Job satisfaction related with organizational commitment: a study on bank employees at Northern region, Malaysia
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ABSTRACT
The purpose of this paper is to empirically examine the extent to which job satisfaction correlate with organizational commitment focusing on bank employees specifically and private sector generally. The study also tries to identify the strongest variables of job satisfaction that contribute towards organization commitment. A sample of 200 respondents was randomly chosen in this survey which 150 respondents gave the feedback. Correlation and regression analysis are being used to determine the relationship between job satisfaction variables (company policy, salary, working condition, interpersonal relation and advancement) and organizational commitment. The result from hypotheses testing has shown that all independent variables have positive relationship with organizational commitment. Furthermore, the result on regression also shows that advancement has the strongest relationship with organizational commitment compare to other variables. As a conclusion, we do believe that the results could be used by organizations to increase their employees’ commitment and lead to further research in the future.

Introduction
Today organizations are continually challenging new working trends and communication, rapid change of technology, new regulations, and environmental and social aspects. These elements may affect to work environment and reflect to employees’ attitudes and behaviors with respect of their input. Researchers and field experts mainly focused to know the factors that impact on the employee satisfaction at their work environment (Igalens and Roussel, 1999; Brewer et al., 2008). Owing to competitive nature of job, most of the employers are very much anxious to know the employee job satisfaction. Employee job satisfaction is related to how people think, feel and perceive their jobs (Spector, 1997). This definition may be directed to the employee attitudes and behaviors towards their job.

In literature many factors have been investigated to know the job satisfaction like management role, work motivation, pay, other benefits, organizational environment, and employee learning perception (Igalens and Roussel, 1999; Kuo et al., 2007; Brewer et al., 2008; Ahsan et al., 2009). Given the importance of employee desires and expectations towards satisfaction in a developing country context, it is worthwhile looking into job satisfaction predictors to complement existing research. Much of the research in this area has not clearly analyzed job satisfaction factors to gain insight into employee attitudes and behaviors.

Although many studies (Mathieu, 1991; Rayton, 2006; Yousef, 2002) assert the high correlation between Job satisfaction and Organizational Commitment, the nature of the relationship between Organizational Commitment and Job Satisfaction is still ambiguous (Rayton, 2006). Four possible causal relationships between Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment have been advocated by scholars (Vandenberg & Lance, 1992), however, no consensus has been reached regarding the causality of these factors.

As mentioned before, there are less empirical studies which linking the relationship between satisfaction and organizational commitment. After concerning the lack of empirical studies on the association between job satisfaction and organizational commitment in private sector, the researcher have take the steps to investigate more about this matter especially in the context of Malaysian working environment consist of multi-racial/ethnic of employees. This study will try to examine whether there is any relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment among bank employees at Northern Region of Malaysia.

Research Objectives
The objectives of the study are:

i) To identify any significant difference in the mean of job satisfaction within the demographic factors;

ii) To examine the significant relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment;

iii) To identify the strength of relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment.

Literature review
Job satisfaction in a narrow context might be accepted as the feelings or a general attitude of the employees in relation with their jobs and the job components such as working environment, working conditions, equitable rewards and communication with colleagues (Glisson and Durick, 1988; Kim et al., 2005)

Job satisfaction has been defined as a pleasurable emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job (Locke 1976; Weiss, 2002); an affective reaction to one’s job (Cranny, Smith & Stone, 1992) and an attitude towards one’s job (Brief, 1998); Weiss (2002) has argued that job satisfaction is an attitude but
points out that researchers should clearly distinguish the objects of cognitive evaluation which are affect (emotion), beliefs and behaviors (Weiss, 2002). This definition suggests that we form attitudes towards our jobs by taking into account our feelings, our beliefs, and our behaviors.

Robbins (2005) defined job satisfaction as a collection of feelings that an individual holds towards his or her job. Numerous factors influence employee job satisfaction, as reviewed by Rad and Yarmohammadi (2006). Job satisfaction has been observed to affect levels of job dissatisfaction, absenteeism, grievance expression, tardiness, low morale, high turnover, quality improvement and participation in decision-making.

Herzberg et al. (1959) defined the best popular “theory of job satisfaction”. The two-factor theory suggests that employees have mainly two types of needs, listed as hygiene and motivation. Hygiene factors are the needs that may be very satisfied by some certain conditions called hygiene factors (dissatisfiers) such as supervision, interpersonal relations, physical conditions, salary, benefits, etc. The theory suggest that job dissatisfaction is probable in the circumstances where hygiene factors do not exist in someone’s working environment. In contrast, when hygiene needs are supplied, it does not necessarily result in full satisfaction. Only the dissatisfaction level is decreased (Furnham et al., 2002).

There have been various studies in the literature addressing the concept of organizational commitment. Organizational commitment refers to an employee’s belief in the organization’s goals and values, desire to remain a part of the organization and loyalty to the organization (Mowday et al., 1982, Hackett et al., 2001). Mowday et al. (1979), described organizational commitment as an attitude, which exists between the individual and the organization. That is why, it is considered as relative strength of the individual’s psychological identification and involvement with the organization (Jaramillo et al., 2005). Hence this psychological conceptualization addresses affective commitment where it includes three factors: identification, involvement and loyalty (Banai et al. 2004). In addition to this construct, other researchers such as Angle and Perry (1981), Hrebiniak and Aluotto (1972) and McGee and Ford (1987) has came out with another dimension labeled as continuance commitment where an individual is committed to the organization not because of a general positive feeling but because of extraneous interest such as pensions, family concerns, etc. (Shaw et al., 2003).

Meyer and Allen (1997) defined committed employees as one who stay with an organization, attend work regularly, put in full days and more, protect company assets, have strong belief in the organizational goals and work hard to achieve these goals. They have developed a three-component model of affective, continuance and normative commitment (Jernigan et al., 2002, Lok and Crawford, 2001, Meyer and Allen, 1991, Meyer et al., 1993).

The affective component refers to the employee’s emotional attachment to identification with and involvement in the organization. Most of the research undertaken in the area of organizational commitment focused on effective commitment (Brunetto and Farr-Wharton, 2003). The continuance component refers to commitment based on costs that the employee associates with leaving the organization. The normative component refers to the employee’s feeling of obligation to remain with the organization. Most of the research has treated job satisfaction as an independent and organizational commitment as a dependent variable (Gaertner, 1999; Jernigan et al., 2002; Lok and Crawford, 2001; Mowday et al., 1982) According to Mowday et al. (1982), commitment and job satisfaction may be seen in several ways. Job satisfaction is a kind of response to a specific job or job related issues; whereas, commitment is a more global response to an organization. Therefore commitment should be more consistent than job satisfaction over time and takes longer after one is satisfied with his/her job (Feinstein and Vondrasek, 2001). Feinstein and Vondrasek (2001) analyzed the effects of job satisfaction on organizational commitment among the restaurant employees and the findings proved that satisfaction level would predict their commitment to the organization. Gaertner (1999) also analyzed the determinants of job satisfaction and organizational commitment. The findings showed that job satisfaction is a cause of organizational commitment.

Yousef (2000) investigated the relationship between job satisfaction, job commitment and performance. The result from his investigation shows that when employees are dissatisfied at work, they are less committed and will look for other opportunities to quit. If opportunities are unavailable, they may emotionally or mentally “withdraw” from the organization. Thus, job satisfactions are important attitudes in assessing employees’ intention to quit and the overall contribution of employee to the organization. Many studies across different industries and geographical regions also revealed strong correlations between organizational commitment with job satisfaction (Benkoff, 1997; Caykoylu et al., 2007; Chen, 2007; Iverson and Roy, 1994; Jernigan et al., 2002; Leong et al., 1996; Lok and Crawford, 2001; Mathieu and Hamel, 1989; Mathieu and Zajac, 1990; Micheals, 1994; Price and Mueller, 1981; Samad, 2005; Taunton et al., 1989; Williams and Hazer, 1986; Yousef, 2001).

Research Model / Framework

Based on the literature review, there is need to study about the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment among employee in banking sectors. The conceptual framework below will offer the conceptual foundation to examine and explore more to the study in verifying the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment.

![Figure 1: Theoretical Framework](image)

Research Methodology

Research Design

This study is designed by using a quantitative method. There are several hypotheses developed to be tested. All the hypotheses are developed based on the objectives of this study.
and answer the research question as well. This research also is a non-experimental research because the study only to determine the significant relationship between “Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment”, not to identify the causal of the variables involve after doing some test.

Population and Sampling
The population of this study is the bank employees at Northern Region. Based on the sample size in Cavana et. al. (2001), a numbers of samples was selected from the total population. A sample of 200 people of bank employees at Northern Region was selected. The rationale of choosing that number of samples out of total population is due to time constrains and cost involve.

Measurement
Questionnaires were used to gain data from respondents. The questionnaires were designed properly to make sure that it was understandable and attractive to be answered by the respondents. It was designed in Bahasa Malaysia in order to facilitate the respondents. An introductory letter outlining the purpose of this study was enclosed together with each set of questionnaires. The questionnaires consists three parts, there are:
- Demographic Factors – six items (gender, age, marital status, level of education, salary, the present job title an tenure.)
- Job Satisfaction – six factors (adapted and measured using eight facet variable structured around Frederick Herzberg’s Two Factor theory).
- Organizational commitment – three items (adapted, measured and tested according to organizational commitment as identified by John Meyer and Natalie Allan (Johns and Saks, 2001).

Responses are operationalized using Likert Scale ranging from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree”. Scores on the items of each sub-scale will be average to yield a summary score reflecting that subscale.

Data Collection
Primary data for this research were collected using self-administrated questionnaires and secondary data were obtained from the journal and articles that is related to this study.

Data Analysis
The data collected from the survey and questionnaires have been analyzed using the “Statistical package for social sciences” (SPSS) software 17.0. The data was analyzed using the reliability test, frequency statistics, correlation, T-test, and ANOVA. After all the data have been keyed-in in the SPSS, the reliability test for independent variables and dependent variables were conducted. The Cronbach alpha was used to measure the consistency and reliability of the items.

After that, the researcher has conducted frequency analysis for the respondent’s demographic factor such as gender, age, education background/level, salary, and years of working, job position and duration of current services. Subsequently, the Pearson Correlation analysis was conducted to examine the relationship between independent variables and dependent variables followed by regression analysis.

Reliability Analysis
Test of internal consistency (Cronbach’s alpha) were conducted to assess the reliability of each of the scales used. The closer the reliabilities coefficient gets to 1.0, the better. Results show that all the measures include in the questionnaires showed adequate levels of internal consistency reliability. (Table 1)

Findings

Respondents Demographic
The result showed that 79 (52.7%) respondents were less than 30 years old. Majority respondents showed that 77 (51.3%) respondents were male and 73 (48.7%) respondents were female. From marital status aspects, respondents can be categorized into three groups, single, married and single parent. The result showed the majority of the respondents were married, 107 (71.3%). For educational background, majority respondents were 62 (41.3%) SPM holders. Approximately 6 (4%) of the respondents were managers, 57 (38%) executive and 87 (58%) are non-executive. While length of service most of the respondents had been working 11 years and above with frequency of 63 (42%) respondents. Lastly about 90 (60%) of the employed respondents earn between RM1001-RM3000 per month.

Hypotheses of the Study
Five alternative hypotheses have been tested in this study by using Pearson Correlation to determine the relationship and the results are as followed:-

Hypothesis 1
Ho: Company policy does not have a significant impact to the organizational commitment among bank employees.
H¹ : Company policy does have a significant impact to organizational commitment among bank employees.
Result from Pearson Correlation showed that there is significant relationship between company policy and organizational commitment where the r-value is 0.887 at the stage 0.01% and significant level (p < 0.01) (Refer Table 2). The relationship is a positive relationship and the conclusion is the company policy has a significant impact to organizational commitment. Therefore this alternative hypothesis is accepted.

Hypothesis 2
Ho: Salary does not have a significant impact to the organizational commitment among bank employees.
H¹ : Salary does have a significant impact to organizational commitment among bank employees.
Result from Pearson Correlation showed that there is significant relationship between salary and organizational commitment where the r-value is 0.832 at the stage 0.01% and significant level (p < 0.01) (Refer Table 2). The relationship is a positive relationship and the conclusion is the salary has a significant impact to organizational commitment. Therefore this alternative hypothesis is accepted.

Hypothesis 3
Ho: Working condition does not have a significant impact to the organizational commitment among bank employees.
H¹ : Working condition does have a significant impact to organizational commitment among bank employees.
Result from Pearson Correlation showed that there is significant relationship between working condition and organizational commitment where the r-value is 0.736 at the stage 0.01% and significant level (p < 0.01) (Refer Table 2). The relationship is a positive relationship and the conclusion is the working condition has a significant impact to organizational commitment. Therefore this alternative hypothesis is accepted.

Hypothesis 4
Ho: Interpersonal relation does not have a significant impact to the organizational commitment among bank employees.
H¹ :Interpersonal relation does have a significant impact to organizational commitment among bank employees.
Result from Pearson Correlation showed that there is significant relationship between interpersonal relation and organizational commitment where the r-value is 0.784 at the stage 0.01% and significant level (p < 0.01) (Refer Table 2). The relationship is a positive relationship and the conclusion is the interpersonal relation has a significant impact to organizational commitment. Therefore this alternative hypothesis is accepted.

Hypothesis 5
Ho: Advancement does not have a significant impact to the organizational commitment among bank employees.
H¹ : Advancement does have a significant impact to organizational commitment among bank employees.

Result from Pearson Correlation showed that there is significant relationship between advancement and organizational commitment where the r-value is 0.914 at the stage 0.01% and significant level (p < 0.01) (Refer Table 2). The relationship is a positive relationship and the conclusion is the advancement has a significant impact to organizational commitment. Therefore this alternative hypothesis is accepted.

Regression Analysis
The result from correlation table (Table 3) shows that R Square value is 0.874. This means that the elements in independent variables explain 87.4 percent of the variance in dependents variables. The F value (199.422) from ANOVA independent variables explain 87.4 percent of the variance in this alternative hypothesis is accepted.

Overall Result
In analyzing the data, the result that gathered through this analysis is illustrated in the form of figures and tables for easy reference and deepens understanding on the explanation. In order to obtain a count of the number of respondents associated with different values of the variable and to express in percentage term, the researchers are used Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) program version 17.0. After analysis and test has been done, it shown that all independent variables have significant relationship with dependent variable. The relationship is a positive relationship and advancement variable has the highest value (t value = 6.125).

Discussion
Finding from this area of study discovered that majority of respondent age below than 30 years old. This result may be due to employees churn or taking Voluntary Separated Scheme (VSS) during big banks merger since 1998. The old generation might have resigned from the company or taking the VSS and leaving the companies with the new and young employee who are coming into this banking sector. The findings also showed that male and female’s respondents give equally responded. Thus, we can say that no gender discrimination in banking sector particularly to female employee. In term of status majority is married. It also shows that the employees are affordable in having family in early age due to good income in this sector whom majority earning salary between RM1000 to RM3000.

Looking toward education, majority falls under SPM (Sijil Pelajaran Malaysia) level. This can be concluded the reason why majority falls under non-executive category though most has been serving the companies more than 11 years.

Result from correlation shows that company policy, salary, working condition, interpersonal relation and advancement have positive relationship with organizational commitment. Furthermore, advancement variable has the strongest relationship with organizational commitment. It shows that employee job satisfaction nowadays is not only depended on the basic reward but also total packages which include appreciation and career development. This implicit reward will contribute to the total employee commitment toward their organization.

The findings of this study have several implications, which would undoubtedly be beneficial to all employees and employers of banking industry in Malaysia. Results, which obtained from the study could be useful for employers to make better decision. In short, organization commitment is more complex nowadays which both explicit and implicit needs are in increasing trends. Furthermore, employees’ satisfaction needs employers to maintain or improve the existing practice besides introducing new approaches to improve employee’s motivation and commitment. Therefore, this research finding also is in line with Frederick Herzberg’s two factors theory (hygiene and motivator).

Recommendation
Several recommendations we considered can be put forward to improve this study. Below are suggestions that we listed and they are as follows: -

i) Geographic area of this study is only limited to North Region of Malaysia (Kedah, Perlis and Penang). Therefore, it is recommended that a similar study should be extended to Southern, Eastern and East Malaysia in future. This extension will provide a more complete overview of respondent views.

ii) This study only focus on five elements of job satisfaction which are company policy, salary, working condition, interpersonal relation and advancement. Other possible elements such as appreciation, responsibility and benefits could be explored further by future researchers.

iii) Encouraging employees to further their studies will improve the educational level of bank employees. As a result, this can contribute to better productivity of employees in future since most of them still young.

iv) Taking proactive approach by offering more and more benefits to the employees in order to increase their loyalty. Instead of react to their problem and looking them leaving the company which can be considered as late already, proactive action can led to their satisfaction as well as loyalty.

v) All levels of management particularly top management should always look on employee satisfaction instead of just focusing on profitability and increasing share value of the companies. Employees are part of the total assets whom need to be taking care too.

vi) The employee needs should be look carefully from the basic rewards up to the career advancement. This happens particularly for those who are in the workforce for quite a long time. Their needs are not only based on the basic salary but more towards career development and company environment.

vii) In short, employee is the important asset of the company. Looking to this matter, organizations should provide better environment towards their employees beside the basic requirement. They could provide more benefits programs, open door policy, good working environment and many others to establish total employees’ commitment towards their organization.
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Table 1: Reliability Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Company Policy</td>
<td>.855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Salary</td>
<td>.922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Working Condition</td>
<td>.915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Interpersonal Relation</td>
<td>.896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Advancement</td>
<td>.872</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Pearson Correlation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>company policy</th>
<th>salary</th>
<th>working condition</th>
<th>interpersonal relation</th>
<th>advancement</th>
<th>organizational commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>company policy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.836†</td>
<td>.874‡</td>
<td>.809†</td>
<td>.805†</td>
<td>.807†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>salary</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.836†</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.889‡</td>
<td>.734‡</td>
<td>.847‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>working condition</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.874†</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.887‡</td>
<td>.704‡</td>
<td>.736‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interpersonal relation</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.809†</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.877‡</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.813‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>advancement</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.895†</td>
<td>.847‡</td>
<td>.704‡</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.914‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organizational commitment</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.887‡</td>
<td>.832‡</td>
<td>.736‡</td>
<td>.847‡</td>
<td>.914‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Table 3: Regression Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.935*</td>
<td>.874</td>
<td>.869</td>
<td>.07242</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), advancement, working condition, interpersonal relation, salary, company policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.046</td>
<td>199.422</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>149</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), advancement, working condition, interpersonal relation, salary, company policy

b. Dependent Variable: organizational commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>2.215</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>35.460</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>company policy</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.271</td>
<td>3.687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>salary</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>1.248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>working condition</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>3.370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interpersonal relation</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>advancement</td>
<td>.206</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.476</td>
<td>6.125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: organizational commitment