



# The Relationship between Job Involvement, Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment among lower-level Employees

Mostafa Emami

Young Researchers Club, Kermanshah Branch, Islamic Azad University, Kermanshah, Iran

\*Corresponding author's Email: Emamemostafa12@yahoo.com

**ABSTRACT:** This study investigated the relationship between job satisfaction, job involvement, and organizational commitment among lower-level employees. Job satisfaction and job involvement were used as independent variables in the study while organizational commitment was used as the dependent variable. Data was gathered from a random sample of 100 lower-level employees of the company concerned. A questionnaire consisting of four-parts was used for data collection. To gather biographical and occupational data, a self-designed 40-item questionnaire was used. To measure job involvement, Kanungo's (1982) 10-item 5-point rating scale was used. To measure job satisfaction, Halpern's (1966) 10-item 7-point rating scale was used. To measure organizational commitment, Mowday, et al. (1982) 15-item 5-point scale was used. Data analysis was done by means of various statistical techniques, including the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Technique and Multiple Regression Analysis. The results indicated that though both job satisfaction and job involvement are strongly associated with organizational commitment, job satisfaction accounts for a higher proportion of variance in organizational commitment than job involvement. Intrinsic job satisfaction, extrinsic job satisfaction, and overall job satisfaction were found to be significantly and highly inter-correlated, an indication that they are all equally associated with organizational commitment. The paper therefore recommends that managers must do all in their power to promote job satisfaction and job involvement in their companies, but especially job satisfaction.

Received 25 Oct. 2012  
Accepted 30 Dec. 2012

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

**Key words:** Job satisfaction, Job involvement, and Organizational commitment

## INTRODUCTION

Organizational commitment can be defined as an employee's psychological attachment to the organization (Organizational commitment Wikipedia, 2008). It can be measured by the following factors: identification with the goals and values of the organisation, the desire to belong to the organisation and the willingness to display effort on behalf of the organisation. Maxwell and Steele (2003) carried out a study to identify the determinants of organizational commitment and its effects in the organisation. The results suggested that organizational commitment is determined by job characteristics such as the job scope and work experiences such as rewards and employee importance. The findings further suggested that organizational commitment was positively related to employee performance.

Organizational commitment has been one of the most widely researched areas in the field of management in relation to different job-related variables but in South Africa very few studies have explored this concept. Various researchers identify multiple factors affecting organizational commitment among employees but the present study focuses on

investigating the impact of job involvement and job satisfaction on organizational commitment. Organizational commitment is considered to be one of the most important and crucial outcomes of human resource strategies. Furthermore employee commitment is seen as the key factor in achieving competitive performance (Sahnawaz and Juyal, 2006). A significant relationship has been identified between job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Narimawati, 2007). Samad (2007) also tried to determine the level of influence job satisfaction facets will have on organizational commitment. Job satisfaction, on the other hand, can be defined as a pleasurable feeling that results from the perception that one's job fulfils or allows for the fulfilment of one's important job values (Wagner and Hollenbeck, 1998). It is more of an attitude that an employee possesses, which reflects how content an individual is with his or her job. Job satisfaction is of great importance because it seems to affect overt organisational behaviour.

Kanungo (1982) views job involvement as a cognitive or belief state of psychological identification with one's job. In other words, this approach suggests that an individual's psychological identification with a



particular job depends on the saliency of his or her needs and the perceptions he or she has about the need satisfying potentialities of the job (Kanungo, 1982). Brown (1996) argues that job involvement will be highest when the work environment: makes one believe that one's work is meaningful; offers control over how work is accomplished; maintains a clear set of behavioural norms; makes feedback concerning completed work available; and provides supportive relations with supervisors and co-workers. Many theorists have hypothesized that highly involved employees will put forth substantial effort towards the achievement of organisational objectives and are less likely to turnover.

Argyris (1957) and McGregor (1960) saw job involvement as a means of aiding productivity and of creating work situations in which there would be better integration of individual and organisational goals. Marcson (1960) presented an argument and findings suggesting that one of the best ways to increase productivity in organisations was to provide employees with jobs that are more demanding and challenging. Recent studies of job involvement show that such involvement enhances the individual's satisfaction, while at the same time increasing productivity for the organization (Hall and Lawler, 2000).

### **Statement of the problem**

Assuming that management have been using the independent variables mentioned below, the fundamental questions that need to be addressed then are: does job satisfaction and job involvement have a negative or a positive impact on organizational commitment? The economic woes which afflicted South Africa recently have made it impossible for many organisations to take significant strides in their drive towards achieving organisational excellence. Many organisations are struggling to survive the hostile economic environment. Many employees are unhappy with their current situation and would prefer leaving should they get an alternative job elsewhere. The labour turnover is being instigated by the decline in the quality of life due to poor remuneration levels and poor organisational policies on benefits (Financial Gazette, 2009).

According to Robert (1997) labor turnover is positively related to job dissatisfaction and is costly to an organisation. Such costs include that of recruitment, training of new employees, high scrap and waste rates as well as high accident costs for new employees. Job dissatisfaction manifests itself in the form of labour turnover in many organisations; hence, it is likely to have negative implications for organizational

commitment, a factor identified as critical to organizational success". According to Werner (2007) only satisfied employees seem more likely to display positive behaviour that contributes to the overall functioning of the organisation. In this regard, management in organisations must be more concerned with the extent to which their employees experience job satisfaction and are involved in their jobs. Organ, Podsakoff and McKenzie (2005) state that the ability of an organisation to innovate and successfully implement business strategy and to achieve competitive advantage depends on how much employees are involved in their jobs and are satisfied in doing their jobs.

### **Purpose of the study**

The main objective of this study was to investigate the relationship between job involvement and job satisfaction on organizational commitment among lower-level employees.

This study seeks to answer the following questions:

- Is there an association between job involvement and organizational commitment?
- Is there an association between job satisfaction and organizational commitment?
- What is the relative strength of the association of each of the two independent variables (job involvement and job satisfaction), on the one hand, and organizational commitment, on the other hand?
- What is the combined strength of the association of the two variables as factors that explain the variance in organizational commitment?

### **Significance of the study**

Establishing a link between job involvement and job satisfaction, on the one hand, and organizational commitment, on the other, could be to the benefit of organisations as management could put in place human resources practices that increase the levels of job involvement and job satisfaction among employees and hence impact positively on their commitment to the organisation. The results of this study will show whether job satisfaction and job involvement have an impact on organizational commitment. If so, future managers would know that to improve organizational commitment, they must improve job satisfaction and job involvement. Research has shown that job involvement and job satisfaction may result in positive outcomes in organisations such as low absentee levels and higher productivity rates among employees (Robbins, 2005). This study aims to determine the relationship between job involvement and job satisfaction, on the one hand, and organizational commitment on the other. Organizational commitment

has been identified as critical for organisational success. Koys (2001) contends that organizational commitment is very vital to the survival of many organisations. It maximizes the efficiency and productivity of both the employees and the organisation, which ultimately contribute to the effective functioning of an organisation.

## **METHODOLOGY**

### **Selection of the sample and sampling procedure**

According to Sekaran (2003), the population of a study is the entire group of people, events, or things of interest that the researcher wishes to investigate. It is the aggregate of all units that have a chance of being included in the sample to be studied. The population involved in this study was made of male and female lower-level employees of motor car manufacturing companies. The population for the research included about 1000 employees from MBSA, East London. From the total population 10% of the lower-level employees were used as a sample. Their job titles included: assemblers, material handlers, inspectors, machine-operators, coordinators and drivers.

Gray (2004) defines a sample as a set of objects, occurrences or individuals selected from a parent population for a research study. The sample selected was a fairly large portion of the non-managerial employees of MBSA and was thus fairly well representative of the population. In this sense, the characteristics of the sample represent those of the entire population. The method used to collect the sample in this study was the stratified probability sampling method. A sample of 100 lower-level employees of Mercedes Benz South Africa, East London was selected. Random sampling was used because it ensures representativeness and generalisability of results.

Random sampling is a probability sampling method, whereby each element in the population has some known chance or probability of being selected as a subject (Uma, 2003). In this study employees were divided according to their work stations, for example work station 1, 2, 3, 4, etc. Each work station represented a stratum. To ensure that samples adequately represented the relevant strata (work stations), respondents were randomly selected from within strata, that is, from each work station using a table of random numbers. The sampling procedure for the research began with a preliminary compilation of a sampling frame. A sampling frame is "a complete list in which each unit of analysis is mentioned only once". The sampling frame was required for clarity about the

population of interest. As stated before, a table of random numbers was used to ensure that the sample was representative of the sample frame. The research site (i.e. Mercedes Benz South Africa East London) was visited for data collection.

### **Research instruments**

A four-part questionnaire was used to collect the data. Nachmias and Nachmias (1996) define a questionnaire as a list of questions that is presumably formulated, constructed and sequenced to produce the most constructive data in the most effective manner. The questionnaire consisted of the following four parts:

#### **The biographical and occupational data questionnaire**

The first part tapped data related to biographical and occupational variables, i.e., age, gender, marital status, educational qualifications, position held in the organisation, and tenure. This data was tapped with a view to obtaining a clear understanding of the sample used in the study.

#### **Kanungo's (1982) job involvement scale (JIS)**

The second part of the questionnaire consisted of Kanungo's (1982) 10-item job involvement scale. This scale measures job involvement on a five-point Likert scale with responses ranging from "Strongly disagree" (1) to "Strongly agree"(5). Kanungo (1982) found this scale to have a Cronbach Alpha coefficient of 0.81, which indicates a reasonably high level of internal consistency, and therefore a reasonably high level of reliability and construct validity.

#### **Halpern's (1966) job satisfaction scale (JSQ)**

The third part of the instrument consisted of Halpern's (1966) job satisfaction questionnaire. It is a seven-point Likert scale ranging from "Very dissatisfied" (1) to "Very satisfied" (7). The scale measures satisfaction both of Herzberg's (1959) motivator and hygiene aspects of the job (Halpern 1966). Fields (2002) reports that this job satisfaction scale has an alpha co-efficient ranging from 0.81 to 0.90

#### **Mowday et al.'s Organizational commitment Questionnaire**

The fourth part of the questionnaire was adopted from Mowday et al. (1979). It is a 15- item questionnaire that measures organizational commitment, using a five-point Likert scale ranging from "Strongly disagree" (1) to "Strongly agree" (5). This instrument has been tested with several groups such as public employees and university employees. Such tests have yielded reliability

coefficients ranging from 0.82 to 0.93 with a median value of 0.90 (Reyes & Pounder, 1993).

#### **Administration on the questionnaire**

In this study, questionnaires were "self-administered." This means that the respondents filled the questionnaire on the spot. The researcher handed over each questionnaire by hand to the respondents. The respondents took about 30 minutes to fill in the questionnaire. The covering letter was drawn carefully to convey the research objectives and to persuade respondents to give frank responses. The covering letter also explained the nature of the study, as well as assuring respondents of the confidentiality of all information provided. Respondents were also provided with detailed instructions as to how the questionnaires were to be completed and returned. This was also reinforced on the days of completion of the questionnaires by the researcher orally, so that the respondents could for clarity where it was needed. The rationale behind providing clear instructions and assuring confidentiality of information was that this significantly reduces the likelihood of obtaining biased responses (Sekaran, 2003). Respondents' names were not asked for. This was done to give them an assurance that their responses would be kept confidential. This approach involves the researcher having direct contact with the respondents. The researcher utilized this method because it is less expensive, ensures anonymity of the respondents and has a high return rate as the researcher can make follow-ups for unreturned questionnaires. The co-operation of the Human Resources Department of Mercedes Benz South Africa made the administration process much easier and quicker. This was facilitated by the HR Manager who arranged one to one meetings between the researcher and the prospective respondents for purposes of questionnaire administration.

#### **Methods of Analysis**

In analyzing the data collected, graphs were used to describe the data. Also descriptive statistics, Pearson Correlation and Multiple Regression Analysis were employed to analyze the collected data.

#### **Descriptive statistics**

Descriptive statistics describe the phenomena of interest (Sekaran, 2003). They include the analysis of data using frequencies, dispersions of dependent and independent variables and measures of central tendency and variability and to obtain a feel for the data (Sekaran, 2003). The mean and standard deviation was

primarily be used to describe the data obtained from the JSQ, JIS and the OCQ.

#### **Inferential statistics**

Inferential statistics allow the researcher to present the data obtained in research in statistical format to facilitate the identification of important patterns and to make data analysis more meaningful. According to Sekaran (2003), inferential statistics is employed when generalisations from a sample to the population are made. The statistical methods used in this research include the Pearson Product Moment Correlation and Multiple Regression Analysis.

#### **The Pearson Product Moment Correlation**

For the purposes of determining whether a statistically significant relationship exists between job involvement and job satisfaction on the one hand, and organizational commitment on the other, the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient was used. It provides an index of the strength, magnitude and direction of the relationship between two variables at a time (Sekaran, 2003). The Product Moment Correlation Coefficient was, therefore, suitable for the purpose of this study.

#### **Multiple Regression Analysis**

Multiple Regression Analysis: is a multivariate statistical technique that is used for studying the relationship between a single dependent variable and several independent variables. It provides a method to predict the changes in the dependent variable in response to changes in more than one independent variable. Hence, it allows the researcher to determine the relative importance of each predictor as well as to ascertain the collective contribution of the independent variables (Sekaran, 2003).

#### **Ethical considerations**

The researcher observed and abided by the three major areas of ethical concern, ethics of data collection and analysis, treatment of human subjects, and the ethics of responsibility to society (Reese and Fremouw, 1984). To successfully conduct the study, several ethical issues were addressed during the process of collecting data. In this regard, permission to carry out the study in the designated organisation was sought from respective senior managers. The researcher also obtained informed consent from the participants through the covering letter; all responses were treated as confidential; and the respondents as anonymous. The researcher informed the respondents orally of their right to acceptance or withdrawal from participation in

the research at any point in time during the research. Finally the researcher, to the best of his ability, ensured that no harm befell any of the respondents, their employer, their families or anyone else that may have had anything to do with the study.

**RESULTS**

**Descriptive statistics**

The descriptive statistics in the form of arithmetic means and standard deviations were computed for Halpern's (1966) Job Satisfaction questionnaire, Kanungo's Job Involvement questionnaire (1982) and Mowday et al. (1979) Organizational commitment Questionnaire. These are presented in Table 1 together with the number of cases (sample size) that responded to each questionnaire.

**Table 1.** Mean, standard deviation and total number of cases in relation to organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and job involvement

Item	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Organizational commitment	51.29	11.217	100
Job satisfaction	38.43	13.383	100
Job involvement	33.92	7.519	100

The level of organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and job involvement among the sample of 100 lower level employees at Mercedes Benz South Africa, east London is depicted in Table 1. The results indicate that organizational commitment has a mean of 51.29 and a standard deviation of 11.217. The results also indicate that the mean for job satisfaction is 38.43 and the standard deviation is 13.383. The results also indicate that job involvement has a mean of 33.92 and a standard deviation of 7.519.

**Hypothesis testing**

This study sought to investigate the relationship between job involvement and job satisfaction, on the one hand, and organizational commitment, on the other. It also sought to determine the relative strength of the association of each of the two independent variables (job involvement and job satisfaction), on the one hand, with organizational commitment, as a dependent variable, on the other. To measure job involvement, Kanungo's (1982) 10-item five-point Likert-type rating scale was used. To measure job satisfaction, Halpern's (1966) 10-item seven-point Likert-type rating scale was used. To measure organizational

commitment, Mowday et al. (1979) 15-item five-point Likert-type rating scale was used. Data analysis was done by means of the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Technique, and Multiple Regression Analysis.

**Table 2.** Pearson inter-correlations of job satisfaction, job involvement and organizational commitment.

Item	Organizational commitment	Job satisfaction	Job involvement
Organizational commitment	---	-0.62**	-0.53**
Job satisfaction	-0.62**	---	-0.44**
Job involvement	-0.53**	-0.44**	---

\*n = 100    \*\* Significant to 0.01

**Hypothesis 1**

The first null hypothesis of the study (H<sub>0</sub>) was stated as, "there is no significant positive correlation between job satisfaction and organizational commitment" and the corresponding alternative hypothesis (H<sub>1</sub>) was that, "there is a significant positive correlation between job satisfaction and organizational commitment". This hypothesis was tested by means of the Pearson Product Moment Correlation technique. The correlation coefficient between overall job satisfaction and overall organizational commitment was found to be  $r = 0.62$ ;  $p < 0.001$ . This shows that the two variables are significantly and highly positively correlated. This leads to a rejection of the null hypothesis and acceptance of the alternative hypothesis.

**Table 3.** Correlation for overall job satisfaction, extrinsic job satisfaction and intrinsic job satisfaction

item	Extrinsic	Intrinsic	Overall Satisfaction
Extrinsic (Pearson Correlation)	---	-0.83**	-0.57**
Intrinsic (Pearson Correlation)	-0.83**	---	-0.54**
Overall Satisfaction (Pearson Correlation)	-0.57**	-0.54**	---

\*n = 100; \*\* Correlation is significant at 0.01

The two main components of overall job satisfaction, that is, intrinsic and extrinsic job

satisfaction were found to be highly inter-correlated. The correlation coefficient between the two was  $r = 0.83$ ;  $p < 0.001$ . This suggests that both are highly correlated with overall organizational commitment. The results also indicated that there is a highly significant relationship between overall job satisfaction and extrinsic job satisfaction ( $r = .57$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ). There is also a highly significant positive relationship between overall job satisfaction and intrinsic job satisfaction ( $r = .54$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ).

Table 4 below indicates the relationship between total organizational commitment and its dimensions. The three main components of organizational commitment, according to Mowday et al., 1979, that are, loyalty to the employing organisation (Loyalty), acceptance of the organisation's values and goals (Value) and willingness to expend a great deal of effort on behalf of the organisation (Effort). These are all highly inter-correlated with overall organizational commitment (see Table 4). The correlation between Loyalty and overall organizational commitment is  $r = 0.91$ ;  $p < 0.001$ . Between Value and overall organizational commitment, the correlation is  $r = 0.99$ ;  $p < 0.001$ . For Effort and overall organizational commitment, the correlation is  $r = 0.98$ ;  $p < 0.001$ .

These high correlations suggest that all three components of organizational commitment are as significantly positively correlated with overall job satisfaction as overall organizational commitment. These high correlations also suggest that the subcategories of job satisfaction (intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction) are highly correlated with the subcategories of organizational commitment (Loyalty, Value and Effort).

**Table 4.** Inter-correlations for the subscales of organizational commitment

	Loyalty	Value	Effort	Overall organizational commitment
Loyalty (Pearson Correlation)	---	0.84**	0.82**	0.91**
Value (Pearson Correlation)	0.84**	---	0.99**	0.99**
Effort (Pearson Correlation)	0.82**	0.99**	---	0.98**
Total organizational commitment	0.91**	0.99**	0.98**	---

\* $n = 100$ ; \*\*. Correlation is significant at 0.01

### Hypothesis 2

The second null hypothesis of the study ( $H_0$ ) was stated as, "there is no significant positive correlation between job involvement and organizational commitment" and the corresponding alternative hypothesis ( $H_1$ ) was that, "there is a significant positive correlation between job involvement and organizational commitment". This hypothesis was tested by means of the Pearson Product Moment Correlation technique. The correlation coefficient between job involvement and organizational commitment was found to be  $r = 0.53$ ;  $p < 0.001$ . This shows that there is a significant positive association between job involvement and organizational commitment. This leads to a rejection of the null hypothesis and acceptance of the alternative hypothesis. The fact that all the subcategories of overall organizational commitment (Loyalty, Value and Effort) are highly inter-correlated (see Table 2) suggests that job involvement is highly correlated with each of these.

### Hypothesis 3

The third null hypothesis of the study ( $H_0$ ) was stated as, "there is no additive effect between job satisfaction and job involvement whereby the two put together account for a higher proportion of variance in organizational commitment than each of them separately" and the corresponding alternative hypothesis ( $H_1$ ) was that, "there is an additive effect between job satisfaction and job involvement whereby the two put together account for a higher proportion of variance in organizational commitment than each of them separately". This hypothesis was tested by means of Multiple Regression Analysis (see Table 5).

**Table 5.** Multiple regression between job satisfaction and job involvement, on the one hand, and organizational commitment, on the other

Multiple R	0.70		
R-Squared	0.47		
Adjusted R-Squared	0.46		
Standard Error	0.44		
F	44.00		
Sign F	0.000*		
Variable	Beta	T	Sig T
Job satisfaction	0.48	5.90	0.000
Job involvement	0.32	3.95	0.000

Table 5 presents the results of the regression analysis, regressing organizational commitment (dependent variable) against the independent variables, that is, job involvement and job satisfaction. The results indicate that the multiple correlation value is 0.70, with

the R-squared value being 0.47. This indicates that approximately 47% of the variance in organizational commitment can be attributed to the independent variables (job satisfaction and job involvement) entered into the regression. The F-statistics of 0.44 is significant at the 0.001 level indicating that this is a highly significant relationship.

Table 5 shows a Beta weight of  $\beta = 0.48$ ;  $p < 0.001$  for the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment. This means that job satisfaction accounts for 0.48 or 48% of the variance in organizational commitment and that this is a highly significant proportion of variance. The same table (Table 3) also shows a Beta weight of  $\beta = 0.32$ ;  $p < 0.001$  for the relationship between job involvement and organizational commitment. This means that job involvement accounts for 0.32 or 32% of the variance in organizational commitment, and that this is a highly significant proportion of variance. While job satisfaction accounts for a higher amount of variance in organizational commitment, than job involvement, therefore, both account for a highly significant proportion of variance.

Table 5, however, shows that R-squared is  $R^2 = 0.47$ . This means that the two independent variables, that is, job satisfaction and job involvement, together account for 0.47 or 47% of the variance in organizational commitment. This result is in support of  $H_0$  of hypothesis 3 in that, though 0.47 is higher than the Beta weight for job involvement ( $\beta = 0.32$ ), it is lower than that for job satisfaction ( $\beta = 0.48$ ). The two independent variables therefore do not have an additive effect that results in them accounting for a greater amount of variance in organizational commitment than the two of them independently. The results therefore lead to the acceptance of the null hypothesis that there is no additive effect between job satisfaction and job involvement whereby the two put together account for a higher proportion of variance in organizational commitment than each of them separately. The lack of an additive effect of job satisfaction, and job involvement is probably due to the high correlation between the two variables ( $r = 0.44$ ;  $p < 0.001$ ).

## DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The first null hypothesis of the study ( $H_0$ ) was stated as: "there is no significant positive correlation between job satisfaction and organizational commitment," and the corresponding alternative hypothesis ( $H_1$ ) was that: "there is a significant positive correlation between job satisfaction and organizational commitment." This hypothesis was tested by means of the Pearson Product Moment Correlation technique.

The correlation coefficient between job satisfaction and organizational commitment was found to be significantly and highly positively correlated. This leads to a rejection of the null hypothesis and acceptance of the alternative hypothesis. The two main components of overall job satisfaction, that is, intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction were found to be highly inter-correlated. The three main components of organizational commitment, according to Mowday et al. (1979), that is, Loyalty, Value and Effort, are all highly correlated with overall organizational commitment (see Table 2). These high correlations suggest that all three components of organizational commitment are as significantly positively correlated with job satisfaction as overall organizational commitment.

The significant positive correlation between job satisfaction and organizational commitment that was found in the present study suggests that job satisfaction is an important factor whose presence must be ensured in an organisation. Such a significant positive correlation was also one of the findings in the study carried out by Yang and Chang (2008) involving a sample of nursing staff. The study carried out by Guleryuz et al. (2008) also found a significant positive relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment ( $r = 0.667$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ). Mosadeghrah et al. (2008), in their study, found moderate levels of job satisfaction and organizational commitment among the sample of hospital employees. Among other results of that study, it was found that the employees' job satisfaction and organizational commitment were highly inter-related. These findings are both in support of the findings of the present study, despite the different working environments.

A study was conducted in Turkey by Gunlu, Aksarayle and Percin (2010) regarding the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment among hotel managers. The study investigated whether there was a significant relationship between the characteristics of the sample, job satisfaction and organizational commitment. The results obtained from this study indicated, *inter alia*, that extrinsic, intrinsic and general job satisfaction have a significant effect on normative and affective commitment. The findings further suggested that the dimensions of job satisfaction had no significant impact on continuance commitment among the hotel managers.

Chang et al. (2010) conducted a cross-sectional questionnaire survey to study the mediating role of psychological empowerment on the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment for school health nurses. The findings of

the research were that psychological empowerment did not fully mediate the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment due to the strong direct effect of job satisfaction on organizational commitment. The influence of empowerment on organizational commitment was mediated through job satisfaction. The researchers suggested that improving the job satisfaction levels of school health nurses would help school leaders achieve greater organizational commitment.

While many studies generally support a positive association between job satisfaction and organizational commitment, the causal ordering between these two variables is both controversial and contradictory (Martin and Bennett, 1996). According to Mowday et al. (1982), "although day-to-day events in the workplace may affect an employee's level of job satisfaction, such transitory events should not cause an employee to re-evaluate seriously his or her attachment to the overall organisation."

The second null hypothesis of the study ( $H_0$ ) was stated as: "there is no significant positive correlation between job involvement and organizational commitment," and the corresponding alternative hypothesis ( $H_1$ ) was that: "there is a significant positive correlation between job involvement and organizational commitment." This hypothesis was tested by means of the Pearson Product Moment Correlation technique. The correlation coefficient between job involvement and organizational commitment was found to be significant and positively correlated. This leads to a rejection of the null hypothesis and acceptance of the alternative hypothesis. The findings of the present study suggest that job involvement is an important factor whose presence in an organisation must be ensured. The following studies are in support of the significant positive correlation between job involvement and organizational commitment that was found in the present study:

Moynihan and Pandey (2007) investigated the relationship between job involvement and organizational commitment using a sample of public sector health and human services managers. The study showed that there is a moderate positive correlation between job involvement and organizational commitment. This concurs with the results of the current study.

The organizational commitment meta-analysis conducted by Mathieu and Zajac (1990) also revealed that among the foci of commitment, the job involvement and organizational commitment relationship is frequently investigated. The two variables are also considered to influence some forms of work-

related behaviour independently. O'Reilly and Chatman (1986) reported that job involvement is an outcome of psychological commitment to an organisation.

Uygur and Kilic (2009) studied the level of organizational commitment and job involvement of the personnel at Central Organisational, Ministry of Health in Turkey. Questionnaires were distributed to a total of 210 subjects. Of this number, 180 (86%) returned the questionnaire and of these, 168 were found to be useable. A significant positive correlation was found between organizational commitment and job involvement ( $r = 0.44, p < 0.001$ ). There have been many other studies into organizational commitment and job involvement especially related to the health-care workers and nurses (Brewer and Lok, 1995; Brooks and Swails, 2000; Ors et al., 2003; Ozsoy et al., 2004; Sjoberg and Sverke, 2000; Blau and Boal, 1989). In a study conducted by Sjoberg and Sverke in a Swedish Emergency Hospital (2000), it was found that organizational commitment and job involvement are significantly positively correlated. Blau and Boal (1989) found that nurses with a higher level of job involvement and organizational commitment had significantly less unexcused absences than nurses with lower levels of job involvement and organizational commitment.

One value of this study is that it was conducted in a developing country, unlike most similar studies that have traditionally been conducted in the highly industrialised countries of the Western world. The present study showed that there is a significant positive correlation between job involvement and organizational commitment. This concurred with different previous studies conducted as mentioned earlier on. One significant difference between the present study and previous studies is that, the present study was conducted in a different geographical area.

The third null hypothesis of the study ( $H_0$ ) was stated as: "there is no additive effect between job satisfaction and job involvement whereby the two put together account for a higher proportion of variance in organizational commitment than each of them separately" and the corresponding alternative hypothesis ( $H_1$ ) was that: "there is an additive effect between job satisfaction and job involvement whereby the two put together account for a higher proportion of variance in organizational commitment than each of them separately". This hypothesis was tested by means of Multiple Regression Analysis. Job satisfaction accounts for a higher proportion of variance in organizational commitment than job involvement, both accounts for a highly significant proportion of variance. The two independent variables therefore do not have an additive effect that results in them accounting for a



higher proportion of variance in organizational commitment than the two of them independently. The null hypothesis was therefore accepted.

Ha-Young and Hyun (2009) conducted a study with the prime aim to analyze an empirical test to classify workers' character in private and public organisations. He sought to answer the question, "what are important organisational determinants of job involvement and job satisfaction?" The study findings suggested that job satisfaction has greater power to influence organizational commitment than job involvement. The results also suggested that, the higher the degree of job involvement, the greater the organizational commitment and effectiveness. They further argued that an increase in the work related attitudes and wage satisfaction results in an increase in organizational commitment. Moynihan and Pandey (2007) made a comparison of job satisfaction, job involvement and organizational commitment using a sample of public sector health and human services managers. The results showed that managers had the greatest influence over job satisfaction and the least influence over job involvement.

The results also showed that job satisfaction accounts for a higher proportion of variance in organizational commitment than job involvement. In the study, it was also shown that there are moderate positive correlations between job satisfaction, job involvement and organizational commitment. The findings of this study concur with the results of the present study as far as the independent correlations are concerned. This study, however, did not investigate the issue of an additive effect of job satisfaction and job involvement on organizational commitment.

The present study showed that job satisfaction has a greater power to influence organizational commitment than job involvement, therefore the results tell us that companies must pay more attention to promoting job satisfaction in order to ensure higher levels of organizational commitment. The aim of this research was primarily to determine the relationship between job involvement and job satisfaction, on the one hand, and organizational commitment on the other among lower-level employees in the motor-car manufacturing industry. The results indicate that there is a statistically significant relationship between the two independent variables, that is, job satisfaction and job involvement on the one hand, and the dependent variable, that is, organizational commitment, on the other. However, the results also indicated that there is no additive effect between job satisfaction and job involvement whereby the two put together account for

a higher proportion of variance in organizational commitment than each of them separately.

This study mainly investigated the relationship between job satisfaction, job involvement and organizational commitment among lower-level employees at Mercedes Benz South Africa, East London, as a representative of the motor-car manufacturing industry. The results obtained from this study showed that there is a significant positive association between job involvement, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. The two main components of overall job satisfaction, that is, intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction were found to be significantly and highly inter-correlated with overall job satisfaction. This suggested that both components of overall job satisfaction are also highly correlated with overall organizational commitment. The results indicated that there is no additive effect between job involvement and job satisfaction whereby the two put together account for a higher proportion of variance in organizational commitment than each of them separately. The results further showed that though both job involvement and job satisfaction are strongly associated with organizational commitment, job satisfaction accounts for a higher proportion of variance in organizational commitment than job involvement.

The fact that job satisfaction was found to account for a higher proportion of variance in organizational commitment than job involvement means that companies must pay more attention to promoting job satisfaction in order to ensure a higher level of organizational commitment. The main practical implication of this study relate to employee retention or prevention of a high rate of labour turnover. Organizational commitment is likely to be strongly associated with employee retention. To ensure organizational commitment, companies must promote both job involvement and job satisfaction. This is likely to lead to employee retention. The fact that intrinsic job satisfaction, extrinsic job satisfaction and overall job satisfaction were found to be highly inter-correlated means that they are all equally important as probable determinants of organizational commitment. Companies must, therefore, constantly upgrade both intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction. The future research studies should incorporate an investigation of the outcomes of organizational commitment, such as retention. The present study assumed that organizational commitment is associated with employees' retention. This needs to be confirmed in actual empirical research.

**REFERENCES**

- Argyris, C. (1957). *Personality and Organization*, New York: Harper Collins.
- Avolio, B. J. and Bass, B. M. (1991). *The full range of leadership development*. Binghamton, NY: Bass, Avolio & Associates.
- Baron, R. A., Bryne, D., Nyler, R., and Branscombe, D. (2006). *Social Psychology*. London: Allyn & Beacon.
- Blau, G., and Boal, K. B. (1989). Using job involvement and organizational commitment interactively to predict turnover. *Journal of Management*, 15 (1): 115-127.
- Brewer, A. M., and Lok, P. (1995). Managerial Strategy and Nursing Commitment in Australian Hospitals. *Journal Advanced Nursing*, 21: 769-799.
- Brooks, I., and Swailes, S. (2002). Analysis of the relationship between nurse influences over flexible working and commitment to nursing. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 38 (2):117-126.
- Brown, S. P. (1996). A meta-analysis and review of organizational research on job involvement. *Psychology Bulletin*, 120, 235-255.
- Chang, L., Shih, C., and Lin S. (2010). The mediating role of psychological empowerment on job satisfaction and organizational commitment for school health nurses: A cross-sectional questionnaire survey. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, 47 (4): 247-276.
- Gray, D. E. (2004). *Doing research in the real world*. London: Sage Publications limited.
- Gunlu, E., Aksarayli, M. and Percin, N. S. (2010). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment of hotel managers in Turkey. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 22 (5): 693-717.
- Ha-Young, H. (2009). Analysis the factors impact on the Job Involvement and Organizational commitment . Department of Public Administration Korea University
- Hall, D. T. and Lawler, E. E. (2000). Job characteristics and job pressures and the organizational integration of professionals. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 15, 271-281.
- Hirschfeld, R. R. and Field, H. S. (2000). Work centrality and work alienation: Distinct aspects. Of a general commitment to work. *Journal of Organisational Behavior*, 21(7), pp.789-800.
- Hufnagel, E. M. and Conca, C. (1994). User Response Data: The Potential for Errors and Bias *Information Systems Research*, 5, 48-73.
- Kanungo, R. N. (1982). Measurement of Job and Work Involvement. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 67(3): 341-349.
- Martin, C. L., and Bennett, N. (1996). The role of justice judgments in explaining the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment. *Group & Organization Management*, 21(1) 84-105.
- Maslow, A. (1954). *Motivation and Personality*; New York: Harper.
- Mathieu, J. E. and Zajac, D. M. (1990). A review and Meta analysis of the antecedents correlates and consequences of organizational commitment. *Psychological Bulletin* 108, 171-199.
- Maxwell, G. and Steele, G. (2003). Organizational commitment : a study of managers in hotels, International: *Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 15(7), pp. 362-369.
- McGregor, D. (1960). *The Human Side of Enterprise*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc.
- Mowday, R., Porter, L., and Steers, R. (1982). *Employee organisational linkages- The psychology of commitment, absenteeism and turnover*. London: Academic Press.
- Mowday, R. T., Steers, R. M. and Porter, L. W. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 14 (2): 224-247.
- Moynihan, D. P and Pandey, S. K. (2007). Finding workable levers over work motivation: Comparing job satisfaction, job involvement and organizational commitment. *Administration & Society*, 39 (7): 803-832.
- Nachmias, C. F., and Nachmias, D. (1997). *Research Methods in Social Sciences*. London: ST Martins Press Inc.
- Organ, D. W, Podsakoff, M. P. and McKenzie, S. B. (2005). *Organizational Citizenship Behavior, Its Nature, Antecedents and Consequences*. London: Sage Publications.
- O'Reilly, C. A and Chatman, J. (1986). Organizational commitment and psychological attachment: the effects of compliance, identification and internalization on pro-social behaviour. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71 (3): 492-499.
- Reese H. W, and Fremour W. J. (1984). Normal and normative ethics in behavioral sciences, *American Psychologist*, 39(8): 863-876.
- Robbins, S. P. (2005). *Essentials of Organisational Behaviour*. New Jersey: Pearson.
- Robert, L. (1997). *Human Resources Management*. London: West Publishing Company.
- Sekaran, U. (2003). *Research methods for business: A skill-building approach*. (3rd ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Uygur, A., and Kilic, G. (2009). A study into Organizational commitment and Job Involvement: An Application towards the Personnel in the Central Organization for Ministry of Health in

Turkey. *Ozean journal of applied sciences* 2(1).2009.

Werner, A. (2007). *Organizational Behavior: A Contemporary South African Perspective*. Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers.