

# Exploring the Relationship between Job Satisfaction Dimensions and Organizational Commitment among Nigerian Banks Employees

Ogunleye P.O

Department of Business Administration and Management Osun State Polytechnic, Iree,  
Nigeria

Odebiyi, I.I

Department of Business Administration and Management Federal Polytechnic, Bida, Nigeria

Olaoye, B.O

Department of Business Administration and Management Osun State Polytechnic, Iree,  
Nigeria

**To Link this Article:** <http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJAREMS/v2-i6/444> DOI:10.6007/IJAREMS/v2-i6/444

---

**Published Online:** November, 2013

## Abstract

The study examined relationship between job satisfaction dimensions and organizational commitment among Nigerian banks employees. Structured questionnaire was used to collect data from respondents. Judgmental sampling was used to select 10 banks while simple random sampling method was employed to select seven (7) respondents from each bank totaling seventy (70) as sample size from Osogbo metropolis. Both correlation and multiple regressions were used to analyze the data. The result revealed that job satisfaction dimensions have positive significant relationship with organizational commitment. The result also revealed that work condition and supervision were independently significant predictors of organizational commitment. It was concluded that conditions attach to work and mentoring relationship are the most motivators to Nigerian banker staff. The study therefore recommended that management of Nigerian banks need to develop strategies to deal with the needs of those bank staff that experience less job satisfaction and commitment by improving the conditions attached to their job and given assurance of job security as well as good mentoring relationship.

**Keywords:** Job satisfaction, Commitment, Pay, Work condition, Supervision, and Promotion.

## Introduction

Job satisfaction facets have been recognized as powerful motivators that influence employees' attitude towards their jobs and various aspects of their jobs. Job satisfaction is affected by personal and organizational factors, which cause an emotional reaction affecting organizational commitment (Mowday, Steers & Porter 1979). Gbadamosi (2003) contended that the more favourable an individual's attitudes toward the organisation, the greater the

individual's acceptance of the goals of the organization, as well as their willingness to exert more effort on behalf of the organization. Schein, (1996) agreed that motivated employees are crucial to an organization's success, and therefore understanding people in their jobs and what motivates them could be a driving force in strengthening organizational commitment. Kreitner and Kinicki (2006) defined job satisfaction a global construct or as a constellation of different dimensions to which the employee reacts affectively. Job satisfaction can be understood as the way employees feel about their jobs and different aspects of their jobs. Job satisfaction can be defined also as the extent to which a worker is content with the rewards he or she gets out of his/her job, particularly in terms of intrinsic motivation (Statt, 2004). While defining organizational commitment, Porter et al., (1974) defined it as "strong belief in and acceptance of the organizational goals and values, willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization, and a definite desire to maintain organizational membership". Previous studies (Adekola, 2012; Meyer and Allen's 2007; Boehman, 2006; Canipe, 2006) on the relationship between commitment and satisfaction with one's job indicate that if employees are satisfied they develop stronger commitment to their work.

Any organization that wishes to achieve its goals need not only to retain talented workers, but must fully engage them, capturing their minds and hearts at each stage of their work lives., for Nigerian banks to wax stronger in the mix of global financial crisis and have access to global markets. Therefore, they cannot afford to neglect essential needs of the workforce job satisfaction and organizational commitment through pay satisfaction, good working environment, satisfaction with promotion and recognition as well as good mentoring relationship.

### **Literature Review**

Organizational commitment has an important place in the study of organizational behavior. This is in part due to the vast number of works that have found relationships between organizational commitment and attitudes and behaviors in the workplace (Meyer and Allen, 2007). Organisational commitment has attracted considerable interest as attempts have been made to better understand the intensity and stability of an employee's dedication to the organisation (Lumley 2010). Meyer and Allen's (2007) three-component model of commitment was created to argue that commitment has three different components that correspond with different psychological states. Meyer and Allen created this model for two reasons: first "aid in the interpretation of existing research" and second "to serve as a framework for future research." Their study was based mainly around previous studies of organizational commitment. Meyer and Allen's research indicated that there are three "mind sets" which can characterize an employee's commitment to the organization, namely; affective, continuance and normative commitment. Commitment can be seen as an affective point of reference towards the organisation (affective commitment), acknowledgement of the consequences of leaving the organisation (continuance commitment), and an ethical responsibility to stay with the organisations (normative commitment). It is believed that affectively committed employees will continue to work with great devotion on voluntary basis, continuance commitment ensures that employees retain their organizational membership, however those who are normatively committed usually feel obligation on their part to stay in the organization.

Mathieu and Zajac (1990) believed that developing a better perception of the progression associated with organisational commitment has an effect on employees, and

organisations. They agreed that the level of employees' organisational commitment will be enhanced if they are better motivated through both extrinsic rewards and psychological rewards. Katz & Kahn (1978) are of opinion that organisational commitment is generally assumed to reduce abandonment behaviours, which include tardiness and turnover. They went further to say that employees who are committed to their organisation may be more willing to participate in 'extra-role' activities, such as being creative or innovative, which frequently guarantee an organisation's competitiveness in the market. Employees who are committed to their organizations may easily accept and adhere to the organizational objectives and goals (Valentine et al., 2002).

### **Job satisfaction**

The term job satisfactions refers to the attitudes and feelings people have about their work. Positive and favorable attitudes towards the job indicate job satisfaction. Negative and unfavorable attitudes towards the job indicate job dissatisfaction (Armstrong, 2006).

Job satisfaction could be defined as a pleasurable emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job, or an attitude towards one's job. Locke (1976) defined job satisfaction as "... a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experience." That is, it is the discrepancy between what an employee values and what the situation provides. Job satisfaction is a worker's sense of achievement and success on the job. It is generally perceived to be directly linked to productivity as well as to personal well-being. Job satisfaction implies doing a job one enjoys, doing it well and being rewarded for one's efforts. Job satisfaction further implies enthusiasm and happiness with one's work. Job satisfaction is the key ingredient that leads to recognition, income, promotion, and the achievement of other goals that lead to a feeling of fulfillment (Kaliski, 2007).

According to Robbins (2003), there are four primary factors that determine job satisfaction. The first determinant is equitable rewards, which refers to the pay and promotion systems that employees perceive as fair and in line with their expectations (related to the equity theory). When employees perceive their promotion and pay systems to be fair and to be based upon pay standards and individual skill levels, they are most likely to experience a feeling of satisfaction. The second determinant is supportive working conditions. Employees do not prefer to work in work environments that are dangerous but in work environments that are comfortable and safe. Moreover, many employees prefer to work as close to home as possible and with adequate tools to successfully complete their tasks. Next determinant is to have mentally challenging work. Jobs that are boring, dull, and have little challenge often create boredom with employees. Contrasting, jobs that are too challenging and demanding often create feelings of failure and frustration. Employees like jobs that can give them opportunities where they can use their capabilities, knowledge, and skills and jobs that offer a variety of tasks, freedom, and feedback. The last determinant is supportive colleagues. While Locke (1976) presented a summary of job satisfaction dimensions that have been established to contribute significantly to organizational commitment, the particular dimensions represent characteristics associated with job satisfaction. The dimensions are work itself, pay, promotions, recognition, working conditions, benefits, supervision and co-workers. This is postulated to influence employees' opinion of "how interesting the work is, how routine, how well they are doing, and, in general, how much they enjoy doing it" (Lumley, 2010). Morrison, (2008) advocated that job satisfaction improved better performance and reduced withdrawal and counter-productive behaviours. In the same view Spector (2008)

agreed that job satisfaction influenced an organisation's well-being with regard to job productivity, employee turnover, absenteeism and life satisfaction.

### **Empirical Studies on the Relationship Between Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment**

A number of previous researchers have reported mixed findings on the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment. For instance, A study conducted by Dirani and Kuchinke (2011) produced results indicating a strong correlation between job satisfaction and job commitment and that satisfaction was a reliable predictor of commitment. According to the study conducted by Gunlu, Ebru; and Aksarayli, (2010) on Job satisfaction and Organizational commitment of hotel managers in Turkey, the findings indicate that extrinsic, intrinsic, and general job satisfaction have a significant effect on commitment. Loui (1995) examined the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment among 109 workers and reported that there are positive relationship between organizational commitment and job satisfaction. A study by Rajendran and Raduan (2005) showed the same result that is job satisfaction has a positive influence on affective and normative commitment. Also, Adnan, Riaz and Muhammad (2010) conducted a study to find out the antecedents of Job satisfaction in telecom sector and result established a positive relationship between job satisfaction and commitment.

However, Curry, Wakefield, Price and Mueller (1986) found no significant relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Also Tella; Ayeni; and Popoola (2007) conducted a study on Work Motivation, Job Satisfaction, and Organisational Commitment of Library Personnel in Academic and Research Libraries in Oyo State, Nigeria. The findings of this study revealed that a correlation exists between perceived motivation, job satisfaction, and commitment, but correlation between motivation and commitment was negative.

It is on this note that this research paper wishes to examine the relationship and effect of job satisfaction dimensions on organizational commitment among Nigerian banks' employees with special reference to the selected banks in Osun state, Nigeria.

### **Research Questions**

- i. Do job satisfaction dimensions have positive relationship with organizational commitment?
- ii. Does pay predict organizational commitment?
- iii. Does promotion predict organizational commitment?
- iv. Does working condition predict organizational commitment?
- v. Does supervision predict organizational commitment?
- vi. Do co-workers predict organizational commitment?

### **Methodology**

#### **Research design and Sources of Data**

Structured questionnaire was used to collect data from respondents. Judgmental sampling was used to select 10 banks while simple random sampling method was employed to select seven (7) respondents from each bank totaling seventy (70) as sample size from Osogbo metropolis. The instruments used in this study are:

**Organizational Commitment Scale (OCS):** This scale will be used to measure respondents' organizational commitment levels. It was developed and validated by Allen and Meyer (1990). It is a 5-point Likert type rating scale with the following degree of response: Strongly agree (5); Agree (4); Uncertain (3); Disagree (2); and Strongly disagree (1). It consists of 24 items: items 1-8 measure affective commitment; 9-16 measure continuance commitment, and 17-24 measure normative commitment. The aggregate scores of respondents as well as their composite scores for each of the three factors will be computed. It was reported that reliabilities coefficients ranging from .78-.81 (affective commitment); .54-.75 (continuance commitment) and .67-.78 (normative).

**Job Satisfaction Questionnaire:** Job Satisfaction Questionnaire measured with five items taken from William & Anderson (1991) measure of JS ( $\alpha = .88$ ). In the current study, JSQ scale reported  $\alpha = .73$  for Cronbach scale reliability estimate. Evidence for high validity of the scale rests upon the nature of the individual items (i.e., "face" validity), and when applied to two groups, personnel and non-personnel, which could reasonably be assumed to differ in job satisfaction, the mean difference of 11.5 points, and the variance were significant at the .01 level. The scale includes items such as, "I feel fairly well satisfied with my present job," "Most days I am enthusiastic about my work," and "Each day of work seems like it will never end" (reversed scored). The response format ranged from 1 ("strongly disagree") to 5 ("strongly agree"), yielding a possible range of scores between 5 and 25. The average score on the items was the participant's score of overall JS.

**Pay Satisfaction Questionnaire (PSQ):** This scale was used to measure pay satisfaction levels of respondents. The scale was developed and validated by Hememan and Schwab (1985). It is a Likert type scale anchored on 5-point rating scale. Its response format ranges from "very satisfied" (5) to "very dissatisfied" (1). The scoring procedure indicates that the higher the score, the higher the pay satisfaction and the lower the score, the lower the pay satisfaction. The PSQ consists of four items of satisfaction with pay level scale with reliability alpha coefficient of .83

**Promotion Questionnaire Scale:** Promotion scale was developed and validated by Spector (1985) and the scale uses four items ( $\alpha = .73$ ). It is a Likert type scale anchored on 5-point rating scale. Its response format ranges from "strongly disagreed (5) to "strongly agreed" (1). The scale includes items such as, 'there is readily too little chance for promotion on my job', 'those who do well on the job stand a fair chance of being promoted', 'I am satisfied with my chances for promotion' and ' people get a head as fast here as they do in other places'.

**Supervision Satisfaction Questionnaire:** This scale was developed and validated by Spector (1985) and was measured using the four items ( $\alpha = .82$ ). It is a Likert type scale anchored on 5-point rating scale. Its response format range from "strongly disagreed (5) to "strongly agreed" (1). The scale includes items such as, 'my supervisor is quite competent in doing his/her job', 'my supervisor shows too little interest in the feeling of subordinates', 'my supervisor is fair to me' and 'I like my supervisor'

**Work Group Questionnaire:** This scale was developed and validated by (Robbin, 2003) and measured the extent to which colleagues contribute to increased job satisfaction. This was measured using four-item ( $\alpha = .60$ ). It is a Likert type scale anchored on 5-point rating scale. Its response format range from "strongly disagreed (5) to "strongly agreed" (1). The scale includes items such as, ' I like people I work with', 'I enjoy my co-workers' and 'I find I have to work harder at my job because of the incompetence of people I work with'.

**Work Condition Questionnaire:** Work condition questionnaire was developed and validated by Spector (1985) and measured the extent to which environmental factors influence job

satisfaction. This was measured using four-item ( $\alpha = .78$ ). It is a Likert type scale anchored on 5-point rating scale. Its response format range from “strongly disagreed (5) to “strongly agreed” (1). The scale includes items such as, ‘the culture and emotional climate of the institution is generally positive and supportive’, ‘I believe in and take pride in my work and my work place’, ‘I feel like I am part of a team (share mission, value, efforts and goals)’ and ‘the atmosphere in facilities services helps me do a good job’.

Data collected were analyzed using correlation and Regression analysis with the aid of Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) software version 20.

### Model specification

Based on the literature discussed above, the research model illustrated in mathematical form for this study consists of five set of variables: pay, working condition, supervision, work group and promotion. These variables are hypothesized to impact significantly on organizational commitment. The general form of the model was as follows:  $OC = \alpha + \beta_1X_1 + \beta_2X_2 + \beta_3X_3 + \beta_4X_4 + \beta_5X_5 + e$  Where, OC = Organizational commitment; X1 = Pay; X2 = Working condition; X3 = Supervision; X4 = Work group; and X5 = Promotion. And  $\alpha$  is constant and  $\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3, \beta_4,$  and  $\beta_5$  are coefficient to estimate, and e is the error term.

### Data Analysis and Result Interpretation

Table 1:

Means, Standard Deviations and Correlations For All Variables

Variable	Mean	SD	1.Organizational commitment	2.Pay	3.Work condition	4.Work group	5.supervision	6.Promotion
1.	4.342	0.738	1.000	0.925*	0.937**	0.923**	0.908**	0.872**
2	4.315	0.771		1.000	0.866**	0.975**	0.838**	0.900**
3	4.414	0.691			1.000	0.860**	0.860**	0.808**
4	4.314	0.752				1.000	0.833**	0.897**
5	4.357	0.742					1.000	0.782**
6	4.285	0.744						1.000

Note \*\*P<.01

The result in table 1 shows that there is positive relationship job satisfaction dimensions ( pay, work condition, work group, supervision and promotion) and organizational commitment with  $r = 0.925, 0.937, 0.923, 0.908$  and  $0.872$  :  $df = 69$ ;  $P < .01$  respectively. This implies that the higher the job satisfaction in term of good pay package, good work condition, contribution of colleagues, good supervision and regular promotion the higher the of level of commitment among Nigerian banks employees. This finding is in line with (Adekola, 2012; Dirani and Kuchinke, 2011; Gunlu et al, 2010 and Mohammed, 2005) who found the positive relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment.



Furthermore, mean of work condition is 4.414 followed by supervision (4.357); pay (4.315); work group (4.314) and promotion (4.285). This indicates that work condition is the most motivator to Nigerian bankers followed by good supervision, well pay package, contribution of colleagues and regular and steady promotion respectively.

Table 2.

*Multiple Regression Analysis Table Showing Job Satisfaction Dimensions And Organizational Commitment*

Variable	Coefficient	Std. error	T	Sig.
-con	-0.190	0.146	-1.299	0.199
Pay	0.145	0.138	1.052	0.297
Work condition	0.399	0.081	4.914	0.000
Work group	0.185	0.137	1.349	0.182
Supervision	0.215	0.069	3.114	0.003
Promotion	0.096	0.070	1.364	0.177
R <sup>2</sup>	0.943			
Adj. R <sup>2</sup>	0.938			
Probability	0.000			
F	211.440			

The result in table 2 shows that the predictors variables (pay, work condition, work group, supervision and promotion) were significant joint predictors of organizational commitment ( $F(5, 64) = 211.440$ ;  $R^2 = 0.943$ ;  $P < .01$ ). The predictor variables jointly explained 94.3% variance of organizational commitment. Work condition ( $\beta = 0.399$ ;  $t = 4.914$ ;  $P < .01$ ) and supervision ( $\beta = 0.215$ ;  $t = 3.114$ ;  $P < .01$ ) were significantly independent predictor of organizational commitment. This implies that good work condition and effective supervision have significant impact on organizational commitment. This result is conform to Luthans (1998) who asserted that, if people work in a clean, friendly environment they will find it easier to come to work. If the opposite should happen, they will find it difficult to accomplish tasks. Also, Robbins, (2008) agreed that the quality of the supervisor-subordinate relationship will have a significant, positive influence on the employee's commitment. Moreover, Pay ( $\beta = 0.145$ ;  $t = 1.052$ ; Pns); work group ( $\beta = 0.185$ ;  $t = 1.349$ ; Pns) and promotion ( $\beta = 0.096$ ;  $t = 1.364$ ; Pns) have positive impact on organizational commitment but not significant. This indicates that increase in pay, contribution of colleague and promotion are not the most important motivators to Nigerian bankers.

This result is contrary to Curry, Wakefield, Price and Mueller (1986) and Tella; Ayeni; and Popoola (2007) who found negative relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment.

### Conclusion and Recommendations

The study examined relationship between job satisfaction dimensions and organizational commitment among Nigerian banks employees. The result revealed that job satisfaction dimensions have positive significant relationship with organizational commitment. The result also revealed that work condition and supervision were independently significant predictors of organizational commitment. This indicates that conditions attach to work and mentoring

relationship are the most motivators to Nigerian bank staff. It has been discovered from the result that pay, work group, and promotion have not significantly impacted on organization commitment. The study therefore recommended that management of Nigerian banks need to develop strategies to deal with the needs of those bank staff that experience less job satisfaction and commitment by improving the conditions attached to their job and given them assurance of job security as well as good mentoring relationship.

## References

- Adekola .B (2012). The impact of organizational commitment on job satisfaction: A study of employee at Nigerian Universities. *International journal of human resources studies*. Vol. 2 No 2.
- Allen, N.J., & Meyer, J.P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63, 1-18.
- Armstrong, M. (2006). *A Handbook of Human resource Management Practice*, Tenth Edition, Kogan Page Publishing, London, , p. 264
- Ayeni, C. O., & Popoola, S. O. (2007). 'Work Motivation, Job Satisfaction, and Organizational Commitment of Library Personnel in Academic and Research Libraries in Oyo State, Nigeria', *Library Philosophy and Practice 2007*.
- Boehman, J. (2006). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment among student affairs professionals, unpublished doctoral dissertation, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC (ProQuest Digital Dissertations).
- Canipe, J.S. (2006). Relationships among trust, organizational commitment, perceived organizational support, and turnover intentions, unpublished doctoral dissertation.
- Curry, J. D, Wakefield, J. Price and C. Mueller, "On the Causal Ordering of Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment," *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 29, No. 4, 1986, pp. 847-858.
- Dirani, K. and Kuchinke P.(2011). "Job satisfaction and organizational commitment: validating the Arabic satisfaction and commitment questionnaire (ASCQ), testing the correlations, and investigating the effects of demographic variables in the Lebanese banking sector",*International Journal of Human Resource Management*, United Kingdom.
- Gbadamosi, G. 2003. 'HRM and the commitment rhetoric: Challenges for Africa', *Management Decision*, 41(3): 274–280.
- Gunlu, E., and Aksarayli, M. (2010). Job Satisfaction And Organizational Commitment Of Hotel Managers In Turkey. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 22(5), 693-717
- Heneman, H.G., and D.P. Schwab. 1985. "Pay Satisfaction: Its Multidimensional Nature and Measurement." *International Journal of Psychology*, 20, 129-141.
- Kaliski, B.S. (2007). *Encyclopedia of Business and Finance*, Second edition, Thompson Gale, Detroit, p. 446
- Klaus, T., LeRouge, C. & Blanton, J.E. (2003). An examination of the relationships between select nature of work characteristics and organizational commitment of IT professionals, Special Interest Group on Computer Personnel Research Annual Conference, Session 3.2, 147–149.
- Katz, D. & Kahn, R. 1978. *The Social Psychology of Organizations* (2nd edition). New York: Wiley.



- Kreitner, R., & Kinicki, A. (2006). *Organizational Behavior*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Lock, E.A. (1976). "The nature and causes of job satisfaction," In M. Dunnette, (ed.) *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, Rand McNally, Chicago, IL, pp.1297-347.
- Loui, K. (1995). *Understanding employee commitment in the public organization: A study of the juvenile detention center. International Journal of Public Administration. 18(8), 1269-1295.*
- Lumley, E. (2010). Exploring the relationship between career anchors, job satisfaction and organisational commitment. Unpublished master's dissertation, Department of Industrial and Organisational Psychology, University of South Africa, Pretoria.
- Mathieu, J.E., & Zajac, D.M. (1990). *A review and meta-analysis of the antecedents, correlates, and consequences of organisational commitment. Psychological Bulletin, 108(2), 171-194.*
- Meyer, JP and Allen, NJ (2007). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment: Some methodological considerations, *Human Resource Management Review, 1*, pp. 61-98.
- Morrison, R. (2008). 'Negative relationships in the workplace: Associations with organisational commitment, cohesion, job satisfaction and intention turnover', *Journal of Management and Organization, 14*: 330–344.
- Mowday, R., Steers, R. & Porter, L.(1979). 'The measurement of organizational commitment', *Journal of Vocational Behaviour, 14*: 224–247.
- Porter, L.W., Steers, R.M., Mowday, R.T., & Boulian, P.V. (1974). Organizational Commitment, Job Satisfaction, and Turnover among Psychiatric Technicians. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 59*, 603-609.
- Rajendran & Raduan (2005). *Antecedents and outcomes of organizational commitment among Malaysian engineers. American journal of Applied Science, 2(6), 1095- 1100.*
- Riaz, A., & Muhammad .R (2010). Antecedents of Job satisfaction-A study of telecom sector. *Perspectives of Innovations, Economics and Business, Vol.4, 66-73.*
- Robins, S.P. (2003). *Organizational Behaviour: Concept Controversy And Application*. Ninth Edition. Prentice Hall.
- Schein, E. (1996). Career anchors revisited: Implications for career development in the 21st century. Society for Organizational Learning. [Online] Available at: <http://www.solonline.org/res/wp/10009.html>.
- Statt, D. (2004). *The Routledge Dictionary of Business Management*, Third edition, Routledge Publishing, Detroit, p. 78
- Spector, P.E. (2008). *Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, cause, and consequences. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.*
- Valentine, S., Godkin, L., & Lucero, M. (2002). Ethical context, organizational commitment, and person-organization fit. *Journal of Business Ethics, 41(4), 349-60.*
- Williams, L. J., & Anderson, S. E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. *Journal of Management, 17(3), 601-617.*