

EDRM611 CLASS PROJECT SUMMER 2012

The Effect of Organizational and Religious Commitment on Job Satisfaction

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the course

EDRM611: Research Methods and Statistics in Education & Psychology II

Andrews University

School of Education

by

Gisele Kuhn and Steven D. Reece

July 27, 2013

The Effect of Organizational and Religious Commitment on Job Satisfaction

Introduction

It is important to examine job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and religious commitment among groups of faculty and administrators in a university in order to increase productivity and quality of service and to retain employees. According to Brown and Sargeant (2007), “a satisfied workforce leads to higher productivity because of fewer disruptions such as absenteeism, departure of good employees, and incidences of destructive behavior (p. 212). Tabbodi (2009) states that “recently, faculty commitment in an institution has been of particular interest in higher education because of the relationship between problems associated with leadership behavior and lack of faculty commitment to the organizations” (p. 22).

According to Wen-Hai, Yang, and Chih-Kai (2012), “Job satisfaction is defined as a person's emotional response to job specific attributes, while organizational commitment refers to a person's emotional response to the entire organization” (p. 599). According to Choi and Tang (2011), the “differentiation between satisfied and dissatisfied commitment is deemed important in contemporary education milieu as it provides new lens for teachers, teacher educators, school leaders and policy makers to understand teacher emotions and re-appraise issues of teacher retention and teacher commitment” (p. 68).

Job satisfaction in schools should be a priority. According to Aydin, Sarier, and Uysal (2011), “schools are the fundamental organizations of educational systems. Schools fulfill the organizational, educational, and administrative purposes. Teachers and administrators perform their tasks using their own skills information and behaviors” (p. 629). Aydin et al. (2011) state that “organizational commitment is a definite desire to maintain organizational membership,

identification with the purposes, successes of organization, the loyalty of an employee, and a willingness to exert considerable effort on the behalf of the organization” (p. 628).

Welsch and LaVan (1981) state that organizational commitment is structured by the determination of well-committed members and the identification of variables that lead to increased organizational commitment. The identification variables include demographics (such as age, gender, and education), job satisfaction (pay, work, and promotion), job characteristics (power, teamwork), professional behavior (attendance), and organizational climate (communication, decision making, leadership).

Welsch and LaVan (1981) found that older age, higher hierarchy, tenure, and length of employment were significantly related to higher commitment, while educational level was not. Teamwork and power was also significantly related to commitment. Welsch and LaVan (1981) also found that job satisfaction was significantly related to satisfaction with work and satisfaction with promotion but not related to satisfaction with pay (p. 1088). However, according to Tabbodi (2009), the study proves that there is a positive relationship between commitment behavior and the two variables of age, gender, and salary (p. 25).

Aydin et al. (2011) state that commitment is divided in three steps, accordance, identification, and internalization. Aydin et al. (2011) state that according to the first step of commitment, accordance is important because an individual feels the necessity of accordance because of an award or a penalty” (p. 628). According to Aydin et al. (2011), “Identification is the second level of commitment and it defines the influence between the individual and the group. An individual feels himself as a part of the group when he gets the opportunity to express himself freely. When a person identifies with the organization, his job satisfaction gets higher while his tolerance with the ambiguity is low” (p. 629). According to Aydin et al. (2011),

internalization is the last level of commitment. It defines the accordance between the organizational and personal norms” (p. 629).

According to Brown and Sargeant (2007), research has been done regarding intrinsic, such as achievement, recognition, the work itself, responsibility, and advancement and extrinsic behaviors, such as salary, company policies, and administrative as well as supervisory practices contribute to workers’ satisfaction and dissatisfaction at the workplace (p. 213). The importance of social linkages between employee and employer commitment contribute to negative behaviors such as absenteeism, tardiness or theft, or positive behaviors such loyalty, punctuality, dedication, and commitment” (p. 213). In order to promote productivity and job satisfaction among employees in an academic setting, the work place should identify the main factors that influence job satisfaction. According to Rosser and Townsend (2006), understanding the factors that affect job satisfaction is critical if institutions are to retain their faculty” (p. 124).

Purpose

The purpose of this research is to identify the effect and the relationship among job satisfaction related to organizational commitment and religious commitment among a group of faculty and administrators in a university in order to identify which intrinsic or extrinsic factors best influence and affect job satisfaction.

Method

Using a survey questionnaire instrument a certain researcher examined a group of faculty and administrators in a university setting which had a student population of roughly 2,500; the researcher wanted to measure job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and religious commitment in the context of a particular set of variables. Four hundred survey questionnaires were distributed. Each faculty and administrator (deans, department chairs, vice presidents, and

the president) received the questionnaire via inter-campus mail. A letter from the University President endorsing the study was also included with the questionnaire. One hundred thirteen of the 400 (28.25%) university employees completed and returned the questionnaires. Basic statistical questions such as age, gender, education level, occupational area were included in the questionnaire. Interestingly 26 people (23%) of the 113 respondents did not indicate their gender; nevertheless, from the data provided no conclusion may be made as to why this occurred. The questionnaire sought to measure responses with regards to fifteen job satisfaction (or dissatisfaction) factors: achievement, advancement, growth, recognition, responsibility, work itself, relations with peers, students and supervisors, job security, organizational policy, salary, status, supervision, and working conditions. The researcher also asked questions concerning the respondent's religious and organizational commitment in order to understand these factors as well.

Description of the Sample

From **Table 1** (below), we see that the sample of university administrators and faculty consisted of 44 males (50.6%) and 43 females (49.4%); apparently and as noted earlier, 26 people (23%) did not indicate their gender. The study did not focus on gender issues concerning job satisfaction, religious and organizational commitment but it focused on measuring issues related to the occupational areas of administrators and faculty. Age breakdown of the respondents specified that 27 (23.9%) were 35 years old or less, 36 (31.9%) were between ages 36-45, while 50 (44.2%) were 45 years of age or older. In the sample the educational level of the respondents showed that 3 (2.7%) had only a high school diploma, 22 (19.5%) had bachelor's degree and 88 (77.9%) had earned a master's or doctoral degree. There were 113 total

respondents of which 36 (31.9%) were administrators and 77 (68.1%) were faculty members in the university.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics of Sample

	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percentages</i>
Age Group		
0-35	27	23.9
36-45	36	31.9
46+	50	44.2
Total	113	100.0
Educational Level		
High School	3	2.7
Bachelors	22	19.5
Masters/Doctorates	88	77.9
Total	113	100.0
Occupational Area		
Administrator	36	31.9
Faculty	77	68.1
Total	113	100.0
Gender		
Male	44	50.6
Female	43	49.4
Total	87	100.0

Result

The study addressed five research questions concerning administrators and faculty of a particular university. First, how satisfied with their jobs are faculty and administrators? Second, how committed are they to their religion and institution? Third, are there significant differences between faculty and administrators in their levels of job satisfaction, religious commitment, and organizational commitment? Fourth, are there age group differences in the levels of religious commitment and organizational commitment when considering the age groups of 35 and

younger, 36-45, 46 and older? Lastly, which linear combinations of the 15 measures of job satisfaction serve best as predictors of organizational commitment?

Job Satisfaction and Commitment Levels of University Administration and Faculty

The study addressed the job satisfaction of the university's administrators and faculty through 15 measures of job satisfaction. From **Table 2** (below) we learn from the study that the majority of university administrators and faculty members were satisfied with their relationships with students (92.0%), with peers (79.6%) and with superiors (60.7%). While they were satisfied with their work (75.2%), their own achievement (72.1%) and their level of responsibility (72.1%), they were less satisfied with their supervision (56.6%) and with job security (54.9%). Nevertheless, when addressing other areas of job satisfaction, most administrators and faculty members were not satisfied with their jobs. We learn that only 47.8% were satisfied with their jobs in terms of advancement, 43.4% in terms of growth, 45.1% in terms of recognition, 38.9% in terms of salary, 37.2% in terms of working conditions and 28.3% in terms of organizational policy and administration.

Table 2: Level of Job Satisfaction

<i>Variable</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>SL (%)</i> *
Relations -students	112	4.25	0.69	92.0
Relations- peers	113	3.89	0.99	79.6
Work itself	113	3.88	0.81	75.2
Achievement	111	3.73	0.89	72.1
Responsibility	111	3.87	0.90	72.1
Relations - Superiors	112	3.56	1.01	60.7
Supervision	113	3.47	1.09	56.6
Job security	113	3.39	1.21	54.9
Advancement	113	3.35	1.08	47.8
Recognition	113	3.18	1.06	45.1
Status	112	3.14	1.14	44.6
Growth	113	3.34	1.04	43.4

Salary	113	3.04	1.14	38.9
Working Conditions	113	2.92	1.17	37.2
Organizational pol. & admin.	113	2.88	1.08	28.3

**SL = Satisfaction Level (%)*

In **Table 3** (below), we see the results of the researcher's examination of administrators and faculty member's commitment levels to the institution and their religion. Organizational commitment and religious commitment were scored using a five-point scale. Higher scores indicated a higher level of commitment of the administrator or faculty to either the organization for which they worked or their religion. From Table 3 we learn that 58.4% of administrators and faculty are committed or highly committed to their organization (Mean = 3.733, SD = .760). On the other hand, a remarkable percentage (94.7%) of the administrators and faculty, who participated in the study are committed or strongly committed to their religion (Mean = 4.63, SD = 0.49).

Table 3: Religious and Organizational Commitment

<i>Variable</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>CL (%)</i> *
Organizational Commitment	113	3.73	0.76	58.4
Religious Commitment	113	4.63	0.49	94.7

**CL = Commitment Level (%)*

Occupational Area, Job Satisfaction, Religious and Organizational Commitment

Through the study the researcher wanted to ascertain additionally if any significant, statistical differences existed between the administrators and faculty of the university related to their levels of job satisfaction, religious and organizational commitment. In order to determine if any such statistical differences existed among administrators and faculty at the university, an independent sample t-test was carried out on the data in conjunction with the Levene's test of homogeneity of variance.

In **Table 4** (below) we can see the group mean scores, standard deviations, results of the independent t-test and effect sizes for each measure (variable) of job satisfaction, as well as, for religious and organizational commitment. When considering the majority of the variables concerning job satisfaction, the independent sample t-test indicate that there are no significant, statistical differences between the two groups of administrators and faculty ($p < 0.05$; $ES \leq 0.28$). Nevertheless, when considering other variables related to job satisfaction, we learn that there were significant, statistical differences among the variables of achievement ($t = 2.20$, $p = 0.030$, $ES = 0.46$), advancement ($t = 3.36$, $p = 0.001$, $ES = 0.68$), growth ($t = 2.35$, $p = 0.020$, $ES = 0.48$), and work itself ($t = 2.13$; $p = 0.035$, $ES = 0.44$). This conclusion is supported at least among the administrators, who are more satisfied with their jobs by comparing their means and standard deviations in the areas of achievement (Mean = 4.00, SD = 0.77), advancement (Mean = 3.83, SD = 1.00), growth (Mean = 3.67, SD = 1.01) and work itself (Mean = 4.11, SD = 0.67). According to the data, faculty members are not as satisfied statistically with their jobs when considering the same four variables having means that ranged from 3.18 to 3.77, indicating a more neutral position with regards to job satisfaction in terms of these variables.

When addressing the level of commitment of administrators and faculty, the results of the independent sample t-test did not show any statistically significant difference in their organizational commitment ($t = 1.93$, $p = 0.056$, $ES = 0.40$). However, there were significant, statistical differences in the religious commitment of administrators and faculty ($t = 2.75$, $p = 0.007$, $ES = 0.50$). From the results we see that both groups of university employees are committed to their religion with administrators having a mean score of 4.78 and faculty having a mean score of 4.56 (with 5 being the highest possible score); however, the small difference in the mean score between the groups is statistically significant.

Table 4: Independent Sample t-Test

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Group</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>ES (d)</i>
Achievement	Administrator	35	4.00	0.77	2.20	109	.030	0.46
	Faculty	76	3.61	0.92				
Advancement	Administrator	36	3.83	1.00	3.36	111	.001	0.68
	Faculty	77	3.13	1.06				
Growth	Administrator	36	3.67	1.01	2.35	111	.020	0.48
	Faculty	77	3.18	1.02				
Relations- peers	Administrator	36	4.03	0.94	0.99	111	.325	0.20
	Faculty	77	3.83	1.01				
Relations -students	Administrator	36	4.28	0.78	0.29	110	.771	0.06
	Faculty	76	4.24	0.65				
Relations - Superiors	Administrator	36	3.42	1.16	-1.05	110	.296	-0.20
	Faculty	76	3.63	0.94				
Job security	Administrator	36	3.47	1.25	0.50	111	.620	0.10
	Faculty	77	3.35	1.19				
Org. pol.& admin	Administrator	36	2.69	1.06	-1.23	111	.222	-0.25
	Faculty	77	2.96	1.08				
Recognition	Administrator	36	3.03	1.13	-1.02	111	.310	-0.20
	Faculty	77	3.25	1.03				
Responsibility	Administrator	36	3.89	0.89	0.12	109	.903	0.02
	Faculty	75	3.87	0.91				
Salary	Administrator	36	3.11	1.21	0.43	111	.671	0.09
	Faculty	77	3.01	1.11				
Status	Administrator	36	3.36	1.10	1.40	110	.163	0.28
	Faculty	76	3.04	1.15				
Supervision	Administrator	36	3.36	1.10	-0.72	111	.473	-0.15
	Faculty	77	3.52	1.08				
Work itself	Administrator	36	4.11	0.67	2.13	111	.035	0.44
	Faculty	77	3.77	0.86				
Working Conditions	Administrator	36	3.06	1.01	0.84	111	.405	0.18
	Faculty	77	2.86	1.24				
Org. Commitment	Administrator	36	3.93	0.61	1.93	111	.056	0.40
	Faculty	77	3.64	0.81				
Rel. Commitment	Administrator	36	4.78	0.31	2.75	106	.007	0.50
	Faculty	77	4.56	0.54				

The results of the Levene's test of homogeneity of variance are seen below in **Table 5**.

We see that there is a violation of the homogeneity of variance assumption in the variable of religious commitment, where $F = 6.95$ and $p = 0.010$. Since $p < \alpha$ (0.05), the homogeneity of variance assumption is violated. The p values of other 14 variables were above (greater than) α (0.05), indicating that the homogeneity of variance assumption was met.

Table 5: Levene's Test of Homogeneity

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Levene Statistic</i>	<i>df1</i>	<i>df2</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
Achievement	2.68	1	109	.105
Advancement	0.12	1	111	.730
Growth	0.20	1	111	.658
Relations- peers	0.59	1	111	.446
Relations -students	0.20	1	110	.654
Relations - Superiors	2.19	1	110	.141
Job security	0.06	1	111	.803
Organizational pol.& admin.	0.43	1	111	.515
Recognition	0.42	1	111	.517
Responsibility	0.18	1	109	.671
Salary	0.48	1	111	.488
Status	0.20	1	110	.658
Supervision	0.00	1	111	.982
Work itself	2.06	1	111	.154
Working Conditions	3.42	1	111	.067
Organizational Commitment	2.53	1	111	.114
Religious Commitment	6.95	1	111	.010

Differences in Religious and Organizational Commitment Based on Age

Based on differences in age, should we expect to see any differences among the two groups of university employees regarding their religious and organizational commitment? In order to determine if there are any statistically significant differences based on age regarding

these two variables, administrative and faculty respondents were divided into three age groups consisting of the following age ranges: 35 and younger, 36 to 45, 46 and older. Below, **Table 6** reports the mean scores and standard deviations for each age group with regards to religious and organizational commitment; we can see below that the means are consistent across the age range for the two variables with religious commitment being higher than organizational commitment.

Table 6: Age Related Descriptive Statistics for Religious and Organizational Commitment

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Age</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Religious Commitment	0-35	27	4.30	0.67
	36-45	36	4.61	0.55
	46+	50	4.68	0.55
Organizational Commitment	0-35	27	3.52	0.58
	36-45	36	3.33	0.93
	46+	50	3.72	0.73

In order to determine if there are any differences between the groups of university employees based on age, a One-way ANOVA was carried out. **Table 7** (below) provides the ANOVA results for religious commitment, which at $\alpha = 0.05$ indicates that there are at least two group means that are significantly different ($F_{ob} = 5.213 > F_{cv} = 3.07$, and $p = 0.021$). The $\eta^2 = 0.068$ shows that effect size is somewhat large. The Levene's test indicates that the homogeneity of variance may be assumed ($p = 0.021$); therefore a post-hoc test, Student Neuman Keuls or SNK, was conducted in order to determine which groups differed from each other. **Table 8** (below immediately following **Table 7**) demonstrates the outcome of the multiple post hoc comparisons procedure using SNK. The SNK post hoc test indicates that employees who were in the age groups of 36 to 45 (Mean = 4.61, SD = 0.55) and 46 years of age or older (Mean = 4.68, SD=0.55) had higher levels of religious commitment than employees who were 35 years of age or younger (Mean = 4.30, SD = 0.67).

Table 7: One-way ANOVA for Religious Commitment

<i>Source</i>	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	η^2
Between	2.687	2	1.344	3.987	.021	0.068
Within	37.065	110	.337			
Total	39.752	112				

Table 8: SNK

<i>Age Group</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>
1. 0-35	4.30	*	*
2. 36-45	4.61		
3. 46+	4.68		

* Indicates significant group differences ($p < 0.05$)

Table 9 shows the results of the ANOVA for organizational commitment. The Levene's test indicates that the homogeneity of variance may be assumed ($p = 0.073$). Since $p (0.073) > \alpha (0.05)$, no significant differences between the age group of 35 and younger (Mean = 3.52, SD = 0.58), 36 to 45 (Mean = 3.33, SD = 0.93), and above 45 (Mean = 3.72, SD = 0.73) were found in terms of organizational commitment ($F_{\text{ob}} = 2.683 < F_{\text{cv}} = 3.07$, and $p = 0.73$). It appears that the effect size ($\eta^2 = 0.047$) is to a certain degree small. We can conclude that there are no age group differences in the level of organizational commitment at the university among the employees surveyed.

Table 9: One-way ANOVA of Organizational Commitment

<i>Source</i>	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	η^2
Between	3.162	2	1.581	2.683	.073	0.047
Within	64.821	110	.589			
Total	67.982	112				

Table 10: Descriptive Statistics and Pearson r Correlations (Zero Order Correlations)

[illegible]

Using Measures of Job Satisfaction to Predict Organizational Commitment

In **Table 10** (above), we see a tabulation of the means, standard deviation and the Pearson r correlation coefficients or zero order correlations of the 15 measures of job satisfaction. The predictors or the independent variables were the fifteen measures of job satisfaction, while the criterion or the dependent variable was the organizational commitment. We realize from the results presented in Table 10 that there are several moderate correlations between organizational commitment and the possible predictors of achievement ($R = 0.41$), advancement ($R = 0.39$), job security ($r = 0.46$), organizational policy and administration ($R = 0.36$), salary ($R = 0.46$) and status ($R = 0.38$). These possible predictors were tested using a full regression model.

Presented in **Table 11** (below) is the full regression model along with a statement from an ANOVA Table where $R = 0.624$, $R^2 = 0.390$, $F_{(15,91)} = 3.877$, $p = 0.000$. We have a significant p -value (.000) and R^2 value of 0.390, which points to significant correlations between organizational commitment (the dependent variable) and the measures of job satisfaction – the predictors (independent variables). The R^2 value (0.390) also indicates that approximately 39% of the variance of organizational commitment in the sample may be explained by the linear combination of the fifteen measures of job satisfaction (predictors). Five of the correlations seen in **Table 11** between the measures of job satisfaction and organizational commitment were negative: growth ($\beta = -.120$), relationships with superiors ($\beta = -.066$), recognition ($\beta = -.063$), responsibility ($\beta = -.055$), and working conditions ($\beta = -.032$).

In contrast, the correlations for the remaining predictors were positive. Furthermore from the full regression model we may note that some of the stronger predictors appear to be achievement ($\beta = .139$), advancement ($\beta = .201$), job security ($\beta = .147$) and salary ($\beta = .277$).

Among the fifteen measures of job satisfaction, salary ($p = .021$) was the only one that was statistically significant ($p < .05$), which may lead us to conclude rather prematurely that the strongest predictor of organizational commitment is salary. Nevertheless, when considering the combination all of the other measures of job satisfaction they have a statistically significant relationship with organizational commitment.

The full regression equation can be described as:

$$y = 1.476 + .126(\text{achievement}) + .138(\text{advancement}) + -.087(\text{growth}) + .103(\text{relations - peers}) + .007(\text{relations - students}) + -.049(\text{relations - superiors}) + .092(\text{job security}) + .071(\text{organizational pol. \& admin.}) + -.044(\text{recognition}) + -.047(\text{responsibility}) + .184(\text{salary}) + .103(\text{work itself}) + -.021(\text{working conditions})$$

Table 11: Full Regression Model (Model 1)

<i>Variable</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	β	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
(Constant)	1.476	.461		3.200	.002
Achievement	.126	.096	.139	1.311	.193
Advancement	.138	.096	.201	1.437	.154
Growth	-.087	.101	-.120	-.856	.394
Relations- peers	.103	.081	.132	1.270	.207
Relations -students	.007	.113	.007	.065	.948
Relations - Superiors	-.049	.083	-.066	-.589	.557
Job security	.092	.071	.147	1.290	.200
Organizational pol. & admin.	.071	.078	.102	.908	.366
Recognition	-.044	.075	-.063	-.585	.560
Responsibility	-.047	.107	-.055	-.443	.659
Salary	.184	.078	.277	2.349	.021
Status	.001	.078	.001	.010	.992
Supervision	.074	.086	.105	.860	.392
Work itself	.103	.098	.110	1.050	.297
Working Conditions	-.021	.070	-.032	-.296	.768

$R = 0.624$, $R^2 = 0.390$, $F_{(15,91)} = 3.877$, $p = 0.000$

In **Table 12** (below) we encounter the first restrictive model (Model 2) along with the ANOVA Table ($R = 0.601$, $R^2 = 0.361$, $F_{(4,106)} = 14.99$, $p = 0.000$), which indicates that we also have statistically significant predictors in the restricted model. We can see from the R^2 value (.361) that approximately 36.1% of the variance for organizational commitment may be explained by the linear combination of the predictors of achievement ($\beta = .183$), advancement ($\beta = .170$), job security ($\beta = .200$) and salary ($\beta = .252$). Even though advancement ($\beta = .170$) appears to be a possible predictor of organizational commitment, it is not statistically significant having a p -value of .058, which is greater than .05.

The first restrictive regression model equation is:

$$y = 1.826 + .126(\text{achievement}) + .138(\text{advancement}) + .092(\text{job security}) + .184(\text{salary})$$

Table 12: First Restricted Model (Model 2)

<i>Variable</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	β	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
(Constant)	1.826	.279		6.558	.000
Achievement	.155	.076	.183	2.048	.043
Advancement	.118	.062	.170	1.913	.058
Job security	.125	.061	.200	2.042	.044
Salary	.168	.061	.252	2.762	.007

$R = 0.601$, $R^2 = 0.361$, $F_{(4,106)} = 14.99$, $p = 0.000$

Lastly in **Table 13**, we ran a second restrictive regression model (Model 3) removing the advancement variable. When examining the results from the ANOVA analysis ($R = 0.582$, $R^2 = 0.339$, $F_{(3,107)} = 18.31$, $p = 0.000$), we learn that we have a statistically significant correlation and that 33.9% of the variance (correlation) between organizational commitment and measures of job satisfaction may be explained by the predictors of achievement ($\beta = .209$), job security ($\beta = .246$), and salary ($\beta = .283$). Each one of these measures of job satisfaction was statistically significant.

With these three predictors we have a better model, so the final restrictive regression model equation is:

$$y = 1.978 + .178(\text{achievement}) + .154(\text{job security}) + .189(\text{salary})$$

Table 13: Second Restricted Model (Model 3)

<i>Variable</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>β</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
(Constant)	1.978	.270		7.319	.000
Achievement	.178	.076	.209	2.343	.021
Job security	.154	.060	.246	2.558	.012
Salary	.189	.061	.283	3.116	.002
R = 0.582, R ² = 0.339, F _(3,107) = 18.31, p = 0.000					

After removing twelve of the predictor variables from the regression model, we did not lose very much variance, as removing these variables only accounted for about 5% ($R^2 - R^2$ or $.390 - .339 = .051$) of the variance between organizational commitment (the dependent variable) and the predictors (measures of job satisfaction). A major finding in this study is that achievement, job security and salary are moderate predictors of organizational commitment accounting for approximately 34% of the variance. What this means is that roughly 66% of the variance is unaccounted for and indicates that there may be better predictors or factors that affect organizational commitment. Further research is indicated.

Discussion and Conclusion

This study addressed five research questions concerning administrators and faculty of a particular university to know how satisfied, how committed to their religion and institution, how significant were the differences between faculty and administrators in their levels of job satisfaction, religious commitment, and organizational commitment, if there were any age group differences in the levels of religious commitment and organizational commitment, and which linear combinations of the 15 measures of job satisfaction served best as predictors of organizational commitment.

In this study, the sample of university administrators and faculty consisted of 44 males (50.6%) and 43 females (49.4%); and 26 people (23%) did not indicate their gender, where 27

(23.9%) were 35 years old or less, 36 (31.9%) were between ages 36-45, while 50 (44.2%) were 45 years of age or older. The study focused on measuring issues related to the occupational areas of administrators and faculty. The educational level of the respondents showed that 3 (2.7%) had only a high school diploma, 22 (19.5%) had bachelor's degree and 88 (77.9%) had earned a master's or doctoral degree. There were 113 total respondents of which 36 (31.9%) were administrators and 77 (68.1%) were faculty members in the university.

Faculty members were satisfied with their relationships with students (92.0%), with peers (79.6%) and with superiors (60.7%). While they were satisfied with their work (75.2%), their own achievement (72.1%) and their level of responsibility (72.1%), they were less satisfied with their supervision (56.6%) and with job security (54.9%). Only 47.8% were satisfied with their jobs in terms of advancement, 43.4% in terms of growth, 45.1% in terms of recognition, 38.9% in terms of salary, 37.2% in terms of working conditions and 28.3% in terms of organizational policy and administration.

The research shows that 58.4% of administrators and faculty are committed or highly committed to their organization (Mean = 3.733, SD = .760). On the other hand, a remarkable percentage (94.7%) of the administrators and faculty, who participated in the study are committed or strongly committed to their religion (Mean = 4.63, SD = 0.49). Yang, Wu, Chang, and Chien (2011) state that job satisfaction influences attitude towards work and organizational commitment and that "overall job satisfaction has significant organizational commitment effect, but not from all but not from all of its dimensions" (p. 274).

A study done by Yang et al. (2011) shows that "regardless of organizational identification or organizational internalization, coworkers and promotion do not have significant effect; the work itself and pay significantly affect both. Therefore this study suggests that if the

organization wants to promote employees' organizational commitment, it should start from the work itself and pay. Finally, this study not only confirms the findings of past studies that supervisor leadership influence employees' commitment to organization but also proves subordinates' commitment to the supervisor (p. 274).

The study shows that employees who were in the age groups of 36 to 45 (Mean = 4.61, SD = 0.55) and 46 years of age or older (Mean = 4.68, SD=0.55) had higher levels of religious commitment than employees who were 35 years of age or younger (Mean = 4.30, SD = 0.67). A major finding in this study is that achievement, job security and salary are moderate predictors of organizational commitment accounting for approximately 34% of the variance. What this means is that roughly 66% of the variance is unaccounted for and indicates that there may be better predictors or factors that affect organizational commitment.

Brown and Sargeant (2007) state that the theory of motivation is based on the hierarchy of needs, focusing on five categories of needs such as physiological, safety and security, affection and social activity, esteem and status, and self-actualization. Maslow's hierarchy hypothesizes three categories such as existence needs, relatedness needs, and growth needs (p. 214). Rosser and Townsend (2006) state that "longer length of time at an institution, older age, and full-time faculty status are demographic characteristics that seem to demonstrate a commitment" (p. 143).

Brown and Sargeant (2007) also state that when using the Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory, "and management not only must provide hygiene factors to avoid employee dissatisfaction but also must provide factors intrinsic to work itself in order for employees to be satisfied with their jobs" (p. 219). Also Brown and Sargeant (2007) found that "there are

significant differences ($p < 0.05$) in overall extrinsic and intrinsic job satisfaction and organizational and religious commitment among age groups” (p. 223).

A study done by Tabbodi (2009) indicates that leadership behavior, organizational commitment, job satisfaction, work environment, job experience, salary, age, and gender affects directly and indirectly organizational outcomes and staff behaviors, where women and the young had higher organizational commitment (p. 25). Tabbodi (2009) states that his study “proved a positive relationship between commitment behavior and age and gender – women showed a degree of commitment higher than men” (p. 25).

According to a study by Schroder (2008), faculty and administrators responded to measures of overall, intrinsic, extrinsic job satisfaction, organizational, and religious commitment. Results revealed a six-predictor model that explained 55.6% of the variance of organizational commitment for faculty. Significant predictors included organizational policy and administration, work itself, religious commitment, salary, working conditions, and achievement. A five-predictor model explained 70.8% of the variance of organizational commitment for administrators with the following predictors included: growth, religious commitment, responsibility, job security, and relations with students (pp. 95-96).

Among the fifteen measures of job satisfaction, salary ($p = .021$) was the only one that was statistically significant ($p < .05$), which may lead us to conclude rather prematurely that the strongest predictor of organizational commitment is salary. Nevertheless, when considering the combination all of the other measures of job satisfaction they have a statistically significant relationship with organizational commitment. According to Choi and Tang (2011), “sense of satisfied commitment provides a great source of strength and enjoyment to a teacher” (p. 68).

There are limitations to this study, which did not take into account the age of participants. Some participants did not provide information about their gender so further studies could be done to determine the reasons why participants decided to omit their gender. According to Tabbodi (2009) and his study, there is a “positive relationship between commitment behavior and the two variables of age and gender- women showed a degree of commitment higher than men under similar conditions” (p. 25). According to Yoon and Thye (2002), “overall job satisfaction and perceptions of organizational support are key emotional and cognitive processes that mobilize commitment in the workplace” (p. 97).

According to Welsch and LaVan (1981), there is an overlap in the concepts of organizational commitment and job satisfaction which indicates a need for further study. Al-Hussami (2008) states that “a positive relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment has been reported by studies involving qualified professionals (p. 288) and he also found in his study that “organizational commitment, perceived organizational support, transformational leadership, and level of education were most strongly related to job satisfaction” (p. 291).

The extrinsic measures, such as relations to students, peers, and superiors, work itself, supervision, job security, recognition, salary, working conditions, organizational policy and administration, and intrinsic measures, such as achievement, responsibility, status, and growth, should be studied in depth. There are many intrinsic and extrinsic factors that could also be related to job satisfaction. In this study, achievement, an intrinsic measure, and job security and salary, which are extrinsic measures, accounted for a third of the variance of the relationship with job satisfaction. Other intrinsic and extrinsic factors may have a stronger significant relationship and could be better predictors of job satisfaction.

Conclusion

According to Aydin et al. (2011) commitment is divided in three steps, accordance, identification, and internalization. We have researched fifteen aspects of commitment which may not have included all intrinsic and extrinsic aspects that significantly pertain to job satisfaction. We have found that achievement, an intrinsic factor, job security, an extrinsic factor, and salary, an extrinsic factor account for 33 percent of the variance of the relationship to job satisfaction while the other remaining percentage may not have seem analyzed in this study. Further studies are needed to provide more information regarding job satisfaction, job commitment and religious commitment. According to Al-Hussami (2008), “the perception that the organization also focus on competitive salaries may also contribute to employee commitment” (p. 292). Our study confirms the findings of Back, Lee, and Abbott (2011) in their statement that “job satisfaction has significant impacts on both organizational commitment and self-esteem” (p. 113).

References

- Al-Hussami, M. (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.
- Aydin, A., Sarier, Y., & Uysal, Ş. (2011). The Effect of Gender on Organizational Commitment of Teachers: A Meta Analytic Analysis. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, 11(2), 628-632.
- Back, K.-J., Lee, C.-K., & Abbott, J. (2011). Internal Relationship Marketing: Korean Casino Employees' Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment. *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly*, 52(2), 111-124. doi: 10.1177/1938965510370742
- Brown, D., & Sargeant, M. A. (2007). Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment, and Religious Commitment of Full-Time University Employees. *Journal of Research on Christian Education*, 16(2), 211-241. doi: 10.1080/10656210701647613
- Choi, P. L., & Tang, S. Y. F. (2011). Satisfied and Dissatisfied Commitment: Teachers in Three Generations. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 36(7), 45-75.
- Rosser, V. J., & Townsend, B. K. (2006). Determining Public 2-Year College Faculty's Intent to Leave: An Empirical Model. *Journal of Higher Education*, 77(1), 124-147.
- Schroder, R. (2008). Predictors of Organizational Commitment for Faculty and Administrators of a Private Christian University. *Journal of Research on Christian Education*, 17(1), 81-97. doi: 10.1080/10656210801968299
- Tabbodi, M. L. (2009). Effects of leadership behaviour on the faculty commitment of humanities departments in the University of Mysore, India: regarding factors of age group,

educational qualifications and gender. *Educational Studies (03055698)*, 35(1), 21-26. doi: 10.1080/03055690802288510

Welsch, H. P., & LaVan, H. (1981). Inter-Relationships Between Organizational Commitment and Job Characteristics, Job Satisfaction, Professional Behavior, and Organizational Climate. *Human Relations*, 34(12), 1079-1089. doi: 10.1177/001872678103401205

Wen-Hai, W. C., Yang, F.-H., & Chih-Kai, C. (2012). The Study of the Antecedents and Outcomes of Attitude Toward Organizational Change. *Public Personnel Management*, 41(4), 597-617.

Yang, F.-H., Wu, M., Chang, C.-C., & Chien, Y. (2011). Elucidating the Relationships among Transformational Leadership, Job Satisfaction, Commitment Foci and Commitment Bases in the Public Sector. *Public Personnel Management*, 40(3), 265-278.

Yoon, J., & Thye, S. R. (2002). A Dual Process Model of Organizational Commitment: Job Satisfaction and Organizational Support. *Work & Occupations*, 29(1), 97.