristics (age, tenure, educational level, and number of dependents), Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment and their dimensions of Mazandaran Fishery and Marine Organization’s employees.

$H_{14}$: the levels of Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment among Mazandaran Fishery and Marine Organization’s employees differ in terms of their gender and marital status.

Methodology:

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 Mazandaran Fishery and Marine Organization’s employees ($N=150$). In order to determination of statistical sample equal to statistical population, the Kokran formula was used ($n=108$).

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 (0.777) and for job satisfaction was (0.931) indicating high internal consistency (see table 1). Then, 108 questionnaires distributed among employees that among them, 100 questionnaires were returned. Data collected were analyzed by the application of statistical tests i.e., Pearson Correlation and Multiple Regression using SPSS 19.

Results:

Descriptive Findings:

The age of participants showed that 15 employees (15%) were between 24 to 33 years old, 34 employees (34%) between 34 to 43 years old, 44 employees (44%) between 44 to 53 years old, and 7 employees (7%) were between 54 to 58 years old. The gender showed that 89 employees (89%) were men and 11 employees (11%) were women. The educational levels of participants showed that 13 employees (13%) were under diploma, 20 employees (20%) diploma, 7 employees (7%) undergraduates, 47 employees (47%) graduates, 12 employees (12%) postgraduates, and 1 employee (1%) was Ph.D. The marital status of participants showed that 6 employees (6%) were single and 94 employees (94%) were married. The range of organizational tenure showed
that 13 employees (13%) were tenured less than 5 years, 6 employees (6%) were between 5 and 10 years, 19 employees (19%) between 11 and 15 years, 18 employees (18%) between 16 and 20 years, 26 employees (26%) between 21 and 25 years, 18 employees (18%) were tenured between 26 and 30 years.

**Inferential Findings:**

**Correlation Analysis:**

It was found that 4 employees (4%) were very dissatisfied, 16 employees (16%) dissatisfied, 31 employees (31%) were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, 41 employees (41%) were satisfied, and 8 employees (8%) were very satisfied.

In order to study the relationships between job satisfaction and its dimensions with organizational commitment and its components used Pearson Correlation Test (PCT).

Table 1 shows the Cronbach’s α (Cron.’s α), Means, Standard Deviations (S.D.), Kolmogorov-Smirnov (K-S), and Correlations among of all variables (see table 1).

**Table 1:** The correlation matrix of biographical characteristics, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and their dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Cron.‘s α</th>
<th>K-S</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>GJS</td>
<td>71.9</td>
<td>12.28</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>JJS</td>
<td>42.87</td>
<td>7.58</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>.880</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>EJS</td>
<td>21.55</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>.836</td>
<td>.768</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>OC</td>
<td>76.79</td>
<td>9.53</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>.391</td>
<td>.392</td>
<td>.365</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>25.26</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>.269</td>
<td>.263</td>
<td>.234</td>
<td>.678</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>32.19</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>.420</td>
<td>.424</td>
<td>.391</td>
<td>.515</td>
<td>.443</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>26.32</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>.256</td>
<td>.251</td>
<td>.248</td>
<td>.821</td>
<td>.477</td>
<td>.495</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>42.76</td>
<td>8.27</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>EL</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.116</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>0.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>17.38</td>
<td>8.13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Notes: S.D.: Standard Deviation; Cron.’s α: Cronbach’s α; K-S: Kolmogorov-Smirnov; GJS= General Job Satisfaction; IJS: Intrinsic Job Satisfaction; EJS: Extrinsic Job Satisfaction; OC: Organizational Commitment; AC: Affective Commitment; CC: Continuance Commitment; NC: Normative Commitment; EL: Educational Level; ND: Number of Dependents.

First, Hypothesis 1 is related to relationship between general job satisfaction and organizational commitment. In order to test $H_1$, correlation analysis was performed. According to the correlation matrix, the analysis and computation of the data by SPSS output show that there is a significant and positive correlation between total scores of general job satisfaction and organizational commitment ($r = 0.391^{**}$, $p < 0.05$), 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 and 3 are related to relationship between intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction and organizational commitment. In order to test $H_2$ and $H_3$, correlation analysis was performed. According to the correlation matrix, there is a significant and positive correlation between total scores of intrinsic job satisfaction and organizational commitment ($r = 0.392^{**}$, $p < 0.05$), so there is a positive significant correlation between total scores of extrinsic job satisfaction and organizational commitment ($r = 0.365^{**}$, $p < 0.05$), indicating that the employees who are more satisfied with intrinsic and extrinsic status of their job are also more committed to their organization (see table 1). Therefore, these results provide support for Hypothesis 2 and 3 ($H_2$ and $H_3$ are accepted).

Third, Hypothesis 4 is related to relationship between job satisfaction and affective commitment. In order to test $H_4$, correlation analysis was performed. According to the correlation matrix, there is a significant and positive correlation between total scores of job satisfaction and affective commitment ($r = 0.260^{**}$, $p < 0.05$), indicating that the employees who are more satisfied with their job are also more affectively committed to their organization (see table 1). Therefore, these results provide support for Hypothesis 4 ($H_4$ is accepted).

Forth, Hypothesis 5 is related to relationship between intrinsic job satisfaction and affective commitment. In order to test $H_5$, correlation analysis was performed. According to the correlation matrix, there is a significant and positive correlation between total scores of intrinsic job satisfaction and affective commitment ($r = 0.263^{**}$, $p < 0.05$), indicating that the employees who are more satisfied with intrinsic status of their job are also more affectively committed to their organization (see table 1). Therefore, these results provide support for Hypothesis 5 ($H_5$ is accepted).

Fifth, Hypothesis 6 is related to relationship between extrinsic job satisfaction and affective commitment. In order to test $H_6$, correlation analysis was performed. According to the correlation matrix, there is a significant and positive correlation between total scores of extrinsic job satisfaction and affective commitment ($r = 0.234^{**}$,
indicating that the employees who are more satisfied with extrinsic status of their job are also more affectively committed to their organization (see table 1). Therefore, these results provide support for Hypothesis 6 ($H_6$ is accepted).

Sixth, Hypothesis 7 is related to relationship between job satisfaction and continuance commitment. In order to test $H_7$, correlation analysis was performed. According to the correlation matrix, there is a significant and positive correlation between total scores of job satisfaction and continuance commitment ($r = 0.420^{*}, p < 0.05$), indicating that the employees who are more satisfied with their job are also more continually committed to their organization (see table 1). Therefore, these results provide support for Hypothesis 7 ($H_7$ is accepted).

Seventh, Hypothesis 8 is related to relationship between intrinsic job satisfaction and continuance commitment. In order to test $H_8$, correlation analysis was performed. According to the correlation matrix, there is a significant and positive correlation between total scores of intrinsic job satisfaction and continuance commitment ($r = 0.424^{*}, p < 0.05$), indicating that the employees who are more satisfied with intrinsic status of their job are also more continually committed to their organization (see table 1). Therefore, these results provide support for Hypothesis 8 ($H_8$ is accepted).

Eighth, Hypothesis 9 is related to relationship between extrinsic job satisfaction and continuance commitment. In order to test $H_9$, correlation analysis was performed. According to the correlation matrix, there is a significant and positive correlation between total scores of extrinsic job satisfaction and continuance commitment ($r = 0.248^{*}, p < 0.05$), indicating that the employees who are more satisfied with extrinsic status of their job are also more normally committed to their organization (see table 1). Therefore, these results provide support for Hypothesis 9 ($H_9$ is accepted).

Ninth, Hypothesis 10 is related to relationship between job satisfaction and normative commitment. In order to test $H_{10}$, correlation analysis was performed. According to the correlation matrix, there is a significant and positive correlation between total scores of job satisfaction and normative commitment ($r = 0.256^{*}, p < 0.05$), indicating that the employees who are more satisfied with their job are also more normally committed to their organization (see table 1). Therefore, these results provide support for Hypothesis 10 ($H_{10}$ is accepted).

Tenth, Hypothesis 11 is related to relationship between intrinsic job satisfaction and normative commitment. In order to test $H_{11}$, correlation analysis was performed. According to the correlation matrix, there is a significant and positive correlation between total scores of intrinsic job satisfaction and normative commitment ($r = 0.251^{*}, p < 0.05$), indicating that the employees who are more satisfied with intrinsic status of their job are also more normally committed to their organization (see table 1). Therefore, these results provide support for Hypothesis 11 ($H_{11}$ is accepted).

Eleventh, Hypothesis 12 is related to relationship between extrinsic job satisfaction and normative commitment. In order to test $H_{12}$, correlation analysis was performed. According to the correlation matrix, there is a significant and positive correlation between total scores of extrinsic job satisfaction and normative commitment ($r = 0.248^{*}, p < 0.05$), indicating that the employees who are more satisfied with extrinsic status of their job are also more normally committed to their organization (see table 1). Therefore, these results provide support for Hypothesis 12 ($H_{12}$ is accepted).

Twelfth, Hypothesis 13a is related to relationship between biographical characteristics (age, tenure, educational level, and number of dependents), job satisfaction, organizational commitment and their dimensions. In order to test $H_{13a}$, correlation analysis was performed. According to the correlation matrix, there is no significant correlation between biographical characteristics (age, tenure, educational level, and number of dependents), job satisfaction, organizational commitment and their dimensions (see table 1). Therefore, these results don’t provide support for Hypothesis 13a ($H_{13a}$ is not accepted).

Thirteenth, Hypothesis 13b is related to different levels of job satisfaction and organizational commitment among employees in terms of their gender and marital status. In order to test $H_{13b}$, independent sample t-test was performed. According to table 2, analysis results indicated that the levels of job satisfaction in terms of gender ($t = 0.44, p = 0.65 > 0.05$) and marital status ($t = -0.39, p = 0.69 > 0.05$), and the levels of organizational commitment in terms of gender ($t = 1.33, p = 0.18 > 0.05$) and marital status ($t = -1.33, p = 0.19 > 0.05$) are not different among the employees (see table 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>T-Statistic</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>72.11</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>70.36</td>
<td>15.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>-0.39</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>12.35</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Commitment</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>71.83</td>
<td>-1.31</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>77.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regression Analysis:
In order to predict the effects and influences of job satisfaction and its dimensions on organizational commitment and its components used Regression Analysis (RA). 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 3) indicated the predictive effects of employees’ intrinsic job satisfaction ($\beta = 0.40, t = 4.21, P = 0.000 < 0.05$), extrinsic job satisfaction ($\beta = 0.36, t = 3.88, P = 0.000 < 0.05$), and general job satisfaction ($\beta = 0.39, t = 4.20, P = 0.000 < 0.05$) on organizational commitment. The results of the analysis indicated that organizational commitment was a function of independent variables (intrinsic, extrinsic, and general job satisfaction). As seen in table 3, the regression coefficients had positive values indicating that as job satisfaction levels increased, organizational commitment increased as well (see table 3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Commitment</th>
<th>T-Statistic</th>
<th>Standard error</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>10.45</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>54.99</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.391</td>
<td>0.153</td>
<td>17.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>10.94</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>55.65</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.392</td>
<td>0.154</td>
<td>17.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>0.117</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>11.36</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>57.46</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.365</td>
<td>0.133</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>0.231</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Second, the results of the regression analysis (table 4) indicated the predictive effects of employees’ intrinsic job satisfaction ($\beta = 0.27, t = 2.70, P = 0.008 < 0.05$), extrinsic job satisfaction ($\beta = 0.23, t = 2.37, P = 0.019 < 0.05$), and general job satisfaction ($\beta = 0.26, t = 2.66, P = 0.009 < 0.05$) on affective commitment. The results of the analysis indicated that affective commitment was a 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, affective commitment increased as well (see table 4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affective Commitment</th>
<th>T-Statistic</th>
<th>Standard error</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>9.29</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>19.70</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.260</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>7.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>9.68</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>19.82</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.263</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>10.12</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>20.53</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.234</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Third, the results of the regression analysis (table 5) indicated the predictive effects of employees’ intrinsic job satisfaction ($\beta = 0.43, t = 4.64, P = 0.000 < 0.05$), extrinsic job satisfaction ($\beta = 0.39, t = 4.20, P = 0.000 < 0.05$), and general job satisfaction ($\beta = 0.42, t = 4.57, P = 0.000 < 0.05$) on continuance commitment. The results of the analysis indicated that continuance commitment was a 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, continuance commitment increased as well (see table 5).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Continuance Commitment</th>
<th>T-Statistic</th>
<th>Standard error</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>6.62</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>14.98</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.420</td>
<td>0.176</td>
<td>20.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.142</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>6.97</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>15.27</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.424</td>
<td>0.180</td>
<td>21.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.233</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>7.41</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>16.16</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.391</td>
<td>0.153</td>
<td>17.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.419</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fourth, the results of the regression analysis (table 6) indicated the predictive effects of employees’ intrinsic job satisfaction ($\beta = 0.25, t = 2.56, P = 0.01 < 0.05$), extrinsic job satisfaction ($\beta = 0.24, t = 2.53, P = 0.01 < 0.05$), and general job satisfaction ($\beta = 0.26, t = 2.61, P = 0.01 < 0.05$) on normative commitment. The results of the analysis indicated that normative commitment was a function of intrinsic, extrinsic, and general job satisfaction. As seen in table 6, the regression coefficients had positive values indicating that as job satisfaction levels increased, normative commitment increased as well (see table 6).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Normative Commitment</th>
<th>T-Statistic</th>
<th>Standard error</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>8.71</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>20.30</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.236</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: The regression analysis for predicting effect of intrinsic, extrinsic and general job satisfaction on organizational commitment
Table 4: The regression analysis for predicting effect of intrinsic, extrinsic and general job satisfaction on affective commitment
Table 5: The regression analysis for predicting effect of intrinsic, extrinsic and general job satisfaction on continuance commitment
Table 6: The regression analysis for predicting effect of intrinsic, extrinsic and general job satisfaction on normative commitment
Discussion:
Results of the correlation test showed that there was significant and positive relationship between job satisfaction with organizational commitment consistent with (Mowday et al., 1982; Shore and Martin, 1989; Al-Ameri, 2000; Wu and Norman, 2006; Lok et al., 2007; AL-Hussami, 2008; Warsi et al., 2009; Azeem, 2010; Malik et al., 2010; Gunlu et al., 2010; Lumley et al., 2011; Eslami and Gharakhani, 2012) and inconsistent with (Curriivan, 1999; Ahmad et al., 2010), affective commitment consistent with (Meyer et al., 2002; Paik et al., 2007; Gunlu et al., 2010; Lumley et al., 2011; Emhan, 2012), continuance commitment inconsistent with (Meyer et al., 2002; Gunlu et al., 2010; Lumley et al., 2011), and normative commitment consistent with (Meyer et al., 2002; Gunlu et al., 2010; Lumley et al., 2011) and inconsistent with (Emhan, 2012). Also, there were significant and positive relationship between dimensions of job satisfaction and organizational commitment and so between components of organizational commitment and dimensions of job satisfaction. There was no significant correlation between biographical characteristics (age, tenure, educational level, and number of dependents), job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Analysis results indicated that the levels of job satisfaction and organizational commitment are not different among the employees in terms of gender and marital status.

The results of the regression analysis indicated the predictive effects of employees’ intrinsic, extrinsic, and general job satisfaction on organizational commitment, affective commitment, continuance commitment, and normative commitment. The regression coefficients had positive values indicating that as intrinsic, extrinsic, and general job satisfaction levels increased, organizational commitment, affective commitment, continuance commitment, and normative commitment levels increased as well.

Conclusion:
The purpose of the present research was to investigate the relationship between biographical characteristics, job satisfaction and organizational commitment of Mazandaran Fishery and Marine Organization’s employees in the Islamic Republic of Iran.

Nowadays, enroute of growth and productivity to improve the performance and effectiveness, organizations are needed to committed employees to accomplishment to their objectives. Because, employees with higher level of commitment to their organizations’ objectives have higher job involvement, higher level of personal satisfaction, have better relations with co-workers, have lower level of absenteeism, personal turnover, sabotages, counterproductive and withdrawal behaviors, and perform their jobs better than employees with lower level commitment.

According to present research results and in order to create attachment and/or commitment sense within employees towards their job and organization, managers of the organization should provide primarily the context of their satisfaction enhancement because, it is assumed that job satisfaction logically can affect and influence on organizational commitment as this assumption is supported by the results of present research, they doing effort beyond organizational formal tasks that is called “Organizational Citizenship Behavior” (OCB).

Some of the contexts that pragmatically caused high levels of satisfaction and then high levels of commitment within employees include compensation, policies, increasing well-being, working conditions, building trust, teamwork, and employee training, participating, and empowerment.

One of the best ways to promotion of employee’s commitment is employee involvement in organization affairs and matters. Involvement creates ownership which increases loyalty and commitment which increases accountability. Involved employees generally are happy employees, and happy employees contribute to the success of the organization. Make sure the employees understand the “assignment” and the extent of their involvement.
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