

**AN EMPIRICAL RESEARCH AMONG THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN
JOB SATISFACTION AND ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT IN THE
LOGISTICS COMPANIES IN THE WEST BANK \ PALESTINE**

Saed Darweesh

Istanbul Aydin University, Turkey.

Department of business, Business management program.

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to find out the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment of employees who works in logistics companies in Palestine, West Bank. Two-hundred and sixty-two employees working in 5 different logistics companies are the sample size. The measures of the study are already tested for validity and reliability. In this study, they are also examined and found to be valid and reliable. The method of data collection used was the questionnaire to include a large sample.

KEYWORDS:

Job satisfaction, Organizational commitment, Logistics companies.

INTRODUCTION

Organizational commitment and job satisfaction are job related attitudes that have received considerable attention from researchers around the globe. This is because committed and satisfied employees are normally high performers that contribute towards organizational productivity [1-3]. There are not much research efforts taken to explore attitudinal and behavioral aspects in Palestine. This study initiates an attempt to address this issue. This study is intended to examine the level of job satisfaction and organizational commitment among employees in the selected organizations in West Bank, Palestine. The success of an organization and the pursuit of quality depend not only on how the organization makes the most of human competencies, but also on how it stimulates commitment to an organization [4,5]. Commitment has been related to valuable outcomes for both employees and employers. Greater commitment can result in enhanced feelings of belonging, security, efficacy, greater career advancement, increased compensation and increased intrinsic rewards for the individual [6]. For the organization, the rewards of commitment can mean increased employee tenure, limited turnover, reduced training costs, greater job satisfaction, acceptance of organization's demands, and the meeting of organizational goals such as high quality [7]. Different authors depending on their backgrounds have defined and measured organizational commitment differently. According to organizational commitment can be defined as an employee's level of identification and involvement in the organization [8]. For Meyer and Allens organizational commitment is a psychological state that characterizes the employee's relationship with the organization with its implications for the decision to continue membership in the organization [9]. Mowday et al. defined organizational commitment as a strong belief in an organization's goals, and values, a willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of an organization and a strong desire to remain a member of the organization [7]. Demographic factors such as age, gender, marital status, education level and work experience have found to be significantly related to organizational commitment [10-13]. However, Salami found that age and job tenure are significant predictors of organizational commitment [14]. Luthans [15] defined job satisfaction as a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experience. It is a result of employee's perception of how well their job provides those things that are viewed as important. Evan [16] defined job satisfaction as a state of mind encompassing all those feelings determined by the extent to which the individual perceives his/her job-related needs to be being met. Mowday et al. [7] defined job satisfaction as the relative strength of an individual's identification with and involvement in a particular organization. It is evident that there are numerous definitions of the construct "organizational commitment". For the purposes of this study, it is the definition of Mowday et al. [7] that will be used. Several researchers have reported mixed findings on the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment. For

instance, Curry, Wakefield, Price and Mueller [17] found no significant relationship between the two. However, other researchers [11,14,18, -21]. Many studies use different facets of job satisfaction to predict organizational commitment [22-24].

2. Theoretical literature review

2.1 Job Satisfaction.

Job satisfaction is widely researched in the literature and researchers vary in their definitions to the concept. McNeese-Smith (1996) defines it as the feelings of individuals about their jobs. In the broadest sense, Knoop (1995) stated that it refers to an employee general attitude toward the job or some dimensions of it. Cumbey and Alexander (1998) considered it as “an effective feeling that depends on the interaction of employees, their personal characteristics, values, and expectations with the work environment, and the organization”. Locke (1969) defined “job satisfaction as a positive emotional feeling, a result of one’s evaluation towards his or her job experience by comparing between what he or she expects from his or her job and what he or she actually gets from it”. Research has shown that job satisfaction or dissatisfaction leads to a number of consequences. It was revealed by many studies (Kirsch, 1990; Knoop, 1995; McNeese-Smith,1996) that satisfaction leads to more productivity, high quality of care and intent to remain in the organization. On the other hand, job dissatisfaction was found to increase absenteeism, turnover, high stress, and grievances (Mc Neese-Smith, 1996). The antecedents of job satisfaction are also examined by a number of studies (Nolan et al.,1995; Herzberg, 1966; Tonges et al., 1998). One of the sounding studies in this regard is Herzberg’s two-factor theory of job satisfaction. He distinguished between factors leading to satisfaction and those leading to dissatisfaction. Of the factors that increase satisfaction are recognition for achievement, work itself, advancement, etc. The factors that influence dissatisfaction are organizational policy and administration, supervision, salary, interpersonal relationship, etc. (Herzberg, 1966). In addition, empirical research shows that leadership (democratic or autocratic), pay and working conditions, workload factors are determinants of job satisfaction (Nolan et al., 1995). On the other hand, several determinants of job satisfaction have been established in past researches, such as organizational reward systems, power distribution individual differences, self-esteem, locus of control etc. (e.g., Chen and Silverthorne, 2008) When employees are not satisfied, they tend to shift and look for satisfaction elsewhere.

2.2 Organizational commitment

Organizational commitment is one of the most important organizational concepts that have widely been examined in managerial literature due to its significance for organizational performance and effectiveness. Organizational commitment is generally confined to as the degree to which an employee is loyal to their organization. Organizational commitment was found to have significant relationship with turnover, productivity and satisfaction (Mathieu and Hamel, 1989). Porter et al. (1974) pointed out that organizational commitment as “the relative strength of an individual’s identification with and involvement in a particular organization”. According to Meyer and Allen (1997), “Individuals who have strong affective commitment remain in the organization because they feel they want to, some with a stronger normative commitment remain because they ought to and those with strong continuance commitment remain because they need to”. These three fundamental components related to the definitions of organizational commitment have been found in literature very frequently, such as: affective, continuance, and normative (Allen and Meyer, 1990, 1996; Karrasch, 2003; Greenberg, 2005; Turner and Chelladurai, 2005). Affective Commitment- that is psychological attachment to organization. It refers to “a positive affection toward the organization, reflected in a desire to see the organization succeed in its goals and a feeling of pride at being part of the organization” (Cohen, 2003). Continuance Commitment- costs associated with leaving the organization. It refers to “an individual’s awareness of the costs of leaving the organization” (Meyer et al., 1993). An employee with continuance commitment finds it difficult to give up his organization due to the fear of the unknown ‘opportunity cost’ of leaving

the organization or having few or no alternatives. Employees with high level of this type of commitment therefore remain a member of the organization because they need it (Nagar,2012) and Normative Commitment- perceived obligation to remain with the organization have implications for the continuing participation of the individual in the organization (Wiener and Gechman, 1977; Meyer and Allen, 1991; Meyer et al., 1993; Ayeni and Phopoola, 2007). It can be said in other words: affective commitment occurs when employee wants to stay; continuance commitment occurs when the employee needs to stay; and the normative commitment occurs when the employee feels s/he ought to stay in the organization (Meyer et al., 1993; Suma and Lesha, 2013). Studies on commitment have provided strong evidence that affective and normative commitment is positively related and continuance commitment is negatively connected with organizational outcomes such as performance and citizenship behavior (Hackett et al., 1994). Research also provides evidence that, employees with higher levels of affective commitment to their work, their job and their career exhibit higher levels of continuance and normative commitments (Cohen, 1996).

2.3 Job satisfaction and Organizational commitment.

Since the Hawthorne studies, job satisfaction and commitment to employing organizations have received a great deal of attention from both academicians and practitioners till in the 21st century. It has increased largely due to their significant impact on organization and individual behaviors (Al-Aameri, 2000). It was found that employee attitudes toward satisfaction and commitment are indicators to the solidarity between organizational members and management (Tonges et al., 1998). According to Meyer et al. (2002), job satisfaction is a determinative of organizational commitment. The main difference between organizational commitment and job satisfaction is that while organizational commitment can be defined as the emotional responses which an employee has towards his organization; job satisfaction is the responses that an employee has towards any job. It is considered that these two variables are highly interrelated. In other words, while an employee has positive feelings towards the organization, its values and objectives, it is possible for him to be unsatisfied with the job he has in the organization (Çelik, 2008). In the past many empirical research has indicated that there is a low correlation between job satisfaction, commitment, and the intention to leave an organization, which suggests that no direct relationship exists. There are satisfied, committed employees who decide to leave, and dissatisfied, ambivalent employees who steadfastly remain at their jobs (Nunn, 2000; Norizan, 2012). Other factors might weigh in the decision to stay or to leave, and these factors may be both works related and personal. Some authors concluded that only a weak negative correlation exists between job satisfaction and voluntary turnover (Mobley et al., 1979; Schwepker, 2001). For example, employees may lack alternatives to staying with their present job situation, or other types of barriers and commitments may affect their decision to stay. Kalleberg and Mastekaasa (2001) found that previous research on the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment has not shown any consistent and easily reconcilable findings. It is posited that a relationship between the level of job satisfaction and turnover intention may be influenced by an employee's efforts to stay with his or her job and try to change the elements of the job that are dissatisfies (Steers and Mowday, 1981). This suggests that an employee might have strong commitment to an organization although he or she is unsatisfied with certain aspects of his or her specific job. Kovach (1977) defined that "job satisfaction is recognized as a component of organizational commitment", while other researchers have clearly stated that job satisfaction is a predictor of organizational commitment (Porter et al.,1974; Price, 1977; Spector, 1997). Whether job satisfaction is a component of or a predictor of organizational commitment, the differences between organizational commitment and job satisfaction can be viewed in various ways (Mowday et al., 1982). The relationship between organizational commitment and job satisfaction is also researched in many professions. Most of these studies whether in the nursing profession or other professions found a positively significant relationship between them (Kirsch,1990; Al-meer, 1995; Knoop, 1995; Mc NeeseSmith, 1996). Job satisfaction is more of a response to a specific job or aspect of a job, while commitment is a more global response (Weiner, 1980). Organizational commitment may be more indicative of an employee's attachment to the organization, as opposed to specific tasks, environment, or job location (Gardner, 1990). In fact, an employee's emotional attachment to an organization may engender a stronger personal commitment and enable the employee to experience a sense of belonging (Allen and Meyer, 1990; Meyer and Herscovitch,

IJETRM

International Journal of Engineering Technology Research & Management

2001). Mohamed et al. (2012) found out that job satisfaction is positively related to organizational trust, affective commitment, continuance commitment and normative commitment. Daneshfard and Ekvaniyan (2012) found that when organizational commitments (affective and normative commitment) increase those jobs satisfaction increases too. And when organizational commitment (affective and normative commitment) decreases faculty members and managers job satisfaction decrease too. Eslami and Gharakhani (2012) found that job satisfaction has positive and significant effects on organizational commitments.

3 Methodology

Many researchers have emphasized the importance of describing the research approach as an effective strategy to improve the validity of corporate research (Newman & Benz, 1998, Cresswell, 2007). To this end, social scientists can use three different methods that can be described as qualitative, quantitative and mixed research methods (Newman and Benz, 1998, Cresswell, 2007). Qualitative research method refers to an approach to discover and understand individuals and groups representing social or human problems (Cresswell, 2007). This method collects and analyzes theory, analysis, correction, evaluation, research questions, backtests, open-ended questions, interviews, focus groups, observations and case studies, and validation targets. She identifies and addresses threats of (Maxwell, 1998, Sutton & Austin, 2015). Also, I think about this "why" one thinks must participate" (Sutton and Austin, 2015). In addition, for qualitative research, it is possible to obtain culturally specific information about the values, attitudes, actions and social contexts of a particular population group (Marshall, 2003). Quantitative research methods help to prove the desired theory when examining the relationship between variables. These variables can often be measured on the instrument and thus numbered data can be analyzed using statistical procedures (Cresswell, 2007). The researchers received the data digitally through online and/or paper-based surveys and interviews. Quantitative studies usually begin with data collection based on hypotheses or theories, followed by explanatory or inferential statistics (Walliman, 2011). Briefly, descriptive statistics indicate that they determine the characteristics of the observed phenomenon or that they discover correlations between two or more entities. Inferential statistics refer to inference of data to infer more general conditions and to test statistics (Trochim, 2006). Social science means mixed, and research methods should collect, analyze, and blend quantitative and qualitative data into a single study or multiple studies. Its main premise is that using quantitative and qualitative approaches is to gain a deeper understanding of research problems only at the heart (Creswell & Plan Clark, 2011). Methods can be an ideal technique for evaluating complex interventions (Johnson, Onwuugbuzie & Turner, 2008, Creswell, 2009). However, this method covers the task of qualitative (light, rich and deep) and quantitative (hard, objective standardization) and quantitative approaches due to the nature of the data nature. (Corbetta, 2003). Corbetta, 2003). The study was carried out on the basis of a quantitative research method. Digital data is collected using online and paper-based surveys designed according to relevant documents. Then, two different scale factors are unified for the variables. Therefore, the analytical analysis method and the descriptive analysis method that were applied (Al-Alami, 2015) used to analyze the test data is defined as the descriptive approach to analysis, thus "easily explaining the performance-defining phenomenon". Events or flows provide data about specific characteristics and they need to know the knowledge of the participants, and research to study to research to study the event or flow requires knowledge of the study of phenomena to study, one of the forms of analysis and interpretation. Data".

3.1 Sample size

The sample included 262 employees from five different logistics companies operating in the West Bank of Palestine. The sample will represent the entire range with a 95% confidence level and ± 5 confidence interval. This study aims to measure the relationship between the job satisfaction and organizational commitment of employees working in the logistics sector in the West Bank of Palestine. Ramallah, Nablus, Turkham, Jenin. That's in the second half of 2021

IJETRM

International Journal of Engineering Technology Research & Management

3.2 Study Tool

A questionnaire was prepared on "Discovering the relationship between organizational commitment and job, and distributed to the logistics sector in the West Bank\Palestine. The work of the participants to answer the questions listed within the basis of the Likert scale, where the scale depends on the responses to indicate the degree of approval and objection to a formula, through the answers of the participants were reached the results of the study.

Likert scale scores:) Schedule (

Response	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral (Agree Slightly)	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Degree	5	4	3	2	1

3.2.1 (JSS) Job satisfaction scale.

The level of job satisfaction of the organization's employees is measured by Paul J. Spector and the JSS job satisfaction survey is a scale of 36 items and 9 aspects that is used to evaluate the attitudes of employees towards work and work. Four items are used to evaluate each aspect and the total score is calculated based on all items. Using the summary rating scale format, there are six options for each item, from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree". Items are written in both directions, so about half should be scored backwards. The nine aspects are salary, promotion, supervision, fringe benefits, contingent rewards (rewards based on performance), operating procedures (required rules and procedures), colleagues, nature of work, and communication. Although JSS was originally developed for human service organizations, it is applicable to all organizations. The specifications provided on this website include various types of organizations in the public and private sectors.

Job Satisfaction scale was .772 which represents the high internal reliability of the scale on the other hand KMO equal 0.750 > 0.60 this reflect that the factor measure study in good quality level.

3.2.2 Organizational Commitment Scale (OCS)

OCS has been extensively tested and received important support (Allen & Meyer, 1996; Meyer et al., 2002). OCS measures the organizational commitment of employees around three components, namely, emotional commitment, normative commitment, and continuity commitment.

The OCS comprises of 24 items, 8 items for each component, the Cronbach α value of the **Affective Commitment** scale was .768 which represents the high internal reliability of the scale, on the other hand KMO equal 0.726 > 0.60 this reflect that the factor measure study in good quality level.

Continues Commitment scale was .747 which represents the high internal reliability of the scale on the other hand KMO equal 0.867 > 0.60 this reflect that the factor measure study in good quality level.

Normative Commitment scale was .769 which represents the high internal reliability of the scale on the other hand KMO equal 0.791 > 0.60 this reflect that the factor measure study in good quality level.

4. Data analysis and presentation

4.1 Introduction

IJETRM

International Journal of Engineering Technology Research & Management

introduction to the data analysis and hypothesis testing of the research, answering the research questions and reviewing the main results of the questionnaire obtained through the analysis paragraph, and finding personal information including (gender, marital status, education level), total work experience) and A statistical analysis was carried out on the collected data. Use the Social Research Statistics Package (SPSS) to obtain the research results presented and analyzed in this chapter.

Testing study hypothesis & Study questions

Factor Analysis of the Scales

Reliability of questioner (Cronbach Alpha)

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.892	60

Cronbach Alpha is very high that equal (0.892) this means scales have high reliability degree to measure hypothesis and test it.

4.2 Testing hypothesis

To achieve the objectives of this study and answer main and sub-questions many hypotheses have been formulated:

Main Hypothesis:

H1: There is significant and positive impact to Organizational Commitment on Job Satisfaction.

From main hypothesis three sub-hypothesis have been formulated to approve main hypothesis and answer main and sub-questions many hypotheses have been formulated:

First Sub -Hypothesis:

H 1.1: There is significant and positive impact to Affective Organizational Commitment on Job Satisfaction.

Second Sub - Hypothesis:

H 1.2: There is significant and positive impact to Continuous Organizational Commitment on Job Satisfaction.

Third Sub - Hypothesis:

H 1.3: There is significant and positive impact to Normative Organizational Commitment on Job Satisfaction.

4.3 Correlation analysis:

Correlation analysis test the relationship between independent Variables (Affective

IJETRM

International Journal of Engineering Technology Research & Management

, Continuous & Normative Organizational Commitment) and dependent Variable (Job Satisfaction) as the following

Correlations

		Job Satisfaction	Organizational Affective Commitment	Organizational Continues Commitment	Organizational Normative Commitment	Organizational Commitment
Job Satisfaction	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed) N	1 .000 262	.530** .000 262	.519** .000 262	.564** .000 262	.676** .000 262
Organizational Affective Commitment	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed) N	.530** .000 262	1 .000 262	.383** .000 262	.490** .000 262	.775** .000 262
Organizational Continues Commitment	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed) N	.519** .000 262	.383** .000 262	1 .000 262	.475** .000 262	.787** .000 262
Organizational Normative Commitment	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed) N	.564** .000 262	.490** .000 262	.475** .000 262	1 .000 262	.824** .000 262
Organizational Commitment	Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed) N	.676** .000 262	.775** .000 262	.787** .000 262	.824** .000 262	1 .000 262

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

As shown at table above the correlation between independent Variables and dependent Variable has high significant level at (0.01) (Rule of Thumb) and there is strong positive relationship between independent & dependent Variable as the following results:

significant positive relationship between Organizational Commitment and Job Satisfaction: 0.676** and sig level $0.000 < 0.01$.

significant positive relationship between Affective Organizational Commitment and Job Satisfaction: 0.530** and sig level $0.000 < 0.01$.

significant positive relationship between Continuous Organizational Commitment and Job Satisfaction: 0.519** and sig level $0.000 < 0.01$.

significant positive relationship between Normative Organizational Commitment and Job Satisfaction: 0.564** and sig level $0.000 < 0.01$.

IJETRM

International Journal of Engineering Technology Research & Management

4.4 Regression analysis.

In this analysis, to prove hypothesis we will highlight the followings:

T-value: should be more than role of them (1.96).

F-test: interpret the quality of the relationship model between independent Variables & dependent variable and the validity of reliance on its results to explain the relationship without errors

R2: interpret the changing percent that independent variable affecting on dependent variable.

Sig. level: should be at Coefficientsa & ANOVAa test less than ($\alpha < 0.01$)

We can approve the main hypothesis and approving sub – hypothesis as the following.

Main Hypothesis:

H1: There is significant impact of Organizational Commitment on Job Satisfaction.

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.676a	.457	.455	.32433	.457	218.612	1	260	.000

a. Predictors: (Constant), Organizational Commitment

ANOVAa

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	22.996	1	22.996	218.612	.000b
	Residual	27.350	260	.105		
	Total	50.347	261			

a. Dependent Variable: Job Satisfaction Scale

b. Predictors: (Constant), Organizational Commitment

Coefficientsa

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.148	.133		8.626	.000
	Organizational Commitment	.645	.044	.676	14.786	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Job Satisfaction Scale

In general, we accept sub - hypothesis (H1) because There is significant impact at level ($\alpha < 0.01$) to Organizational Commitment on Job Satisfaction because of:

Significant level at Coefficients & ANOVA test is less than ($\alpha < 0.01$) and equal (0.000).

T-value of main hypothesis equal (8.626) that consider more than role of them (1.96).

IJETRM

International Journal of Engineering Technology Research & Management

R² equal 45.7 %: Organizational Commitment interpret the change percent in job satisfaction by 45.07 % the rest of percent (54.93 %) it is explained by other factors in addition to random errors resulting from the accuracy of the sample selection and the accuracy of the measurement

The value of F-test function equal (218.612) at high sig. level of (0.000<0.01) so the model is high quality to interpret the relationship between independent variable (Organizational Commitment) & dependent variable (Job Satisfaction) and the model valid to reliance on its results to explain the relationship without errors.

According to the main hypothesis is supported that changing in (Organizational Commitment) by 0.645 will increase Job Satisfaction by one unit, here this table show that the level of positive influence for Organizational Commitment on Job Satisfaction.

First Sub-Hypothesis:

H 1.1: There is significant and positive impact of Affective Organizational Commitment on Job Satisfaction.

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df 1	df 2	Sig. F Change
1	.530a	.281	.278	.37314	.281	101.598	1	260	.000

a. Predictors: (Constant), Organizational Affective Commitment Scale

ANOVAa

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	14.146	1	14.146	101.598	.000b
	Residual	36.201	260	.139		
	Total	50.347	261			

a. Dependent Variable: Job Satisfaction Scale

b. Predictors: (Constant), Organizational Affective Commitment Scale

Coefficientsa

IJETRM

International Journal of Engineering Technology Research & Management

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1 (Constant)	1.834	.127		14.454	.000
Organizational Affective Commitment Scale	.418	.041	.530	10.080	.000

Dependent Variable: Job Satisfaction Scale

In general, we accept sub - hypothesis (H1.1) because There is significant impact at level ($\alpha < 0.01$) to Affective Organizational Commitment on Job Satisfaction because of:

Significant level at Coefficients & ANOVA test is less than ($\alpha < 0.01$) and equal (0.000).

T-value of first sub - hypothesis equal (14.454) that consider more than role of them (1.96).

R2 equal 28.1 %: Affective Organizational Commitment interpret the change percent in job satisfaction by 28.1 % the rest of percent (71.9 %) it is explained by other factors in addition to random errors resulting from the accuracy of the sample selection and the accuracy of the measurement

The value of F-test function equal (101,598) at high sig. level of ($0.000 < 0.01$) so the model is high quality to interpret the relationship between independent variable (Affective Organizational Commitment) & dependent variable (Job Satisfaction) and the model valid to reliance on its results to explain the relationship without errors.

the first sub – hypothesis is supported that changing in (Affective Organizational Commitment) by 0.418 will increase Job Satisfaction by one unit, here this table show that the level of positive influence for Affective Organizational Commitment on Job Satisfaction.

Second Sub-Hypothesis:

H 1.2: There is significant and positive impact of Continuous Organizational Commitment on Job Satisfaction.

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df 1	df 2	Sig. F Change
1	.519a	.270	.267	.37606	.270	96.005	1	260	.000

Predictors: (Constant), Organizational Continues Commitment Scale

ANOVAa

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1 Regression	13.577	1	13.577	96.005	.000b
Residual	36.769	260	.141		
Total	50.347	261			

IJETRM

International Journal of Engineering Technology Research & Management

- a. Dependent Variable: Job Satisfaction Scale
- b. Predictors: (Constant), Organizational Continues Commitment Scale

Coefficientsa

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.929	.121		15.954	.000
	Organizational Continues Commitment Scale	.382	.039	.519	9.798	.000

Dependent Variable: Job Satisfaction Scale

In general, we reject sub-hypothesis H1.2 and accept null sub-hypothesis (There is significant positive impact of Continuous Organizational Commitment on Job Satisfaction) because There is significant impact at level ($\alpha < 0.01$) to Continues Organizational Commitment on Job Satisfaction because of: Significant level at Coefficients & ANOVA test is less than ($\alpha < 0.01$) and equal (0.000).

T-value of first sub - hypothesis equal (15.954) that consider more than role of them (1.96) at high sig. level of ($0.000 < 0.01$) also.

R2 equal 27 %: Continues Organizational Commitment interpret the change percent in job satisfaction by 27 % the rest of percent (73 %) it is explained by other factors in addition to random errors resulting from the accuracy of the sample selection and the accuracy of the measurement

The value of F-test function equal (96,005) at high sig. level of ($0.000 < 0.01$) so the model is high quality to interpret the relationship between independent variable (Continues Organizational Commitment) & dependent variable (Job Satisfaction) and the model valid to reliance on its results to explain the relationship without errors.

the second sub – hypothesis is support that changing in (Continues Organizational Commitment) by 0.418 will increase Job Satisfaction by one unit, here this shows the level of positive influence for Continues Organizational Commitment on Job Satisfaction.

Third Sub-Hypothesis:

H 1.3: There is significant and positive impact of Normative Organizational Commitment on Job Satisfaction.

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df 1	df 2	Sig. F Change
1									

IJETRM

International Journal of Engineering Technology Research & Management

1	.564 a	.318	.315	.36340	.318	121.239	1	260	.000
---	-----------	------	------	--------	------	---------	---	-----	------

a. Predictors: (Constant), Organizational Normative Commitment Scale

ANOVAa

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	16.011	1	16.011	121.239	.000b
	Residual	34.336	260	.132		
	Total	50.347	261			

a. Dependent Variable: Job Satisfaction Scale
Predictors: (Constant), Organizational Normative Commitment Scale

Coefficientsa

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.818	.118		15.422	.000
	Organizational Normative Commitment Scale	.427	.039	.564	11.011	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Job Satisfaction Scale

In general, we accept Sub-hypothesis H1.3 because There is significant impact at level (alpha<0.01) to Normative Organizational Commitment on Job Satisfaction because of:

Significant level at Coefficients & ANOVA test is less than (alpha < 0.01) and equal (0.000).

T-value of first sub - hypothesis equal (15.422) that consider more than role of them (1.96) at high sig. level of (0.000<0.01) also.

R2 equal 31.8 %: Normative Organizational Commitment interpret the change percent in job satisfaction by 31.8 % the rest of percent (68.2 %) it is explained by other factors in addition to random errors resulting from the accuracy of the sample selection and the accuracy of the measurement

The value of F-test function equal (121.239) at high sig. level of (0.000<0.01) so the model is high quality to interpret the relationship between independent variable (Normative Organizational Commitment) & dependent variable (Job Satisfaction) and the model valid to reliance on its results to explain the relationship without errors.

the third sub – hypothesis is support that changing in Normative Organizational Commitment by 0.427 will increase Job Satisfaction by one unit, here this shows the level of positive influence for Normative Organizational Commitment on Job Satisfaction

5. Conclusion

IJETRM

International Journal of Engineering Technology Research & Management

We conclude this study with the aim of measuring the relationship between JS and OC of employees in the logistics department. Based on a quantitative analysis, two scales used in this study were used to rate employees in the logistics department. The first scale is the Job Satisfaction Scale, comprising 36 items and the second scale is the Organizational Engagement Scale, comprising 24 items. Analysis of job satisfaction, organizational commitment concepts are very important for employees of logistics companies. High levels of job satisfaction and organizational commitment enable employees to provide high motivation. Employees will do their best to achieve the goals set by the organization. As a result of this effort, the organization will be unprecedented. To improve the level of organizational engagement of logistics sales staff, job satisfaction can give the following suggestions, implement a fair salary plan, create a supportive organizational culture, establish effective communication systems, and improve employee benefits employees. A system of rewards and punishments must be established and this system must be applied objectively, and human resource policies and enforcement procedures must be developed which are essential in forming organizational commitment. These results indicate that the relationship between organizational commitment and job satisfaction will lead to a certain degree of independence and dependence. Unless these aspects are taken into account, turnover rate will increase, service quality will decrease, customer satisfaction will be negatively affected, and competitive inconvenience will occur, thus, businesses face the risk of withdrawing or leaving.

6. Recommendations

Due to the importance of the subject, the researcher recommends conducting an in-depth study on the relationship between job satisfaction and institutional commitment from the perspective of managers in private companies in order to improve organizational performance and the function of managers. will be reflected in the employee's job satisfaction and continued to establish good relationship between colleagues and superiors due to its significant impact on the high level of job satisfaction of employees in logistics company. And this through open seminars, conferences and meetings, both helps to build social relationships, and tightens the camaraderie between colleagues and superiors, on the other hand, encourages continued efforts and development. promote work efficiency to achieve the best level in order to develop the professional level of employees. By establishing clear job duties in the workplace, increasing the appropriate training for each major, and assigning individuals according to the nature of their work, while at the same time paying attention to ensuring for employees, by providing job security systems for employees during or after work. and provide them with health care, given the importance of the subject, the researcher advises to conduct an in-depth study on the relationship between job satisfaction and institutional commitment from the point of view of by managers in private companies to d" improve the organization and functional performance of managers, which will lead to employee job satisfaction and enable and develop incentive system by reviewing and evaluating regulations and laws relating to end of service and annual bonuses, and then developing them in a way that aligns with employee needs and employee assessments. influence and increase job satisfaction, on the other hand, involve employees in decision making and develop independent development plans and programs, increase flexibility in relationship between employees and their managers, which positively reflects the employee's job satisfaction and discovered their efforts and increase opportunities for promotion, material development for employees, increase the level of job satisfaction of workers and managers, and finally need to have the guidance of all levels of the public. administrative positions for promotion. and incentives take place on the basis of job differentiation, which increases and affects the level of job satisfaction.

7. Reference

[1]. T. Oshagbemi, "Job Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction in Higher Education," *Education & Training*, Vol. 39, No. 9, 1997a, pp. 354-359.

[2]. Cohen, A. (2003). *Multiple Commitments in the Workplace*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
Cumbey, D. A. and Alexander, J. W. (1998). The Relationship of Job Satisfaction with Organizational Variables in Public Health Nursing. *Journal of Nursing Administration*, 28 (5), pp. 39-46.

IJETRM

International Journal of Engineering Technology Research & Management

- [3] D. A. Yousef, "Organizational Commitment: A Mediator of the Relationships of Leadership Behavior with Job Satisfaction and Performance in a Non-Western Country," *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, Vol. 15, No. 1, 2000, pp. 6-24.
- [4] G. Beukhof, M. J. de Jong and W. J. Nijhof, "Employee Commitment in Changing Organization: An Exploration. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, Vol. 22, No. 6, 1998, pp. 243-248.
- [5] A. Thornhill, P. Lewis and M. N. K. Saunders, "The Role of Employee Communication in Achieving Commitment and Quality in Higher Education," *Quality Assurance in Education*, 4, 1996. 12-20.
- [6] R. W. Rowden, "The Relationship between Charismatic Leadership Behaviors and Organizational Commitment," *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, Vol. 21, 2000, pp. 30-35.
- [7] R. T. Mowday, L. W. Porter and R. M. Steers, "Employee-Organization Linkages: The Psychology of Commitment, Absenteeism and Turnover," Academic Press, Inc., New York, 1982.
- [8] L. T. Mullins, "Management and Organizational Behavior," 5th Edition, Financial Times Management, London, 1999.
- [9] Meyer, J. P. and Allen, N. J. (1997). *Commitment in the Workplace: Theory, Research, and Application*, Sage Publications, Inc
- [10] D. Dodd-McCue and G. B. Wright, "Men, Women and Attitudinal Commitment: The Effects of Workplace Experiences and Socialization," *Human Relations*, Vol. 49, No. 8, 1996, 1065-1089.
- [11] B. Mannheim, Y. Baruch and J. Tal, "Alternative Models for Antecedents and Outcomes of Work Centrality and Job Satisfaction of High-Tech Personnel," *Human Relations*, Vol. 50, No. 12, 1997, pp. 1537-1562
- [12] Meyer, J. P., Stanley, D. J., Herscovitch, L. and Topolnytsky, L. (2002). Affective, Continuance, and Normative Commitment to the Organization: A Meta-analysis of Antecedents, Correlates, and Consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 61 (1), pp. 20-52.
- [13] S. M. Wiedmer, "An Examination of Factors Affecting Employee Satisfaction, 1998.
<http://clearinghouse.missouriwestern.edu/manuscripts/51.asp>
- [14] S. O. Salami, "Demographic and Psychological Factors Predicting Organizational Commitment among Industrial Workers," *Anthropologist*, Vol. 10, No. 1, 2008, pp. 31-38.
- [15] E. Luthans, "Organizational Behavior," Irwin/McGraw- Hill, New York, 1998
- [16] L. Evans, "Delving Deeper into Morale, Job Satisfaction and Motivation among Education Professionals: ReExamining the Leadership Dimension," *Educational Management and Administration*, Vol. 29, No. 3, 2001, pp.291-306.
- [17] J. Curry, 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.
- [18] T. Busch, L. Fallan and A. Pettersen, "Disciplinary Differences in Job Satisfaction Self-Efficacy, Goal Commitment and Organizational Commitment among Faculty Employees in Norwegian Colleges:

IJETRM

International Journal of Engineering Technology Research & Management

An Empirical Assessment of Indicators of Performance,” *Quality in Higher Education*, Vol. 4, No. 2, 1998, pp. 137-157.

[19] Wiener, Y. and Gechman, A. S. (1977). Commitment: A Behavioral Approach to Job Involvement. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 10 (1), pp. 47-52.

[20] Ayeni, C. O. and Phopoola, 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*

[21] A. Freund, “Commitment and Job Satisfaction as Predictors Turnover Intentions among Welfare Workers,” *Administration in Social Work*, Vol. 29, No. 2, 2005, pp. 5-21.

[22] J. R. Dienhart and M. B. Gregoire, “Job Satisfaction, Job Involvement, Job Security, and Customer Focus of Quick-Service Restaurant Employees,” *Hospitality Research Journal*, Vol. 16, No. 2, 1993, pp. 29-44.

[23] Suma, S. and Leshia, J. (2013). Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment: The Case of Shkodra Municipality. *European Scientific Journal*, 9 (17), pp. 41-51.

[24] D. A. Yousef, “Satisfaction with Job Security as a Predictor of Organizational Commitment and Job Performance in a Multicultural Environment,” *International Journal of Manpower*, Vol. 19, No. 3, 1998, pp. 184-194

[25] McNeese-Smith, D. (1996). Increasing Employee Productivity, Job Satisfaction, and Organizational Commitment. *Hospital and Health Services Administration*, 41 (2), pp. 160-175.

[26] Knoop, R. (1995). Relationships among Job Involvement, Job Satisfaction, and Organizational Commitment for Nurses. *The Journal of Psychology*, 129 (6), pp. 643-649

[27] Cumbey, D. A. and Alexander, J. W. (1998). The Relationship of Job Satisfaction with Organizational Variables in Public Health Nursing. *Journal of Nursing Administration*, 28 (5), pp. 39-46.

[28] Locke, E. A. (1969). What Is Job Satisfaction? *Organizational Behaviour and Human Performance*, 4 (1), pp. 309-36.

[29] Kirsch, J. C. (1990). Staff Development Opportunity and Nurse Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment, and Intent to Remain in the Organization: Implications for Staff Development. *Journal for Nurses in Professional Development*, 6 (6), pp. 279-282.

[30] Nolan, M., Nolan, J. and Grant, G. (1994). Maintaining Nurses' Job Satisfaction and Morale. *British Journal of Nursing (Mark Allen Publishing)*, 4 (19), pp. 1149-1154.

[31] Herzberg F. (1966). *Work and the Nature of Man*, Cleveland (USA): World Publishing. Ivancevich, J. M. and Donnelly, J. H. (1968). Job Satisfaction Research: A Manageable Guide for Practitioners. *Personnel Journal*, 47 (1), pp. 172-177

[32] Chen J. C. and Silverthorne, C. (2008). The Impact of Locus of Control on Job Stress, Job Performance and Job Satisfaction in Taiwan. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 29 (7), pp. 572-582.

[33] Tonges, M. C., Rothstein, H. and Carter, H. K. (1998). Sources of Satisfaction in Hospital Nursing Practice: A Guide to Effective Job Design. *Journal of Nursing Administration*, 28 (5), pp. 47-61

IJETRM

International Journal of Engineering Technology Research & Management

[34] Porter, L., Steers, R., Mowday, R. and Boulian, P. (1974). Organizational Commitment, Job Satisfaction, and Turnover among Psychiatric Technicians. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 59 (5), pp. 603-609

[35] Mathieu, J. E. and Hamel, D. (1989). A Cause Model of the Antecedents of Organizational Commitment among Professionals and Non-Professionals. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 34 (3), pp. 299-317.

[36] Karrasch, A. I. (2003). Antecedents and Consequences of Organizational Commitment. *Military Psychology*, 15 (3), pp. 225-236.

[37] Allen, N. J. and Meyer, J. P. (1990). The Measurement and Antecedents of Affective, Continuance and Normative Commitment to the Organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63 (1), pp. 1-18.