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Abstract
The objective of the study was to investigate the relationship between employees’ job satisfaction (as measured by Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire) and organizational commitment (as measured by Organizational Commitment Scale) among academic staff members in higher education institution, South Africa (N=302). The study utilised a self-administered questionnaire to solicit data from 302 participants randomly selected from a South African higher education institution. Correlations were used to test whether there is any relationship between the variables. T-tests and ANOVA were also used in this study. Results showed a significant positive relationship between job satisfaction and affective commitment as well as continuance commitment, but no significant relationship between job satisfaction and normative commitment was found. The results also show that there is a significant difference in job satisfaction between male and female academic staff members. The results show that there is no significant mean difference between employee job satisfaction as well as employee organizational commitment in terms of age.
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Introduction
In the business world, employees are among the most important determinants and leading factors that determine the success of an organization and its competitive advantage in a long-run. In other words, employees have become valuable assets for the continued existence of the organization. For that reason, employees’ job satisfaction can be an important indicator of how employees feel about their jobs and a predictor of work behaviours such as organizational citizenship, absenteeism, and turnover for a greater success of the organization. On the other hand, employee’s low level of satisfaction might lead to less work commitment and high turnover from the organization, as well as physical withdrawal or they may retreat from the organization emotionally or mentally. Consequently, low level of satisfaction may not only increase intention to quit but also reduce the contribution of the employee to the organization (Lok & Crawford, 2003). In other words, it might lead to less employees’ commitment

“The practice of the organizations with regards to their employees’ commitment is different if we compare the past to the present” (Madi, Abu-Jarad & Alqahtani, 2012: 299). Previously, organizations secured the loyalty of their employees by guaranteeing job security. However, Madi, Abu-Jarad and Alqahtani (2012) maintained that many organizations have practiced downsizing, restructuring and transformation as a response to competitive pressures. Yet, they created a less secure organizational climate. As a result, a growing number of employees feel that they were victims of empty promise. Maintaining employee organizational commitment remains one of the challenges faced by organizations in this competitive world (Bergmann, Lester, De Meuse & Grahn, 2000).

Organizational commitment is one of the foremost goals considering the efforts of organization regarding maintenance of its existence (Yavuz, 2010). As such, organizational commitment is the level of allegiance an employee feels for his employer (Demirel & Goc, 2013). Demirel and Goc (2013) further highlighted that employees with greater level of organizational commitment are more productive, compatible, have more loyalty towards his work, possesses more responsibility and satisfaction resultantly cost lesser to the organization.

Numerous investigators have studied the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment in different cultures, occupations, organizational settings and industries. Therefore, job satisfaction and organizational commitment are one of the widely studied factors in management literature (Bodla & Danish, 2009) which are the origin of employee’s performance as well as organization’s success. As such, these variables (job satisfaction & organizational commitment) are even more significant to study in higher education institutions. In the South African higher education context, Mabasa and Nqirande (2015) suggests that these variables are even more significant because higher education institutions in South Africa are expected to play a critical role in the development of human resources for social development through the production of knowledge and high-level person power.
This study was another effort aimed at determining the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment among academic staff members in a selected higher education institution.

As mentioned, earlier job satisfaction and organizational commitment have been studied in different sectors. Some of these studies focused on municipalities (Suma & Lesha, 2013), hospital employees (Kaplan, Ogut, Kaplan & Aksay, 2012), information technology environment (Lumley, Coetzee, Tladinyane & Ferreira, 2011). However, there is a lack of information pertaining to the relationship between employee job satisfaction and organizational commitment, more especially among academic staff members in higher education institutions.

**Problem statement**
Taking into consideration that other studies have been conducted on the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Malik, Nawab, Naem & Danish, 2010; Kaplan, Ogut, Kaplan & Aksay; Suma & Lesha, 2013), very little information is known regarding the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment, particularly among academic staff members in higher education institutions in South Africa. Therefore, the current study was conducted with the aim to answer the question whether there is a significant relationship between employee job satisfaction and organizational commitment among academic staff members at a selected higher education institution in South Africa.

**Research Objectives**
- To investigate the relationship between job satisfaction and affective commitment
- To investigate the relationship between job satisfaction and normative commitment
- To investigate the relationship between job satisfaction and continuance commitment
- To investigate whether there are any mean significance differences between academic staff members job satisfaction and organizational commitment based on their gender and age

**Research hypotheses**

**H0:** There is no positive relationship between job satisfaction and affective commitment

**H1:** There is a positive relationship between job satisfaction and affective commitment

**H0:** There is no positive relationship between job satisfaction and normative commitment

**H2:** There is a positive relationship between job satisfaction and normative commitment

**H0:** There is no positive relationship between job satisfaction and continuance commitment

**H3:** There is a negative relationship between job satisfaction and continuance commitment

**H0:** There is no significance mean difference between academic staff member’s job satisfaction and organizational commitment based on their gender and age

**H4:** There is significance mean difference between academic staff member’s job satisfaction and organizational commitment based on their gender and age

**Limitation of the study**
As in other studies, this study has its own limitations as well. Firstly, one of the limitations of the study is that this study only focuses on the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment of academic staff members. As a result, the findings of the current study might not be applicable to the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment of employees in the corporate world.

Secondly, this study only focuses on the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment of academic staff members. Therefore, the results of this study might not be applicable to the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment of supporting staff members (e.g., administrators and secretaries).

**Literature review**

**Job satisfaction**
Job satisfaction is a multidimensional in nature, enduring, important and highly researched concept in the field of organizational behaviour. The concept of job satisfaction is a consequence of human relations movement which began with the classic Hawthorne studies in the late 1920s. Job satisfaction is one of the most studied concepts in industrial and organizational psychology and in the sociology of work and occupations (Mulinge, 2000).
As a result, job satisfaction is one of the factors that plays central role in the organization. As such, Akfopure Ikhifa, Imide and Okokoyo, (2006) claim that job satisfaction has been an important topic over the years. It has the potential to affect a wide range of behaviour in organizations and contribute to employees’ levels of well-being (George & Jones, 2012).

As noted by Wann-Yin and Htaik (2011), job satisfaction is one of the most widely studying and measuring constructs in the organizational behaviour and management literature. As such job satisfaction of an employee is a topic that has received significant attention by managers and researchers alike (Qasim & Syed, 2012). Job satisfaction deals with the feelings that an individual employee has about his/her job. As such organizational behaviour research has revealed that individuals who express high satisfaction in their jobs are likely to be more productive, have higher involvement and are less likely to resign than employees with less satisfaction (Qasim & Syed, 2012).

Job satisfaction has been widely used and studied in scientific research. However, Aziri (2011) claims that despite vide usage job satisfaction in scientific research, as well as in everyday life, there is still no general agreement regarding what job satisfaction is. In fact there is no final definition on what job satisfaction represents. In other words, there is a lack of consensus as to what job satisfaction really is and how satisfaction of employees can be assessed. Therefore, before a definition of job satisfaction can be given, the nature and importance of work as a universal human activity must be well thought-out. Mullins (2002) asserted that job satisfaction is a complex and multi-dimensional notion, which can mean different things to different people.

Job satisfaction has been defined simply as a worker’s positive or negative attitude toward one’s job (Ucar & Otken, 2010). According to Miao (2011), job satisfaction refers to an employee’s overall sense of well-being at work. It is an internal state based on assessing the job and job-related experiences with some degree of favour or disfavour.

Job satisfaction is one’s positive feeling about his or her job, but also further stated that the assessment was based on an evaluation of the job characteristics (Robbins & Judge, 2007). Each individual of values, attitudes and expectations differ; thus, motivational factors can be quite different. Researchers found that the most researched definition of job satisfaction is by Locke in his book titled The Nature and Causes of Job Satisfaction. M.D. Dunnette (Ed.), in Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology (1976) defines it as a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job or job experiences (p. 1304). However, Locke’s definition includes evaluative or expectancy components and the importance of both affect (feeling), and cognition (thinking). Similarly, job satisfaction is an employee’s effective response resulting from an evaluation of the work situation.

Hakkak, Gashti and Nawaser (2014) in their study on investigating the relation among job satisfaction, perceived organizational support and organizational commitment, job satisfaction is divided into two categories, namely, internal and external satisfaction. External satisfaction is related to factors such as payment, promotion, admiration and interaction with colleagues; whereas employees’ satisfaction is related to values, social status, position; and professional responsibility indicate internal satisfaction (Robbins & Judge, 2007). Individuals’ assessment of their job and expression of satisfaction or dissatisfaction can be regarded as the general outcome of their job constituents.

Some workers have high intrinsic values and thus desire work to be satisfying regardless of factors such as pay and benefits (George & Jones, 2008). Rahaman (2003) assert that others with high extrinsic values desire high compensation. Benefits represent satisfying many stages of needs for the employees. Most approaches to job satisfaction are based on the theories of motivation, among the premise of the Herzberg theory in 1959, known as the Two-Factor Theory of Motivation. Intrinsic factors, such as employees’ opportunity for personal achievement, recognition from supervisors, the work itself and growth, are related to job satisfaction (Wann-Yin & Htaik, 2011). Conversely, extrinsic factors such as company policy, administration, supervision, and working conditions are associated with job dissatisfaction. According to Stello (2011), the factors associated with work that are considered to be the motivators include the following: achievement; recognition; tasks (the work itself); responsibility; advancement; and personal growth. The factors associated with work that are considered to be hygienic include the following: policies and administration; supervision/managerial relationships; salaries; working conditions; status; security; and co-worker relationships.

**Organizational commitment**

The area of organizational commitment is one of the most investigated areas of research. Colakoglu, Culha and Atay (2010) state that increasing interests of various disciplines, such as sociology, psychology and behavioural sciences on organizational commitment, and examining organizational commitment by researchers in the field, both cause one’s own perspective to take different definitions into account.
However, the notion of commitment is that it can influence individual actions independent of other factors. Cetin (2006) outlines that organizational commitment means one’s devotion to his/her occupation, it requires the purpose of the occupation, belief in the values of the occupation and acceptance of them; and showing an effort to survive in his/her occupation and membership. Herrbach (2006) found that organizational commitment can lead to persistence in a course of action even in the face of conflicting motives or attitudes, and may even lead individuals to behave in ways that, from the perspective of neutral observers, might seem contrary to their own self-interest.

Organizational commitment has been defined differently by different researchers. Organizational commitment has been defined by Lyons (2006) as the degree to which an employee identifies with an employer, wants to remain with the organization, and is willing to use extra effort to stay with that organization. Krishnaveni and Ramtumar (2008) further define commitment as a psychological state that characterizes the employee’s relationship with the organization, and has implications for the decision to continue membership in the organization. The strength of employee commitment to an organization depends on how far the individual employee believes an organization is in accomplishing its observed compulsion of which negative organizational politics can impinge on. It was argued that the prevalence of an individual’s commitment towards the organization acts as a driving force behind organizational performance (Rahaman, 2003). According to Lyons (2006), organizational commitment has been linked to performance, lower employee absenteeism and lower turnover.

Bashir and Ramay (2008) state that organizational commitment is important and is positively correlated with self-rated job performance; employees’ retention; job satisfaction; and employees' productivity and motivation. Highly committed employees have high performances as compared to those employees who have less commitment to the organization. They further maintained that psychological characteristics are significantly predicted and correlated with organizational commitment, characteristics such as emotional intelligence, work role salience, achievement motivation and job satisfaction; and they found that only job security, supervision, training opportunities and actual work undertaken are positively correlated with organizational commitment.

Meyer and Allen (1997) categorized organizational commitment into three dimensions. The three constituent conceptions of organization commitment developed are, namely, affective, continuous and normative commitment. When employees are treated quite fairly, they are pleased and they have good relations with the supervisors then they develop high levels of affective commitment (Grant, 2008). Herrbach (2006) noted that organizational commitment has three dimensions: these are internalization which is the involvement predicated on congruence between organizational and individual values, identification which is the attachment based on a desire for affiliation with the organization and compliance which is the instrumental involvement for specific extrinsic rewards. It is further argued by Herrbach (2006) that identification is viewed as a base, in other words, a determinant, for the development of affective commitment. In either case, however, identification is related only to the affective dimension of commitment and excludes the normative and continuance components.

**The relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment**

Several studies have been conducted which demonstrated the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment. In a study carried out by Aydogdu and Asikgil (2011) on the employees working in the service and production industry, results showed a significant relationship between affective commitment and job satisfaction. Results also showed that there is a significant relationship between job satisfaction and normative commitment. Aydogdu and Asigil (2011) also found out a significant and positive relationship between job satisfaction and continuance commitment. In contrast, study conducted by Ahmad and Oranya (2010) showed that there is no significant correlation between job satisfaction and continuance commitment.

A study conducted in five Lebanese banks by Dirani and Kuchinke (2011) on the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment, results showed that job satisfaction and organizational commitment were significantly correlated and satisfaction was a predictor of commitment. This is similar to the study conducted by Malik, Nawab, Naeem and Danish (2010); Suma and Lesha (2013); and Ahmad and Oranya (2010) since they also found that there is a significant and positive correlation between job satisfaction and organizational commitment.

**Research methodology**

The quantitative research design was used in this study to investigate the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment. The study population consist of both male and female academic staff members at a selected higher education institution in South Africa. The total size of the population was 472(N=472). Due to manageable environment and organizational settings, four hundred and seventy-two questionnaires were distributed to obtain more representative results.
Participants and setting

Three hundred and two (302) academic staff members from a South African higher learning institution participated in this study (males = 59.3%; females = 40.7%; Blacks = 90.4%; Whites = 7.3%; Indian = 1.3; Coloured = 1.0, age range 36-45 years). All participants (n = 302, 100%) held post-graduate qualifications (see Table 1 for demographics).

Table 1: Demographic variables: gender, age, race, highest qualification and tenure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable(s)</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Frequency (f)</th>
<th>Percentages (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>59.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>40.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>25 years and below</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26-35 years</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36-45 years</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46 years and above</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>90.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coloured</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest qualification</td>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Postgraduate degree</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>94.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 years and above</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>46.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data collection

Based on literature review and research objectives, self-administered questionnaire was used to solicit data from all the sampled junior academic staff members. Two types of questionnaires were used to obtain primary information from the respondents. Firstly, Employees’ level of job satisfaction was measured by adopting items from the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ20: the shortened version of MSQ consisted of 20 items). The participants were asked to rate the extent to which they agree with each item on a five-point Likert-type scale ranging from very dissatisfied (1) to very satisfied (5).

The MSQ has been widely used as a tool for measuring job satisfaction with reliable and valid results. Martin (2007) concur that the MSQ20 has been proven to be reliable by a number of researchers including Sempane, Rieger and Roodt in their study in 2002 with Cronbach’s Alpha of 0.9169 on a sample of government welfare employees. Martin (2007) obtained Cronbach’s Alpha of 0.898 based on 17 items, indicating an acceptable reliability. For the purpose of this study, Cronbach’s alpha 0.916 was obtained.

The Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) was used to obtain data on employee’s level of organizational commitment. Organizational Commitment Questionnaire consists of 18 items and also has a five-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (2). The Organizational Commitment Questionnaire has been widely used as a tool for measuring organizational commitment with reliable and valid results. Allen and Meyer and Allen (1991) reported an alpha of 0.87 for affective commitment, 0.79 for normative and 0.75 for continuance. Dunham, Grube and Castaneda (1994) reported an alpha range of 0.74 to 0.84 for affective commitment, 0.67 to 0.78 for normative commitment and 0.73 to 0.81 for continuance commitment. Meyer (1997) reported 0.87 for the affective commitment scale, 0.75 for the continuance commitment scale, and
0.79 for the normative commitment scale. Martin (2007) confirmed the reliability Organizational Commitment Questionnaire. For the purpose of this study, Cronbach’s alpha 0.639 was obtained.

*Table 2: Cronbach’s alpha reliable coefficients*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Number Of items</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Commitment Questionnaire</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Questionnaire</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.819</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data collection procedures*

In administering the questionnaire, permission was requested from the university’s research office and management to distribute questionnaires to all academic staff members. Consent was also requested from the respondents before distribution of the questionnaires. Questionnaire distribution was done in such a way as to cause no disturbance to work performance of the respondents. The questionnaires were distributed to the respondents during breaks (during lunch time and after hours) and also the respondents were made aware of the time they have to complete the questionnaire. Respondents were given seven working days to complete the questionnaires. After seven days, questionnaires were collected from the respondents for inspection before they were coded.

*Data analysis*

The collected data was coded and analyzed using SPSS version 23.0 statistical software. Correlations were used to test whether there is any relationship between the variables (job satisfaction and organizational commitment. T-test and Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) were also used to tests for differences in the work context variables by employee demographics.

*Ethical considerations*

Permission was sought and granted by the organization’s authority. Voluntary informed consent was sought from the participants. In addition, confidentiality was maintained at all times and participants were informed through a letter sent via email from HR office which communicated essential information about the research.

*Results and Discussion*

*Response rate*

Four hundred and seventy-two (472) questionnaires were distributed to all academic staff members. Out of four hundred and seventy-two (472) distributed questionnaires, three hundred and two (302) usable questionnaires were returned. This indicated that a response rate of 64% was achieved. This was considered acceptable to continue with the analysis of the data. According to Bryman and Bell (2011), response rates above 60% are acceptable in business research.

*Hypotheses testing*

Hypothesis 1: There is a positive relationship between job satisfaction and affective commitment.

Hypothesis 1 suggested that job satisfaction is positively related to affective commitment. Pearson Correlation was used to test the sixth hypothesis. Based on the results, there is a strong significant relationship between job satisfaction and affective commitment ($r = 0.556$, $p = 0.000$) and the findings are shown in table 3. The research findings here are in conformation with those of Lumley, Coetzee, Tladinyane & Ferreira (2011) and Bilgin & Demirer (2012) who also reported a positive significant relationship between job satisfaction and affective commitment. However, the findings may be attributed to the notion that both job satisfaction and affective commitment relate to an individual’s attitude towards their work. Therefore, an increase in the level of job satisfaction will influence an increase in affective commitment. Thus, hypothesis 1 was supported.
Hypothesis 2: There is a positive relationship between job satisfaction and continuance commitment.

Hypothesis 2 suggested that job satisfaction is positively related to continuance commitment. Pearson Correlation was also used to test hypothesis seven. As expected, the findings of the study demonstrated that there is a positive significant relationship between job satisfaction and continuance commitment ($r = 0.512, p=0.000$) and the results are shown in table 3. As such, a change in job satisfaction will influence a change in continuance commitment. These results are in line with the findings reported by Yang’s study (2010) showing that job satisfaction and continuance commitment are positively related. Lumley, Coetzee, Tladinyane and Ferreira (2011) also reported similar results. These results mean that satisfied employees feel that they need to remain with the organization. Therefore, hypothesis 3 was supported.

Hypothesis 3: There is a positive relationship between job satisfaction and normative commitment.

Pearson Correlation was used to test hypothesis 3. The eighth hypothesis was tested to determine if job satisfaction is positively related to normative commitment. The findings of the study demonstrated that there is no significant correlation between job satisfaction and normative commitment ($r = -0.052; p = 0.372$). Such results may have been obtained due to a different work setting since these findings are not consistent with prior research (Colakoglu, Culha & Atay, 2010; Lumley, Mohammed & Elewed, 2013). Consequently, an increase in job satisfaction will not result in a change of normative commitment. Hypothesis 3 was therefore, not supported.

Table 3: Pearson’s Correlation Coefficients of the Job Satisfaction, Affective Commitment, Continuance Commitment and Normative Commitment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Affective Commitment</th>
<th>Continuance Commitment</th>
<th>Normative Commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Satisfaction</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pearson Correlation</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.556**</td>
<td>0.512**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sig.(2-tailed)</strong></td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td>302</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affective Commitment</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pearson Correlation</strong></td>
<td>0.556**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.638**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sig.(2-tailed)</strong></td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td>302</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Continuance Commitment</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pearson Correlation</strong></td>
<td>0.512**</td>
<td>0.638**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sig.(2-tailed)</strong></td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td>302</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Normative Commitment</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pearson Correlation</strong></td>
<td>-0.052</td>
<td>0.230**</td>
<td>0.226**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sig.(2-tailed)</strong></td>
<td>0.372</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td>302</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Hypothesis 4: There is significance mean differences between academic staff members job satisfaction and organizational commitment based on their gender and age.
A t-test was used to compare job satisfaction and organizational commitment based on gender. As shown in table 4. Results from table 4 show that the mean score for female academic staff members towards job satisfaction was \( M_f = 3.44 \) which was slightly lower than the mean score for males \( M_m = 3.34 \). The results for the t-test are shown in table 4 above (df=300, \( t = 39.788, p=0.00 \)). Therefore, the results show that there is a significant difference in job satisfaction between male and female academic staff members.

Table 4: One-Sample t-Test: Gender differences with regard to job satisfaction and organizational commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Test Value = 0</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Sig.(2tailed)</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Upper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td></td>
<td>39.788</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.414</td>
<td>1.287</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study hypothesised that there is no mean differences between academic staff members’ level of satisfaction and commitment in terms of gender. As shown in table five, the results show that there is no significant mean differences between employee job satisfaction (df=4, \( F = 2.623, p=0.038 \)) as well as employee organizational commitment (df=4, \( F=1.116, p=0.331 \)). Therefore, we fail to reject the null hypothesis since \( p>0.05 \) and conclude that there is a significant differences academic staff members’ age groups and their level of job satisfaction and organizational commitment. These findings are contradictory with Noordin and Jusoff (2009) research findings which stated that age appear to have significant impact on the academics’ level of job satisfaction and organizational commitment.

Table 5: Anova: Mean differences between job satisfaction and organizational commitment by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction Between Groups</td>
<td>4.815</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.238</td>
<td>2.623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>29.543</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>0.462</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34.448</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational commitment Between Groups</td>
<td>1.436</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.352</td>
<td>1.166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>19.965</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>0.308</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21.427</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusion

Findings of this study suggest that there is a relationship between job satisfaction and affective commitment as well as continuance commitment. But then again, the relationship between job satisfaction and normative commitment was inconsistent with the existing literature. However, the possible reason for this lack of consistency can be due to different limitations of these studies. The results also show that there is a significant difference in job satisfaction between male and female academic staff members. The results show that there is no significant mean difference between employee job satisfaction as well as employee organizational commitment in terms of age. Furthermore, the results of the present study are therefore believed to have contributed to the field of organizational behavior and industrial psychology in general, on both the academic and theoretical level. Therefore, Higher Learning Institutions can utilize these results to shape the employees’ level of satisfaction as well as commitment.
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