

**An Empirical Investigation Of Job Satisfaction And Organizational Commitment Among
Managers of Private and Public Establishments.**

Philip O.Sijuwade
School Of Urban and Public Affairs
University of Texas, Arlington,Texas.

Abstract

This study examines attitudes among managers with regards to job satisfaction and organizational commitment and the possible variations of these attitudes according to some demographic properties of the managers. The subjects of this study were 50 managers in private and public organizations in Lagos, Nigeria. Data were collected about their organizational commitment and job satisfaction as well as whether they worked in the private or public sector. According to the findings, managers in the private sector had a higher job satisfaction than the ones in the public sector. However, job satisfaction did not show any variations when the managers' demographic properties were considered. The components of organizational commitment did not show any difference according to working in private or public sector. There were also no differences in the components of organizational commitment according to the demographic properties except only one. Finally, job satisfaction had significant relationships with the components of organizational commitment.

KEYWORDS: Job Satisfaction; Manager; Organizational Commitment; Public Sector; Private Sector.

INTRODUCTION

People need group interaction to accomplish their goals at work and in social settings. Business and other organizations therefore play a key role in people's lives. From a management perspective, it is necessary to utilize and manage human resources effectively. The basic aims of contemporary management are to choose employees with necessary skills to maintain high levels of employee satisfaction and to create a sense of loyalty among employees by harmonizing organizational values with employee value judgments. Interpersonal relationships in organizations are important. Management mentality exerts a meaningful influence on the attitudes and behaviors of employees. Employee satisfaction and organizational commitment are particularly crucial for successful organizational behavior and the effective management of human resources. Employees who are dissatisfied with their jobs and disloyal to their organizations tend to be unproductive and dispirited at work. These employees have a negative influence on their co-workers and on the organization as a whole.

They dampen the motivation and will of their co-workers which leads to a general unwillingness to participate in organizational activities and results in a loss of efficiency and productivity in the organization. In short, job satisfaction and organizational commitment are factors that can affect entire organizations. By examining these concepts, this study makes an important contribution to the literature on the subject. Furthermore, this study describes the state of job satisfaction and organizational commitment in Nigeria which makes it an important contribution to the international literature.

The Concepts of Job Satisfaction And Organizational Commitment And The Relationships
These Concepts.

Conceptualizing Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment: Social scientists have been studying

jobsatisfaction since the early 1900s. This body of research clarifies the concept of job commitment and examines employee behavior with the aim of developing strategies for improving employee motivation. Judge(2000) finds that in one international database, more than 7850 studies have been published since 1970 on the subject of job satisfaction. Job satisfaction has been defined in various ways because there are many distinct views on the subject. For instance, Vecchio (1991) and Gilmer(1971) provide similar definitions of job satisfaction in terms of employees attitudes, thoughts and emotions regarding their jobs. Similarly, Schultz and Schultz (2000), Saal and Knight(2008) and Johns(2003) describe job satisfaction as the overall attitude of employees toward various features of their jobs. However, Schermerhorn et al.(2004) break up the concept of overall attitude into three distinct factors: physical conditions, social conditions and the nature of the work and argue that job satisfaction should be defined as the sum of attitudes toward these factors. Alternatively, Locke(1976) defines job satisfaction as the experience of pleasant or positive emotions associated with employees assessments of the quality of their jobs and experiences at work.

Davis(2008) considers both the positive and negative sides of the issue when he combines the concept of job satisfaction with that of job dissatisfaction; he defines job satisfaction as the sense of either satisfaction or dissatisfaction; he defines job satisfaction as the sense of either satisfaction or dissatisfaction employees feel toward their jobs. Similarly, Newstorm and Davis(2003) define job satisfaction as the full set of pleasant and unpleasant feelings and emotions employees feel toward their jobs. There are some interesting common points in the definitions discussed before. First, job

satisfaction is thought to be the accumulation of emotions employees feel about their jobs and the environments they work in. Second, job satisfaction does not derive from any single factor instead, it results from multiple factors such as, success at work, the structure of social relationships at work, working conditions and work environment and salary. For the purposes of this study and in keeping with the general features of the definitions before, job satisfaction can be briefly defined as employee perceptions regarding the input-output balance at work and in job related issues. The concept of organizational commitment should also be addressed.

Job satisfaction and organizational commitment are similar concepts but while job satisfaction refers to the feelings, thoughts and attitudes of employees toward their jobs and job-related issues, organizational commitment describes employees feelings and attitudes toward their organizations. In other words whereas job satisfaction is job-oriented, organizational commitment is organizational is organizational-oriented and relates to all employees and the organization as a whole . Many issues are considered in this whole and used in the definition of organizational commitment. For example when Mowday et al.(1979) define organizational commitment as adopting organizational values and objectives, exerting more effort than is expected on behalf of the organization and having a strong desire to maintain membership in the organization. Yuksel (2000) proposes that organizational commitment means not only being loyal to the organization but also expressing ideas and striving for the success of the organization. These two definitions imply that organizational commitment requires employees to make sacrifices. However, some definitions in the literature are less about sacrifice and more about employees adapting to the organization in normative terms. For instance, Wiener(1982) defines organizational commitment as internalized and idealized pressure to behave in ways that further organizational objectives and interests. Gaertner and Nollen(1989) and Robbins(1998) define organizational commitment as a desire on the part of employees to stay in the organization regardless of financial concerns and the experience of learning to identify with organizational values or at least, wanting to identify with organizational values.

In other definitions, organizational commitment is a psychological commitment employees make to their organizations or an attitude of organizational loyalty. Organizational commitment can be briefly defined as a desire on the part of employees to transfer energy and loyalty to the systems of organization. In keeping with the definitions before, organizational commitment can also be defined as a condition in which employees identify with their organizations in their emotions, thoughts, attitudes and behaviors without any financial expectations. Three types of organizational commitment are claimed to exist in the literature(Wasti,2000).

Continuance Commitment: A sense of commitment that develops as the result of the contributions employees make to their organizations.

Affective Commitment: A sense of commitment felt by employees in proportion to the extent to which they adopt the values and objectives of their organizations.

Normative Commitment: A sense on the part of employees that it is their duty to work for their organization; employees show commitment to the organization not because they fear losing their jobs but because they feel it is the right thing to do.

The Relationship Between Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment: As discussed before, job satisfaction is the attitude employees develop toward their jobs and organizational commitment is the attitude employees toward the organization they work for. The relationship between these two factors depends on these different attitude distinctions. An organization is characterized by the jobs held in the organization. Thus, factors that influence individual employees in their specific jobs may also affect the attitudes of employees toward the organization as a whole. Therefore, the common view in the literature is that job satisfaction affects organizational commitment (Lincoln and Kalleberg,

2000 ; Mueller et al.1994;Rose,1991;William and Hazer,1986).Several explanations for this relationships have

been suggested. For instance, Delaney(2012) asserted that employees who are satisfied with their jobs

live better, less stressful lives and are therefore, able to adapt to their organizations more easily.

It has also been argued that salary levels and the regularity of paychecks have an important influence

on job satisfaction; low salaries decrease organizational commitment over time(Fafunwa,1971; Nwagwu,1977). A general finding is that there is a positive relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment. In contrast, several studies (Loke,2011;Vandenberg and Scarpello,1994)

suggest that this effect may be in the opposite direction. It may be that organizational commitment influences not only job satisfaction but also labor turnover. Organizational commitment may also serve as a mediating variable in the relationship between job satisfaction and labor turnover (Slattery and Selvarajan,2005). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment are clearly related. Yet, there are important differences in the way the concepts vary empirically. Whereas job satisfaction shows more variability in the short term, organizational commitment forms over time and changes only in the long term (Scholl,1981;Walton,2005). Also while organizational commitment is primarily emotional, job satisfaction may include emotional and non-emotional components .

Research and Interpretation of Findings

Description Of Subjects and Research Goals: The subjects of this study were managers of private and public establishments in Lagos, Nigeria. Data were collected on organizational commitment, job satisfaction, demographic variables and whether the manager worked in the private and public sector.

The goals of the study were to evaluate statistically the concepts of job satisfaction and organizational commitment and to investigate the relationship between these two concepts and the effects of demographic variables on this relationship. This study sought to answer two questions:

*Do job satisfaction and organizational commitment levels vary depending on whether managers work in private or public sector?

*Do job satisfaction and organizational commitment levels of managers in the private and public sectors

vary depending on demographic features such as job type, salary, education. marital status, years of experience in the profession, years of experience in the same job and residence status (owning, renting or public housing)?

Importance of the Research: The most crucial input of an organization is the human element. Even though, suitable structural, economic and physical conditions exist for organizational efficiency and productivity if adequate importance is not given to the person responsible for the organization management and his/her needs and expectations are not met that organization may not function efficiently and productively.

In this sense, managers who have important duties in supporting the existence and continuity of private and public organizations should have a strong organizational commitment attitude which is defined as a strong commitment to the goals and targets of the organization and should adopt these goals and targets, strive for the organization and desire to maintain membership within the organization. The other concept, job satisfaction, includes the attitudes and emotions of the employees in an organization toward the job and job-related issues.

According to literature, it is emphasized that individuals with high job satisfaction have higher levels of organizational commitment. This study aims to accomplish the following goals:

*By determining the levels of job satisfaction and organizational commitment of the managers, data will be available to studies and developments in this subject.

*By determining the levels of job satisfaction and organizational commitment of the managers, the level of job-related problems will be determined and there will be a chance for these problems to be kept at the desired level.

*Relationships between the satisfaction and organizational commitment of the managers and various types of demographic elements will be identified and these relationships will shed light on future studies of similar qualities.

Research Model: This study aims to examine and compare job satisfaction and organizational commitment among managers according to various demographic factors. It utilizes a Relational Screening Model as the base model because the goal is to evaluate job satisfaction and organizational commitment levels in relation to various other variables. The research design is a Single Factorial Mode between groups. An independent t-test, a one-way ANOVA Model, a Scheffe test and a Correlation test were carried out in the course of the statistical analysis. This study tests the following hypotheses:

First Hypothesis: There is a significant difference in the level of job satisfaction between public and private sector managers.

Second Hypothesis: The job satisfaction of managers varies significantly in accordance with demographic properties of managers.

Third Hypothesis: There is a significant difference in the harmony dimension of organizational commitment between public and private sector managers.

Fourth Hypothesis: The harmony dimension of organizational commitment varies significantly in accordance with demographic properties of managers.

Fifth Hypothesis: There is a significant difference in the identification dimension of organizational commitment between public and private sector managers.

Sixth Hypothesis: The identification dimension of organizational commitment varies significantly in accordance with demographic properties of managers.

Seventh Hypothesis: There is a significant difference in the internalization dimension of organizational commitment between public and private sector managers.

Eighth Hypothesis: The internalization dimension of organizational commitment varies significantly in accordance with demographic properties of managers.

Research Population and Sample: The population of this research is managers working in private public establishments in the city of Lagos. The sample consists of 50 managers at various job levels randomly selected.

Data Collection Technique: Data were collected using a survey method. A survey approach was the best data collection method available given the time and cost limitations. Respondents were given three surveys which covered the topics of demographic information, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment.

Job Satisfaction Survey: The job satisfaction survey measures people's perceived job satisfaction and it was originally developed by Cetinkanat (2000). Individuals rated their own job satisfaction on a numerical scale which produced data in the form of a continuous variable. Various aspects of job satisfaction were developed using Maslow's hierarchy of needs with the addition of the need for autonomy in this scale.

Therefore, the dimensions of job satisfaction are physiology, safety, love and belonging, autonomy, esteem and self-actualization. The aim of the survey was to measure perceptions about job satisfaction and the importance of job satisfaction. Therefore, job satisfaction was measured as the difference between the degree of importance and the actual level perceived for each dimension. In other words, job satisfaction is the extent to which people's expectations for each dimension are met or the difference between the importance the person assigns to each factor and the perception of whether the need for that factor has been met. A small difference implies satisfaction, a larger difference implies dissatisfaction. The survey was prepared as two forms each consisting of 32 questions. The first form measured perceived satisfaction and the second form measured levels of importance. The survey asked respondents to answer using a Likert-type scale with the following values: strongly disagree, disagree, agree and strongly agree. Levels of importance was measured with the values very unimportant, unimportant, important and very important. Job satisfaction consists of six sub factors. Each factor and the numbered survey questions addressing the factors is listed as:

*Factor 1: Style of management: 6,11,13,14,18,19,22,23,27 and 29.

*Factor 2: Work Facilities: 24,25,26,30,31 and 32.

*Factor 3: Opportunities for development and promotion:1,4,5,8 and 28.

*Factor 4: Co-workers: 9,12,15,16,17,20 and 21.

*Factor 5: Physical environment: 2 and 3.

*Factor 6: Salary and personnel: 7 and 10.

Organizational Commitment Survey: The organizational commitment survey was developed by Balay (2000). The survey collected data on three factors to determine the degree to which individuals were integrated in their organizations. Each factor was designed as a sub-scale and included the following dimensions; harmony, identification and internalization. Respondents answered questions about organizational commitment using a 5-point Likert-type scale with the values strongly disagree, somewhat agree, reasonably agree, mostly agree, and strongly agree. The factors and the numbered survey questions addressing the factors are as follows:

*Factor 1: Harmony: 1,2,3,4,5,6 and 7.

*Factor 2: Identification: 8,9,10,11,12,13 and 14.

*Factor 3: Internalization: 15,16,17,18,19,20,21,22,23,24, and 25.

Reliabilities of The Scales: Cronbach's α was used to test the reliability of the scales. The Cronbach's α coefficient for the perceived job satisfaction scale as developed by Cetinkenat (2000) was 0.8523, the coefficient for the scale measuring the importance of job satisfaction was 0.8175. The dimensions of the organizational commitment scale developed by Balay(2000) have Cronbach's α coefficients of 0.79 for the harmony dimension, 0.89 for the identification dimension and 0.93 for the internalization dimension. To assure scale reliability, the surveys that were adapted for use in this study were given to 25 managers chosen at random from the sample and the reliability analysis was repeated. Results from the repeated analysis are as follows:

*Job Satisfaction (Measures perception) : $\alpha=0.9326$

*Job Satisfaction (Measures levels of importance): $\alpha=0.1965$

*Organizational Commitment(Harmony): $\alpha=0.8253$

*Organizational Commitment(Identification): $\alpha=0.8873$

*Organizational Commitment(Internalization): $\alpha=0.8980$

All elements in the surveys have acceptable coefficients, suggesting that the scales have high reliability.

Limitation of The Study: The scope of this study is limited to managers working in private and public establishments in only one city. Therefore, the generalizability of the conclusions to the country as a whole is limited. No other data collection techniques other than surveys was employed, so there was no opportunity to analyze data collected by different methods.

Findings and Remarks: In this study, the demographic summary statistics of the managers in the sample are presented. The findings related to job satisfaction and organizational commitment are also presented. A t-test was used to determine whether job satisfaction and organizational commitment differ according to workplace, a t-test and one-way analysis of variance was used to determine whether job satisfaction and organizational commitment vary with demographic factors.

Properties of the sample: Exactly half(25) of the participants work in the private sector and the other half work in the public sector. The job types of the managers in the sample are distributed as follows: 3(6% of the total) are general managers, 20(41%) are deputy general managers, 14(28%) are department heads and 13(25%) are administrators.

Regarding educational level, 74% of the respondents have bachelor's degree, 20% have master's degrees and 6% have doctorate degrees. A majority of the participants are married (87% of th total), the remainder are single.

There are no participants who are widowed or have any other marital status. Regarding work experience, 10% of the total have 6-10 yeas of service, 14% have 1-5 years of service, 29% have 11-15 years of service, 31% have 16 -20 years of service and 16% have less than 20 years of service. In terms of experience in the same job, 42% have less than 1 year od service, 31% have 1-3 years of service and 27% have more than 3 years of service. Regarding residence, 43% reside in government allocated housing, 27% are renters and 30% are homeowners.

Testing of the first hypothesis: The hypothesis to be tested in this study is that there is a significant difference in the level of job satisfaction between public and private sector managers.

A t-test is performed to determine whether job satisfaction is significantly different for managers in the public and private sectors in terms of management style, work facilities, development and promotion opportunities, co-workers, physical environment, salary and personnel and total job satisfaction perceptions.

The result shows significant differences exist between the private and public sector with respect to perceived job satisfaction in terms of management style($t=2.515, p<0.05$), physical environment($t=2.127, p<0.05$), salary and personnel ($t=2.331, p<0.05$) and total job satisfaction($t=2.576, p<0.05$). It is also note worthy that job satisfaction related to management style is significantly higher in the private sector ($X=-0.8171$) than in the public sector($X=-1.0285$). The reason for this differences may be that public establishments are less able to satisfy the autonomy and esteem needs of the managers. On the other hand, the ability of the managers in the private sector to take more initiatives may increase their job satisfaction. These explanations likely explain higher job satisfaction in terms of management style in the private sector. Job satisfaction related to physical environment is significantly higher in the private sector($X=-06463$) than in the public sector ($X=-0.9187$). A potential reason for this difference may be that managers who work in the public sector have limited access to technical equipment office supplies, computers and libraries compared to those in the private sector. These resources facilitate job performance and their inadequacy in public institutions may lower perceived job satisfaction in terms of work facilities.

At the same time, managers in the private sector may feel more satisfied with the physical environment because they have more opportunities to engage in relaxation, dining and other positive experiences.

Job satisfaction related to salary and personnel is significantly higher in the private sector($X=0.8049$) than in the public sector ($X=-1.0569$). Higher salaries and more flexible salary schedules, coupled with the feeling of being more valued as personnel by their organizations may cause managers in the private sector to feel more satisfaction than public sector managers regarding salary and personnel.

Total job satisfaction is significantly higher for managers in the private sector($X=-0.6011$) than for those in the public sector($X=-0.7786$). In each dimension in which significant differences exist, it seems that managers in the private sector have more job satisfaction than those in the public sector. It therefore makes sense that managers in the private sector have a higher total job satisfaction than those in the public sector. On the other hand, there is no significant difference in the job satisfaction in the private and public sectors with respect to work facilities($t=0.488, p>0.05$), development and promotion opportunities($t=1.867, p>0.05$) and co-workers($t=1.521, p>0.05$).

Testing Of The Second Hypothesis: The second hypothesis to be tested is that job satisfaction of managers varies significantly in accordance with demographic properties. To test this hypothesis, a t-test was used to determine whether job satisfaction differs according to the marital status of the managers. One way analysis of variance was used to test whether job satisfaction differs according to a participant's job, salary, educational background, work experience, time spent at the same job and residence status(housing).

Marital Status: The results of t-test analyzing the relationship between job satisfaction and marital status showed that for all job satisfaction dimensions there were no significant satisfaction differences related to marital status for satisfaction with management style($t=1.431, p>0.05$), work facilities($t=-0.377, p>0.05$), development and promotion opportunities ($t=0.980, p>0.05$), co-workers($t=1.153, p>0.05$), physical environment($t=-0.775, p>0.05$) or salary and personnel($t=0.552, p>0.05$). Thus, there was not a significant difference in total job satisfaction according to marital status($t=0.532, p>0.05$).

Job Type: The results of a one way analysis of variance exploring the relationship between job satisfaction and job type showed that no significant difference exists in job satisfaction in terms of management style for managers with varying duties ($F=2.160, p>0.05$), work facilities ($F=0.707, p>0.05$), development and promotion opportunities($F=0.671, p>0.05$), co-workers($F=2.184, p>0.05$), physical environment($F=1.198, p>0.05$) or salary and personnel($F=1.962, p>0.05$).

There is no statistically significant difference for total job satisfaction ($F=0.674, p>0.05$) that depends on the duties of the managers.

Salary: The results of a one way analysis of variance exploring the relationship between job satisfaction and the salary of managers showed that differences in salary produce no significant differences in job satisfaction in terms of management style($F=0.854, p>0.05$), work facilities ($F=1.778, p>0.05$), development and promotion opportunities($F=1.750, p>0.05$), co-workers($F=1.964, p>0.05$), physical environment($F=1.960, p>0.05$) or salary and personnel($F=0.903, p>0.05$). Again, total job satisfaction ($F=1.214, p>0.05$) does not differ significantly according to salary.

Total Years of Service in The Profession: The findings here showed that differences in years of services are not associated with any statistically significant difference in any of the job satisfaction subcategories or in total job satisfaction (management style($F=0.156, p>0.05$), work facilities ($F=0.508, p>0.05$), development and promotion opportunities ($F=0.752, p>0.05$), co-

workers ($F=1.644, p>0.05$), physical environment ($F=0.378, p>0.05$), salary and personnel ($F=2.192, p>0.05$) and total job satisfaction ($F=0.381, p>0.05$).

Years Spent in the same job: The results of a one way analysis shows that variation in years spent in the same job is not significantly associated with any difference in any of the job satisfaction sub categories or in total job satisfaction (management style ($F=0.356, p>0.05$), work facilities ($F=0.467, p>0.05$), development and promotion opportunities ($F=0.668, p>0.05$), co-workers ($F=1.894, p>0.05$), physical environment ($F=1.583, p>0.05$), salary and personnel ($F=0.615, p>0.05$), and total job satisfaction ($F=0.376, p>0.05$).

Educational Background: The results of a one way analysis showed that variation in educational background is not significantly associated with any of the job satisfaction subcategories or in total job satisfaction (management style ($F=0.474, p>0.05$), development opportunities ($F=0.843, p>0.05$), co-workers ($F=0.659, p>0.05$), physical environment ($F=0.520, p>0.05$), salary and personnel ($F=2.449, p>0.05$) and total job satisfaction ($F=1.046, p>0.05$).

Residence Status(Housing): Lastly, the results of a one-way analysis of variance exploring the relationship between job satisfaction and residence status shows that variation in residence status(housing) is not statistically related related with any of the job satisfaction categories or in total job satisfaction (management style ($F=0.946, p>0.05$), work facilities ($F=0.418, p>0.05$), development and promotion opportunities ($F=0.086, p>0.05$), co-workers ($F=0.981, p>0.05$), physical environment ($F=1.349, p>0.05$), salary and personnel ($F=0.318, p>0.05$) and total job satisfaction ($F=0.226, p>0.05$).

The second hypothesis in this study that the job satisfaction of managers varies significantly in accordance with demographic properties can be rejected as there is no significant variance associated with the hypothesized demographic factors.

Correlation Between Dimensions of Job Satisfaction :Correlations between the dimensions of job satisfaction shows that job satisfaction are positively and significantly correlated as satisfaction related to the dimensions of job satisfaction increases, total job satisfaction also increases. The dimension of management style contributes to total job satisfaction the most (0.796) whereas co-workers the least (0.603).

Findings Related To Organizational Commitment:

Testing of The Third Hypothesis: The third hypothesis to be tested is that there is no significant difference in the harmony dimension of organizational commitment between the public and private sector managers. A t-test was used to determine whether significant differences in harmony exists between the two groups. There is no significant difference for the dimension of harmony of organizational commitment between managers who work in the public and private sectors ($t=0.653, p>0.05$). Therefore, the third hypothesis can be rejected.

Testing of The Fourth Hypothesis: The fourth hypothesis in this study is that the harmony dimension of organizational commitment varies significantly in accordance with demographic properties of managers. The first demographic characteristic to be discussed is marital status.

The t-test results showed no significant differences exist between married and single managers in terms of the harmony dimensions of organizational commitment ($t=0.145, p>0.05$).

The results of a one way analysis of variance exploring the relationship between the harmony dimension of organizational commitment and various demographic properties such as job type, salary, total years of service in the profession, years spent in the same job, education and residence status showed no statistically significant relationship with them and that the hypothesis should be rejected because the demographic characteristics of managers are unrelated to the harmony dimensions of organizational commitment.

Findings Related To Organizational Commitment In the Identification Dimension.

Testing of The Fifth Hypothesis: The fifth hypothesis being tested is that there is a significant difference in the identification dimension of organizational commitment between public and private sector managers. A t-test was used to determine whether there is a significant difference between the two groups. No significant difference was found in respect to the identification dimension of organizational commitment in the managers working in the private or public sectors. Therefore the fifth hypothesis was rejected.

Testing of The Sixth Hypothesis: The sixth hypothesis states that the identification of organizational commitment varies significantly in accordance with demographic properties of the managers. The result showed no significant difference in the identification dimension between single and married managers ($t=1.342, p>0.05$). Also the perceptions of the managers related to the identification dimension of organizational commitment do not vary significantly according to demographic properties such as job type ($F=0.353, p>0.05$), salary ($F=0.615, p>0.05$), total years of service ($F=0.249, p>0.05$), years spent in the same job ($F=0.160, p>0.05$), educational background ($F=0.321, p>0.05$), and residence (housing) status ($F=0.048, p>0.05$). The perceptions of the managers related to the identification dimension of organizational commitment do not vary in accordance with demographic properties. Hence, the sixth hypothesis is rejected.

Findings Related to The Internalization Dimension of Organizational Commitment.

Testing of The Seventh Hypothesis: The seventh hypothesis in this study is that the internalization dimension of organizational commitment between public and private sector managers shows a significant difference. The hypothesis was rejected because the findings showed no significant difference in the internalization dimension of organizational commitment between public and private sector managers ($t=1.205, p>0.05$).

Testing The Eighth Hypothesis: The eighth hypothesis states that the internalization dimension of organizational commitment varies significantly in accordance with demographic properties of managers. The results of a t-test shows no meaningful difference in the internalization dimension of organizational commitment between married and single managers ($t=0.131, p>0.05$). A one way analysis of variance was performed to examine whether internalization has a meaningful relationship with other demographic properties. Managers' perceptions related to the internalization dimension of organizational commitment are significantly related only to residence status ($F=3.081, p>$

0.05). A reason for this finding may be that managers who own their homes may feel more satisfied with their economic situations and as a result feel more comfortable about their relationships with the organization. In other words, managers who rent their homes may feel more financial pressure and may therefore be more likely to turn to other organizations that provide better financial benefits rather than maintaining organizational commitment. With regard to other demographic variables, there are no significant differences in the internalization dimension of organizational commitment. The eighth hypothesis can be rejected because internalization is related to housing status but not to any other demographic properties.

There is a significant relationship between the dimensions of organizational commitment and total job satisfaction. Total job satisfaction is significantly negatively related to the harmony dimension of organizational commitment while it is significantly positively related to the identification and internalization dimensions. Whereas harmony is linked to obligation, identification and internalization are based on the voluntary will of the employee to commit to the organization. Therefore, managers likely feel more satisfaction toward their when they willingly commit to their organization.

CONCLUSION

Job satisfaction and organizational commitment may directly affect the performance of organizations.

It is therefore of strategic importance to ensure that employees are satisfied with their jobs which will in turn increase their commitment to the organizations they work for. This study shows that there is a statistically significant difference in job satisfaction of managers in the private and public sectors in terms of overall job satisfaction and in terms of the dimensions of management style, physical environment, salary and personnel. In all of these categories, the job satisfaction of managers is higher in the private sector than in the public sector. Better conditions in the private sector may help to explain this finding.

Therefore, improving the salaries and physical working environments for managers are two suggested strategies for improving job satisfaction in the public sector.

Another finding from this study is that the job satisfaction of managers does not vary significantly with demographic properties. Specifically, job satisfaction among managers is unrelated to marital status, job type, educational background, total years of service, years spent in the same job, salary or housing status. From the point of view of the researcher, this is an unexpected result because at the very least, job type, salary and years spent in the same job were expected to influence job satisfaction levels. There may be other factors not tested in this study that have a significant effect on the job satisfaction of managers.

Some interesting conclusions can also be drawn about organizational commitment. It appears that working in the public or private sector has no influence on manager's perceptions of organizational commitment in the dimension of harmony, identification and internalization. Because the sum of these three dimensions forms overall organizational commitment, the level of organizational commitment of managers is unrelated to whether the organization operates in the public or private sector.

Demographic properties appear to have little effects on the organizational commitment of managers. Arguments in the literature generally asserts that job satisfaction affects organizational commitment. Therefore, it is founded that job satisfaction that is unaffected by demographic characteristics may have some bearing on the relationship between organizational commitment and demographic characteristics as well. This study shows that demographic features in fact have

little effect on organizational commitment with the only exception being the finding that internalization dimension seems to vary depending on whether managers use government housing, own or rent their homes. It may be the case that managers who own their homes enjoy better economic circumstances than those who pay rent. Managers with economic advantages are likely less inclined to change jobs in order to improve their financial situations.

Therefore, helping managers by providing opportunities for long-term, low-interest mortgages or supplemental payments to be used toward rent are incentives that are likely to increase organizational commitment.

Finally, this study finds that all relationships between job satisfaction and dimensions of organizational commitment are statistically significant. However, the harmony dimension of organizational commitment that is more normative and even shows obligatory properties has an inverse relationship with job satisfaction. This finding implies that if managers perceive being in harmony with their organization as a task or obligation, they are less satisfied with their jobs. On the other hand if people develop harmony with their organization on their own initiatives, job satisfaction increases.

This study found that job satisfaction and organizational commitment among managers is largely unrelated to demographic properties. Therefore future study should search for other factors that influence job satisfaction. Moreover when examining the relationships discussed before, the concept of culture can be included as an explanatory variable.

REFERENCES

Baley, R.2000.Organizational Commitment of Managers and Teachers.Nobel Publications, Amsterdam, Holland.

Davis, K.2008.Human Behavior in Organization. McGraw-Hill,New York.

Delaney,B. 2012. Alternative Work Arrangements: Do They Make Economic Sense? HR Professional,19:20-25.

Fafunwa,A B.,1971,. New Perspective in Education.Macmillan Education Ltd., London, UK.

Gaertner, K.N. and S.D. Nollen,1989. Career Experiences,Perceptions of Employment practices and Psychological Commitment To The Organization.

Gilmer,H. 1971.Industrial and Organizational Psychology. 3rd Edition.McGraw-Hill,New York.

Johns,G.2003. Organizational Behavior: Understanding Life at Work. Scout Foresman Co., Illinois.

Judge,T.,2000. Promote Job Satisfaction Through Mental Challenge. Handbook of Principles of Organizational Behavior, Locke,E.A.(Ed.). Blackwell Publishing Ltd. Oxford, UK., pp.75-89.

Lincoln, J. and A.Kalleberg,2000. Culture, Control and Commitment: A Study of Work Organization and Work Attitudes in the United States and Japan. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Loke, J.,2011. Leadership Behaviors: Effects on Job Satisfaction, Productivity and organizational commitment. Journal of Nursing Management,9:191-204.

Mowday, R.,R.Steers and L.Porter,1979. The Measurement of Organizational Commitment. Journal of Organizational Behavior,14:224-247.

Mueller,C.,E.Boyer,J.Price and R.Iverson,1994. Employee attachment and noncoercive conditions of work. The Case of Dental Hygienists. Work Occupation,21:179-212.

Nwagwu,C.,1997. The environment of crisis in the Nigerian Education System.J.Comput. Educ.,33:87-95.

Rose,R., 1991. Comparisons of employee turnover in food and beverage and other departments in hotel properties. Ann Arbor,MI.

Saal,F., and P Knight,2008. Industrial/Organizational Psychology: Science and Practice. Brooks/Cole Public Co.PacificGrave,California.

Schermerhorn, Jr.J.,J.Hunt and R.Osborn,2004. Managing Organizational Behavior: 5th Ed.

John Wiley and Sons, New York.

Scholl,R.,1981. Differentiating Organizational Commitment from Expectancy As a Motivating force. Acad. Manage. Rev.,6:589-599.

Schuitz, D. and S.Schultz,2000. Psychology and Industry Today: An Introduction to Industrial and Organizational Psychology. 5th Ed., Macmillan,New York.

Slattery,J.and T. Selvarajan,2005. Antecedents to Temporary employee's turnover intentions. Acad Manage. Rev.,8:486-500.

Vandenberg,R. and V.Scarpello,1994. A longitudinal assessment of the determinant relationship between employee commitments to the occupation and the organization. J. of Organizational Behav., 15: 535-547.

Vecchico, R.,1991. Organizational Behavior.2nd Ed. The Dryden Press, Saunders College Publishing, Phildelphia.

Walton,R.,2005. From control to commitment in the workplace. Harvard Bus. Rev.,63:77-84.

Wasti,A.,2000.Leadership and Human Resources Practices.1st Ed.Prentice-Hall.NewJersry.

Wiener,Y., 1982. Commitments in Organizations: A Normative View.Acad. Manage,Rev., 7: 418-428.

Williams,L. and J.Hazer,1986. Antecedents and Consequences of Satisfaction and Commitment in turnover models : A re-analysis using latent variables structural equations methods. Journal of Applied Psychology,71:219-231.

Yuksel,O., 2000.Human Resources Management. Prentice-Hall International Inc. New Jersey.