



AENSI Journals

Journal of Applied Science and Agriculture

ISSN 1816-9112

Journal home page: www.aensiweb.com/jasa/index.html

An Investigation of Relationship between Employees' Biographical Characteristics, Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment

¹Hamzeh Samadi Miarkolaei and ²Hossein Samadi Miarkolaei

¹Islamic Azad University, Tehran's Science and Research Branch, Department of Public Administration, Faculty of Management and Economy, Tehran, Iran.

²Islamic Azad University, Qaemshahr Branch, Department of Public Administration, Faculty of Management, Qaemshahr, Iran.

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 23 December 2013

Received in revised form 25

February 2014

Accepted 26 February 2014

Available online 15 March 2014

Keywords:

Job Satisfaction

Organizational Commitment

Biographical Characteristics

Mazandaran Fishery and Marine

Organization

ABSTRACT

Background: Job satisfaction refers to cognitive, affective and evaluative reactions or attitude and state that it 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 that an individual accepts, internalizes, and views his or her role based on organizational values and goals. **Objective:** The purpose of present research was to investigate the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment of Mazandaran Fishery and Marine Organization's employees ($N=150$ and $n=108$). **Results:** Results showed that there were significant relationships among employees' biographical characteristics, job satisfaction and its' dimensions, and organizational commitment and its' components. 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. **Conclusion:** 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. 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.

© 2014 AENSI Publisher All rights reserved.

To Cite This Article: Hamzeh Samadi Miarkolaei and Hossein Samadi Miarkolaei., An Investigation of Relationship between Employees' Biographical Characteristics, Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment. *J. Appl. Sci. & Agric.*, 9(2): 578-590, 2014

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

Corresponding Author: Hamzeh Samadi Miarkolaei, Islamic Azad University, Tehran's Science and Research Branch, Department of Public Administration, Faculty of Management and Economy, Tehran, Iran.
E-mail: hamzeh_samadi@yahoo.com

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 than 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 Parboteeah, 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 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 and Perry, 1981).

OC is an essential element of employee's 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).

The concept of commitment in the workplace is still one of the most challenging and researched concepts in the fields of management, organizational behavior, and HRM (WeiBo *et al.*, 2010; Sowmya and Panchanatham, 2011).

Allen and Meyer (1990; Meyer and 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 and Meyer, 1990; Meyer and Allen, 1991; Meyer *et al.*, 2004).

Meyer and Allen's three-component model of OC has been the dominant framework for OC research in 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 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; Currivan, 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; Riketta, 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 begun 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; Currivan, 1999; Al-Aameri, 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, Currivan 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 (Currivan, 1999).

Al-Aameri (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-Aameri, 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-Aameri, 2000; Alavi and Askaripur, 2003; Bender *et al.*, 2005; Chughtai and Zafar, 2006; Azeem, 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-Aameri, 2000; Bedeian *et al.*, 1992; Alavi and Askaripur, 2003; Bender *et al.*, 2005; Bender and Heywood, 2006; Chughtai and Zafar, 2006; Azeem, 2010; Iqbal, 2010);

(4) Educational level (Clark, 1996; Alavi and Askaripur, 2003; Bender *et al.*, 2005; Chughtai and Zafar, 2006; Gunlu *et al.*, 2010; Iqbal, 2010; Bakan *et al.*, 2011);

(5) Marital status (Al-Aameri, 2000; Alavi and Askaripur, 2003; Md Dawal *et al.*, 2003; Chughtai and Zafar, 2006; Azalea *et al.*, 2009), and

(6) Number of dependents (Alavi and Askaripur, 2003).

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-Aameri, 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-Aameri, 2000).

A recent study (Chughtai 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 (Chughtai 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 (Azeem, 2010) found that a moderate significant positive relationship was found among job satisfaction facets, demographical factors (age and tenure), and organizational commitment (Azeem, 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:

H₁: there is a significant relationship between Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment of Mazandaran Fishery and Marine Organization's employees.

H₂: there is a significant relationship between Intrinsic Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment of Mazandaran Fishery and Marine Organization's employees.

H₃: there is a significant relationship between Extrinsic Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment of Mazandaran Fishery and Marine Organization's employees.

H₄: there is a significant relationship between Job Satisfaction and Affective Commitment of Mazandaran Fishery and Marine Organization's employees.

H₅: there is a significant relationship between Intrinsic Job Satisfaction and Affective Commitment of Mazandaran Fishery and Marine Organization's employees.

H₆: there is a significant relationship between Extrinsic Job Satisfaction and Affective Commitment of Mazandaran Fishery and Marine Organization's employees.

H₇: there is a significant relationship between Job Satisfaction and Continuance Commitment of Mazandaran Fishery and Marine Organization's employees.

H₈: there is a significant relationship between Intrinsic Job Satisfaction and Continuance Commitment of Mazandaran Fishery and Marine Organization's employees.

H₉: there is a significant relationship between Extrinsic Job Satisfaction and Continuance Commitment of Mazandaran Fishery and Marine Organization's employees.

H₁₀: there is a significant relationship between Job Satisfaction and Normative Commitment of Mazandaran Fishery and Marine Organization's employees.

H₁₁: there is a significant relationship between Intrinsic Job Satisfaction and Normative Commitment of Mazandaran Fishery and Marine Organization's employees.

H₁₂: there is a significant relationship between Extrinsic Job Satisfaction and Normative Commitment of Mazandaran Fishery and Marine Organization's employees.

H_{13a}: 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_{13b}: 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 6 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

Row	Variables	Mean	S.D.	Cron.'s α	K-S	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	GJS	71.9	12.28	0.93	0.86	1						
2	IJS	42.87	7.58	0.89	0.31	.880**	1					
3	EJS	21.55	3.88	0.80	0.34	.836**	.768**	1				
4	OC	76.79	9.53	0.79	0.19	.391**	.392**	.365**	1			
5	AC	25.28	3.66	0.75	0.18	.260**	.263**	.234*	.678**	1		
6	CC	25.19	4.15	0.72	0.28	.420**	.424**	.391**	.715**	.443**	1	
7	NC	26.32	4.02	0.70	0.47	.256*	.251*	.248*	.821**	.477**	.495**	1
8	Age	42.76	8.27	-	-	0.018	0.04	0.06	0.018	0.036	0.025	0.05
9	EL	-	-	-	-	0.08	0.042	0.15	0.05	0.014	0.008	0.145
10	ND	3.26	2.21	-	-	0.002	0.013	0.025	0.13	0.116	0.143	0.075
11	Tenure	17.38	8.13	-	-	0.04	0.03	0.06	0.02	0.07	0.05	0.06

*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 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 ($r = 0.234^{**}$,

$p < 0.05$), 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 continual 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 continual 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 ($r = 0.391^{**}$, $p < 0.05$), indicating that the employees who are more satisfied with extrinsic status of their job are also more continual 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 2: independent sample t-test

Variables			Number	Mean	S.D.	T-Statistic	Sig
Job Satisfaction	Gender	Male	89	72.11	11.97	0.44	0.65
		Female	11	70.36	15.13		
	Marital Status	Single	6	12.1	70.0	-0.39	0.69
		Married	94	12.35	72.2		
Organizational Commitment	Gender	Male	89	77.1	9.6	1.33	0.18
		Female	11	73.2	7.5		
	Marital Status	Single	6	9.8	71.83	-1.31	0.19
		Married	94	9.4	77.11		

Regression Analysis:

In order to prediction 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 3: 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 ²	F
Constant	10.45	5.26		54.99	0.000	0.391	0.153	17.64
General Job Satisfaction	4.20	0.07	0.39	0.30	0.000			
Constant	10.94	5.08		55.65	0.000	0.392	0.154	17.79
Intrinsic Job Satisfaction	4.21	0.117	0.40	0.49	0.000			
Constant	11.36	5.05		57.46	0.000	0.365	0.133	15.6
Extrinsic Job Satisfaction	3.88	0.231	0.36	0.89	0.000			

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 4: 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 ²	F
Constant	9.29	2.12		19.70	0.000	0.260	0.06	7.11
General Job Satisfaction	2.66	0.02	0.26	0.07	0.009			
Constant	9.68	2.04		19.82	0.000	0.263	0.07	7.30
Intrinsic Job Satisfaction	2.70	0.04	0.27	0.12	0.008			
Constant	10.12	2.02		20.53	0.000	0.234	0.05	5.66
Extrinsic Job Satisfaction	2.37	0.09	0.23	0.22	0.019			

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 5: 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 ²	F
Constant	6.62	2.26		14.98	0.000	0.420	0.176	20.93
General Job Satisfaction	4.57	0.03	0.42	0.142	0.000			
Constant	6.97	2.18		15.217	0.000	0.424	0.180	21.52
Intrinsic Job Satisfaction	4.64	0.05	0.43	0.233	0.000			
Constant	7.41	2.17		16.16	0.000	0.391	0.153	17.72
Extrinsic Job Satisfaction	4.20	0.10	0.39	0.419	0.000			

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 6: 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 ²	F
Constant	8.71	2.31		20.30	0.000	0.256	0.06	6.84
General Job Satisfaction	2.61	0.03	0.26	0.084	0.01			

Constant	9.13	2.25		20.61	0.000	0.251	0.06	6.58
Intrinsic Job Satisfaction	2.56	0.05	0.25	0.133	0.01			
Constant	9.36	2.21		20.77	0.000	0.248	0.07	6.43
Extrinsic Job Satisfaction	2.53	0.10	0.24	0.257	0.01			

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-Aameri, 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 (Curri van, 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 affaires 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.

REFERENCES

- Addae, H.M., K.P. Parboteeah and N. Velinor, 2008. Role stressors and organizational commitment: public sector employment in St Lucia. *International Journal of Manpower*, 29(6): 567-582.
- Ahmad, H., K. Ahmad and A. Ali Shah, 2010. Relationship between Job Satisfaction, Job Performance Attitude towards Work and Organizational Commitment. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 18(2): 257-267.
- Alavi, H.R., and M.R. Askaripur, 2003. The relationship between self-esteem and job satisfaction of personnel in government organizations. *Public Personnel Management*, 32(4): 591-599.
- Al-Aameri, A.S., 2000. Job satisfaction and organizational commitment for nurses. *Saudi Medical Journal*, 21(6): 531-535.

Al-Hawajreh, K., 2011. Exploring the Relationship between Occupational Stress and Organizational Commitment among Nurses in Selected Jordanian Hospitals. *An - Najah University Journal Resource (Humanities)*, 25(7): 1932-1975.

AL-Hussami, M.R.N., 2008. A Study of Nurses' Job Satisfaction: The Relationship to Organizational Commitment, Perceived Organizational Support, Transactional Leadership, Transformational Leadership, and Level of Education. *European Journal of Scientific Research*, 22(2): 286-295.

Allen, N.J., and J.P. Meyer, 1990. The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63: 1-18.

Angle, H.L., and J.L. Perry, 1981. An Empirical Assessment of Organizational Commitment and Organizational Effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 26(1): 1-14.

Angle, H.L., and J.L. Perry, 1983. Organizational commitment: individual and organizational influences. *Work and Occupation*, 10: 123-146.

Armstrong, M., 1998. *A handbook of Personnel Management Practice* (1th ed.). London: Kogan Page Limited.

Atchison, T., 1999. They myths of employee satisfaction. *Healthcare Executive*, 14(2): 18-23.

Azalea, A., F. Omar and K.A. Mastor, 2009. The Role of Individual Differences in Job Satisfaction among Indonesians and Malaysians. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 10(4): 496-511.

Bakan, İ., T. Büyükbeşe and B. Erşahan, 2011. An Investigation of Organizational Commitment and Education Level among Employees. *International Journal of Emerging Sciences*, 1(3): 231-245.

Bedeian, A.G., G.R. Ferris and K.M. Kacmar, 1992. Age, Tenure, and Job Satisfaction: A Tale of Two Perspectives. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 40: 33-48.

Ben-Bakr, K., ID.S. Al-Shammari, O.A. Jefri and J.N. Prasad, 1994. Organizational Commitment, Satisfaction, and Turnover in Saudi Organizations: A Predictive Study. *The Journal of Socio-Economics*, 23(4): 449-456.

Bender, K.A., S.M. Donohue and J.S. Heywood, 2005. Job Satisfaction and Gender Segregation. *Oxford Economic Papers*, 57: 479-496.

Bender, K.A., and J.S. Heywood, 2006. Job Satisfaction of the Highly Educated: The Role of the Gender, Academic Tenure, and Earnings. *Scottish Journal of Political Economy*, 53(2): 253-279.

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., and P.C. Hardigan, 2000. Pharmacists' Sources of Job Satisfaction: Inter-Gender Differences in Response. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, 64: 420-425.

Chughtai, A.A., and S. Zafar, 2006. Antecedents and Consequences of Organizational Commitment Among Pakistani University Teachers. *Applied H.R.M. Research*, 11(1): 39-64.

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*, pp: 189-217.

Clark, A.E., A. Oswald and P. Warr, 1996. Is job satisfaction U-shaped in age?. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 69: 57-81.

Cronbach, L.J., 1951. Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of test. *Psychometricka*, 16: 297-334.

Curri van, D.B., 1999. The causal order of job satisfaction and organizational commitment in models of employee turnover. *Human Resource Management Review*, 9(4): 495±524.

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.

Eslami, J., and D. Gharakhani, 2012. Organizational Commitment and Job Satisfaction. *ARPN Journal of Science and Technology*, 2(2): 85-91.

Fadzilla Ali, H., T.Y. Lew and A.K.S. Sim, 2013. Examining the relationship between employees' perceptions on competency training and affective commitment: The moderating influence of volition. *Australian Journal of Basic & Applied Science*, 7(13): 209-218.

Feather, N.T., and K.A. Rauter, 2004. Organizational citizenship behaviours in relation to job status, job insecurity, organizational commitment and identification, job satisfaction and work values. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 77: 81-94.

Gautam, T., R. Van Dick, U. Wagner, N. Upadhyay and A.J. Davis, 2005. Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Organizational Commitment in Nepal. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 8(3): 336-345.

Geurts, S.A., W.B. Schaufeli and C.G. Rutte, 1999. Absenteeism, Turnover Intention and Inequity in the Employment Relationship. *Work & Stress*, 13(3): 235-267.

Greenberg, J., 1990. Organizational justice: Yesterday, today, and tomorrow. *Journal of Management*, 16: 399-432.

- Gunlu, E., M. Aksarayli and N. Sahin Percin, 2010. Job satisfaction and organizational commitment of hotel managers in Turkey. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 22(5): 693-717.
- Huselid, M.A., and N.E. Day, 1991. Organizational Commitment, Job Involvement, and Turnover: A Substantive and Methodological Analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76(3): 380-391.
- Iqbal, A., 2010. An Empirical Assessment of Demographic Factors, Organizational Ranks and Organizational Commitment. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 5(3): 16-27.
- 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.
- Lin, C-H., 2009. Antecedents to Continuance Organizational Commitment Among Salespersons in the Retailing Services Industry. *The Journal of International Management Studies*, 4(2): 206-214.
- Locke, E.A., 1976. The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology*, Eds., Dunnette, M.D. Chicago: IL, Rand Nally.
- Lok, P., P.Z. Wang, B. Westwood and J. Crawford, 2007. Antecedents of job satisfaction and organizational commitment and the mediating role of organizational subculture. Working paper. [Online] URL: <http://www.unisa.edu.au/igsb/docs/WP-Lok2.pdf>
- Lumley, E.J., M. Coetzee, R. Tladinyane and N. Ferreira, 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., S. Nawab, B. Naeem and R.Q. Danish, 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., B. Hanisah, N. Zawawi, M. Hitam and J. Mohd Jody., 2011. Organizational Commitment and Job Burnout among Employees in Malaysia. In the Proceedings of the 2011 International Conference on Business and Economics Research, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, pp: 185-187.
- Md Dawal, S.Z., Z. Ismail and Z. Taha, 2003. Human Factors, Ergonomics Model and Application in Automotive Industries: Focus on Job Satisfaction. *New Trends and Developments in Automotive Industry*, 79-88.
- Meyer, J.P., and N.J. Allen, 1991. A three component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1(1): 61-89.
- Meyer, J.P., and N.J. Allen, 1997. *Commitment in the Workplace: Theory, Research, and application* (1th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Meyer, J.P., T.E. Becker and C. Vandenberghe, 2004. Employee Commitment and Motivation: A Conceptual Analysis and Integrative Model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(6): 991-1007.
- Meyer, P.J., and L. Herscovitch, 2001. Commitment in the workplace: Toward a general model. *Human Resource Management Review*, 11(3): 299-326.
- Meyer, J.P., P.G. Irving and N.J. Allen, 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., D.J. Stanley, L. Herscovitch and L. Topolnytsky, 2002. Affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 61: 20-52.
- Mohd Suki, N., and N. Mohd Suki, 2011. Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment: The Effect of Gender. *International Journal of Psychology Research*, 6(5): 1-15.
- Mowday, R.T., R.M. Steers and L.W. Porter. 1982. *Employee-Organizational Linkages: The Psychology of Commitment, Turnover, and Absenteeism* (1th ed.). New York: Academic Press, Inc.
- Nachimuthu, P. 2006. A Study of Job Satisfaction among Male and Female Police Personnel. *The Indian Police Journal*, LIII(2): 93-101.
- Paik, Y., K.P. Parboteeah and W. Shim, 2007. The relationship between perceived compensation, organizational commitment and job satisfaction: the case of Mexican workers in the Korean Maquiladoras. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 18: 1768-1781.
- Peterson, R.A., 1994. A Meta-analysis of Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha. *Consumer Research*, 21: 381-391.
- Riketta, M. 2002. Attitudinal organizational commitment and job performance: a meta-analysis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23: 257-266.
- Schermmerhorn, J.R.Jr., 1996. *Management* (5th ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Shore, L.M., and H.J. Martin, 1989. Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment in Relation to Work Performance and Turnover Intentions. *Human Relations*, 42(7): 625-638.
- Sowmya, K.R., and N. Panchanatham, 2011. Factors influencing organizational commitment of banking sector employees. *Journal of Economics and Behavioral Studies*, 2(1): 19-25.
- Spector, P., 1997. *Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, causes and consequences* (1th ed.). Sage Publication Inc., Thousand Oaks, CA.

Uygur, A., and G. Kilic, 2009. A Study into Organizational Commitment and Job Involvement :An Application Towards the Personnel in the Central Organization for Ministry of Health in Turkey. *Ozean Journal of Applied Sciences*, 2(1): 113-12.

Warsi, S., N. Fatima and S.A. Sahibzada, 2009. Study on Relationship Between Organizational Commitment and its Determinants among Private Sector Employees of Pakistan. *International Review of Business Research Papers*, 5(3): 399-410.

WeiBo, Z., S. Kaur and WeiJun, 2010. New development of organizational commitment: A critical review (1960 - 2009). *African Journal of Business Management*, 4(1): 012-020.

Weiss, D.J., R.V. Dawis, G.W. England and L.H. Lofquist, 1967. *Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire*. © Copyright 1967 by the Work Adjustment Project Industrial Relations Center University of Minnesota.

Wu, L., and I.J. Norman, 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.

Yilmaz, K., and O. Cokluk-Bokeoglu, 2008. Organizational citizenship behaviours and Organizational Commitment in Turkish Primary Schools. *World Applied Sciences Journal*, 3(5): 775-780.

Zeinabadi, H., 2010. Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as antecedents of Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) of teachers. *Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 5: 998-1003.