

# The Impact of Job Satisfaction on Facet of Organizational Commitment (Affective, Continuance and Normative Commitment): A Study of Banking Sector Employees of Sudan

Aisha Mirgahni Shibeika <sup>1</sup>

## ABSTRACT

*Employees are an organizations human capital. Being, an important asset of an organization, employee's satisfaction is imperative to the organization. Organizations are concerned about the job satisfaction and organizational commitment of the employees. These are important considerations in the organizations like banking sector where employees have to face much stress especially at the workplace.*

*The main objective of the study was to explore the relationship between employees' job satisfaction (as measured by the Job Satisfaction Survey) and organizational commitment (affective, continuance and normative commitment).*

*The methodology of the research relies on data collected from 375 employees' questionnaires within the banking sector in the Sudan. The stratified sampling technique was used for the bank's employees' questionnaire. Descriptive and reliability analysis were performed and regression analysis was conducted to test the hypotheses.*

*The findings of this study indicate that job satisfaction positively influenced organizational commitment of employees. Specifically, there are statistically significant positive relation between job satisfaction and organizational commitment affective, continuance and normative commitment.*

**Key words:** *Job Satisfaction, Affective Commitment, Normative Commitment, Continuance Commitment, Banking Sector in Sudan.*

## Introduction

Employees an important investment for the organization. Therefore it is the need to manage them properly (Tella et al., 2007). Employees' commitment towards an organization is important components that help organization to retain the valuable employees and to get the competitive advantage (Abdulla & Ramay, 2012). Job satisfaction is the largely research topic to determine organizational behavior (Lu & Barriball, 2005). Management and organization always has the concern towards employees' organizational commitment (Abdulla & Ramay, 2012).

Human Resource is an asset for any organization as it helps organization to succeed (Bemana et al., 2013). Job satisfaction is an imperative for every organization (Saeed et al., 2013). It is a greatest and essential issue for today's Human Resource Managers of an organization, as it provides a "strategic Links" between satisfaction of employees towards job and their productivity. It plays an important role in retaining employees (Fatma & Zaheer, 2010).

Organizational Commitment refers to when an employee accepts the organization and wants to remain with it (Robbins, 1998:142). It is a mental state that ties the individual to the institution, a strong wish to remain a member of a specific organization, a person readiness to struggle a high level of efforts and a strong trust and acceptance of, the principles and goals of the institution (Tella et al., 2007).

\* Dr. Aisha Mirghani Shibeika , is an Assistant Professor of strategic management at the School of Management Studies , University of Khartoum, Sudan. She received her MBA in (2011) and her PhD degree in (2015) in strategic Management, both from University of Khartoum , School of Management Studies , Business Administration Department.([aisha.shibeika@gmail.com](mailto:aisha.shibeika@gmail.com)) .

Improvements in loyalty levels can not only constructive behavioral effects, however according to the current outcome, the indirect result of improved worker contentment as well. Results of the emotions about work recital (Organizational commitment and Job satisfaction) and being in a job and institution that suits one's principles and targets (by means of job unit influence and work inspiration) have an effect on intentions to give up or continue (Bashir & Ramay, 2008).

### **Literature Review**

#### ***Job satisfaction***

The research tells us that job satisfaction is the level of “favorableness or un favorableness with which workers view their job” (Werther & Davis, 1999:501). It refers to an employee’s general opinion towards his/her job, such as; a person with high degree of job satisfaction has a positive feeling towards his job, whereas one who is unhappy with the job can grip a negative attitude (Robbins & Coulter, 2005:374). Some scholars argue that job satisfaction is an emotive reaction to a job condition, which is often decided by how nicely results meet up or exceed expectations, for example, if workers think that they are treated unjustly, receive less remunerations, they are more probably to have a negative feelings toward their work, supervisor or coworkers (Luthans, 2005:212; Manzoor et al., 2011).

Therefore, job satisfaction is concerned with how well an employee’s expectations at work are in tune with outcomes (Khan, 2006). The quality of the staff implies acceptable social and financial status, a wish to reduce inequality such as, those relating to gender; a concern to supervise force in accordance with the deserve belief and give them within the service instruction they require, in turn to carry out their function in a altering society; the formation of motivation and constitutions to promote scholars to work in multidisciplinary groups on thematic projects, therefore violation with the custom of entirely sole technical job (Sabir et al., 2011).

#### ***Organizational commitment***

It reflects the employee’s belief in the mission and targets of employer establishment and his/her willingness to expend attempt in their achievement with intent to carry on working there (Singh & Pandey, 2004:98). A large variety of explanation and measures of organizational commitment exist; a strong wants to remain the part of a specific organization; a willingness to exert high levels of efforts on behalf of the organization; and belief in and acceptability of the values and goals of the organization (Tella et al., 2007). It is the psychological state that binds the individual to the organization. Antecedents of organizational commitment are quite diverse in nature and origin (Bashir & Ramay, 2008).

Based on the multidimensional nature of organizational commitment there is increasing support for a three factor model, which have implication for the individual and organization:

***Normative Commitment:*** It is defined as “an employee’s feelings of obligation to remain with the organization” (Meyer and Allen, 1984). Workers stay with an organization, because he feels grateful to maintain employment (Singh & Pandey, 2004:98). The recognition measurements involve adoption of goals and values (Moynihan & Pandey, 2007). Normative commitment is an emotion of requirement to carry on service (Bashir & Ramay, 2008).

***Affective Commitment:*** It is defined as “an employee sentimental attachment, sense of belonging and participation in the organization” (Meyer & Allen, 1984). Workers stay with an establishment because he needs to. He believes in and recognizes himself with the organization. The ethical participation requires internalization of the targets and principles of the establishment (Moynihan & Pandey, 2007). Affective commitment is the worker’s motive attachment to recognition with, and participation in the organization (Sabir et al., 2011).

***Continuance Commitment:*** Founded on the expenses that individual link towards leaving the organization (Meyer & Allen, 1984). An employee stays with an organization, because he feels that the individual costs of leaving are also high, for example when age limits his probability to find new job (Singh & Pandey, 2004:98). Continuance commitment is “a consciousness of the expenditure linked with parting the organization” (Bodla & Naeem, 2008; Aydogdu & Asikgil, 2011).

#### ***Job satisfaction and organizational commitment***

Strong positive relationships have been observed between organizational commitment and desirable work outcomes such as performance, adaptability and job satisfaction (Angle & Perry 1981; Hunt, Chonko & Wood 1985; Mowday, Porter & Dubin 1974). Research results indicate that satisfied employees tend to be committed to an organization, and employees who are satisfied and committed are more likely to attend work, stay with an organization, arrive at work on time, perform well and engage in behaviors helpful to the organization (Aamodt, 2007).

According to Kotze and Roodt (2005), a strong correlation has been empirically established between job satisfaction, employee commitment and retention.

Organizational commitment is most probably affected by factors such as type and variety of work, the autonomy involved in the job, the level of responsibility associated with the job, the quality of the social relationship

at work, rewards and remuneration, and the opportunities for promotion and career advancement in the company (Riggio 2009).

The major purpose of this study is to examine the influence on job satisfaction on organizational commitment in banking sector in Sudan. The relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment is studied in the Western countries; the knowledge about these correlations in Sudan is scarce. Additionally, in the literature few studies have investigated the relationship between different dimensions of job satisfaction and components of organizational commitment (Tsai, 2008).

Organizational commitment is an important attribute that is regarded by every organization. Banking sector, which is considered to be the most stressed sector, the need arises to check the impact of employee's job satisfaction towards the affective commitment, continuance commitment and normative commitment (being the three important facets of organizational commitment). As a result of the discussions given above, the research question is: How Job Satisfaction impact and influence facets of Organizational Commitment (Affective, Continuance and Normative Commitment)? And the following hypothesis can be stated:

**H1.1:** There is a positive relationship between job satisfaction and affective commitment.

**H1.2:** There is a positive relationship between job satisfaction and continuance commitment.

**H1.3:** There is a positive relationship between job satisfaction and normative commitment.

## Research Methodology

### Participants and Procedures

Primary data was collected through questionnaires administered to a sample of banks employees selected according to the probability sampling techniques. The researcher also used Disproportionate Stratified Random Sampling because some stratum is over-represented and some are less-represented (e.g. total number of employees in Financial Investment Bank are only 7 employees and total number of employees in Agricultural Bank are 2106 employees). The sample size decision should be guided by a consideration of the resource constraints such as limited money, limited time, and availability of qualified personnel for data collection (Sekaran and Bougie, 2010). The distribution of all banks employees' questionnaires (400) was administered by the researcher where respondents were asked to return completed questionnaires to the researcher after one week through the bank. This may have made some employees a bit reserved in their responses. However, 380 questionnaires were collected of which (375 questionnaires) were completed and valid for analysis.

### Respondents' Profile

Table (1) below shows the respondents' profile. The respondents comprised of 375 employees within the banking sector in Sudan. As expected, males within the banking sector in Sudan constitute 52.5% and females constitute 47.5%. This could be due to the fact that traditional ideology of Arab culture which continues to dominate the lives of women and to isolate them from activities outside the family (Manasra, 1993). In addition, 8.0% were aged less than 20 years, 32.3% between 20–30 years, 36.8% between 30–40 years, 27.2% between 40–50 years, and 2.9% of respondents were aged 50-60 years. More than half of the respondents, 68.5% were married, 27.2% were single and 4.3% were other. Of the study subjects, 10.4 % had worked in their bank for a year or less, 25.1% between 1 and 4 years, 32% between 4 and 7 years, 23.7% between 7 and 10 years and the organizational tenures of 8.8% of the sample were 10 years and above. A total of 9 employees were educated to high School diploma level or less, 236 subjects were university-graduates and 130 employees were postgraduates.

**Table No (1)**  
**Respondents' Profile**

Categories	Frequency	Percent%
<b>Employees' Experience :</b>		
Less than one year	<b>39</b>	<b>10.4%</b>
1 year and less than 4 years	<b>94</b>	<b>25.1%</b>
4 years and less than 7 years	<b>120</b>	<b>32%</b>
7 years and less than 10 years	<b>89</b>	<b>23.7%</b>

10 years and more	33	8.8%
<b>Employees' Age :</b>		
Less than 21 years	3	8%
21 to 30 years	121	32.3%
31 to 40 years	138	36.8%
41 to 50 years	102	27.2%
51 to 60 years	11	2.9%
<b>Employees' Gender :</b>		
Male	197	52.5%
Female	178	47.5%
<b>Employees' Marital Status :</b>		
Single	102	27.2%
Married	257	68.5%
Other	16	4.3%
<b>Employees' Educational Level :</b>		
High Secondary School	0	0%
High School Diploma	9	2.4%
University Education	236	62.9%
Post Graduate Education	130	34.7%

Source: Prepared By the Researcher for this Study

### Measures

In order to measure job satisfaction, the survey questionnaire items were based on Spector Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) (1997) an instrument developed for the comprehensive assessment of job satisfaction. Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) is a nine items assessment of nine facets of job satisfaction (pay, promotion, supervision, fringe benefits, contingent rewards, operating conditions, co-workers, nature of the work and communication), as well as overall job satisfaction. A summated rating scale format is used; with five choices per item ranging from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree" using Likert scale. JSS has been validated and showed good internal consistency, with the Cronbach's alphas ranging from 0.60 to 0.91 (Spector, 1997).

Organizational commitment was measured with three revised component scale of affective, normative and continuance commitment (Allen and Meyer, 1996). Meyer et al. (1993) reported internal consistency reliability estimates (Cronbach's alphas) for affective commitment (0.82), continuance commitment (0.74) and normative commitment (0.83).

The questionnaire consisted of three sections, which are Section **A** consist of demographic questions. Section **B** consist of questions measuring job satisfaction, Section **C** consists of questions measuring organizational commitment .

### Reliability Analysis of the Instrument

This study uses the most popular test of inter-item consistency reliability, Cronbach's Alpha coefficient, which is usually used in multipoint scaled items. As exhibited in Table (2), all the resulting scales are sufficiently reliable, with an overall alpha of .90 for all the items, which is quite satisfactory and meet the reliability requirements.

As **Table (2)** indicates, the Cronbach's Alpha shows that the selected sets of questions relate to each other strongly as reflected in the high values of alphas. Consequently, all these sets will be subjected to factor analysis.

**Table No (2)**

#### Scale Reliability Test of the Questionnaires

Variables	Items	Alpha Cronbach %
Job Satisfaction	9	83%
Affective Commitment	8	89%
Continuous Commitment	8	89%
Normative Commitment	8	86%
<b>Total Reliability of the Model</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>90%</b>

Source: Prepared By the Researcher for this Study

### Descriptive Statistics of the Independent Variable

Table (3) below shows the descriptive statistics of all questions and the average score for overall questions, which includes the mean, standard deviation and Chi-Square.

However, for JS items, the highest mean scored is for (Q9) communications (Mean=4.36, SD=.59), followed by (Q8) the nature of the work (Mean=4.29, SD=.62), followed by (Q7) co-workers (Mean=4.27, SD=.62), followed by (Q6) nature of the operations (Mean=3.93, SD=.83), followed by (Q3) supervision (Mean=3.44, SD=1.13), followed by (Q5) contingent rewards (Mean=3.38, SD=1.09) and with the lowest mean level for (Q4) bonuses, (Q2) promotion and (Q1) pay (Mean=3.21, SD=1.12), (Mean=3.13, SD=1.13) and (Mean=3.09, SD=1.21) respectively. The average score for overall job satisfaction is (3.68) with a standard deviation (.62).

The descriptive statistics of JS reflects similarity with the findings of Steven and John,(2005), after collecting data through Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS), which conclude that the overall level of JS of communications, nature of the work, co-workers, nature of the operations had a high mean value of 4.827 (SD 1.21), 4.32 (SD 1.12), 4.64 (SD 0.95) and 4.76 (SD 0.99) respectively, which can be interpreted that employees were highly satisfied with communications, nature of the work, co-workers, nature of the operations. They slightly agreed with supervision (mean=3.85, SD= 1.25), contingent rewards (mean=3.71, SD= 0.97), bonuses (mean=3.62, SD= 1.30). While they were slightly dissatisfied with promotion and pay (mean=3.13, SD= 1.13), (mean=2.95, SD= 1.26) respectively.

**Table (3)**

#### Descriptive Statistics of the Independent Variable (N=375)

Mediator Variable and Questions	Mean	Std. Deviation	Chi-Square	Sig
<b>Job satisfaction :</b>				
<b>Q1 ( pay ) .</b>	3.09	1.21	90.61	.00*
<b>Q2 ( promotion ) .</b>	3.13	1.13	100.13	.00*
<b>Q3 ( supervision ) .</b>	3.44	1.13	125.84	.00*
<b>Q4 ( bonuses ) .</b>	2.21	1.12	81.01	.00*
<b>Q5 ( contingent rewards ) .</b>	3.38	1.09	131.12	.00*
<b>Q6 (nature of the operations).</b>	3.93	.83	395.78	.00*
<b>Q7 (co-workers) .</b>	4.27	.62	322.01	.00*

<b>Q8 ( the nature of the work) .</b>	4.29	.62	320.09	.00*
<b>Q9 ( communication ) .</b>	4.36	.59	341.57	.00*
<b>Over all (Mean, Std. Deviation and chi-square)</b>	<b>3.68</b>	<b>.62</b>	<b>405.12</b>	<b>.00*</b>

\*significant at 1% level

Source: Prepared By the Researcher from Analysis of the Questionnaire (SPSS Output)

### Descriptive Statistics of the Dependent Variables

Table (4) shows the descriptive statistics of all questions and the average scores for overall questions (main dependent variables) of the model, which include the mean, standard deviations and Chi-Square.

Regarding employees'-organizational commitment, Table (4) below shows that, the respondents generally agree with the overall statement with mean and standard deviation (affective commitment, mean=3.91, SD=.66, continuous commitment, mean=3.79, SD=.72 and normative commitment, mean=3.77, SD=.62) .

Chi-Square test was used to determine if there was a significant respondent's opinion. The result of this test (as reported in the same table) indicates that respondent's opinions are highly significant (Sig. level 0.05).

**Table (4)**  
**Descriptive Statistics of the Dependent Variables (N=375)**

<b>Dependent Variables and Questions</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Std. Deviation</b>	<b>Chi-Square</b>	<b>Sig</b>
<b>Affective Commitment :</b>				
<b>Q1 (I would be very happy if I spent the rest of my career with this organization).</b>	4.00	.81	350.53	.00*
<b>Q2 (I enjoy discussing my organization with people outside it ) .</b>	3.95	.82	389.25	.00*
<b>Q3 (I really feel as if this organization's problems are my own problems ) .</b>	4.01	.80	389.25	.00*
<b>Q4 (I think that I could easily become as attached to another organization as I am to this one) .</b>	3.69	1.04	173.73	.00*
<b>Q5 (I feel like " part of the family " at my organization) .</b>	3.76	.96	81.64	.00*
<b>Q6 (I feel emotionally attached to this organization) .</b>	3.84	.94	246.05	.00*
<b>Q7 (This organization a great deal of personal meaning has to) .</b>	4.00	.84	336.50	.00*
<b>Q8 (I feel strong sense of belonging to my organization) .</b>	4.02	.84	322.40	.00*
<b>Over all (Mean, Std. Deviation and chi-square)</b>	<b>3.91</b>	<b>.66</b>	<b>492.92</b>	<b>.00*</b>
<b>Continuous Commitment :</b>				
<b>Q1 (I am afraid of what might happen if I quit my job without having another one) .</b>	3.82	.97	319.92	.00*
<b>Q2 (It would be very difficult for me to leave my organization right now) .</b>	3.86	.93	320.93	.00*
<b>Q3 (Too much in my life would be disrupted if I decided to leave organization now) .</b>	3.75	1.00	217.46	.00*
<b>Q4 (It would be too costly for me to leave my organization now) .</b>	3.69	1.01	185.94	.00*
<b>Q5 (Right now, staying with my organization is a matter of necessity as much as desire) .</b>	3.77	1.01	184.34	.00*

<b>Q6</b> (I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving this organization) .	3.82	.95	292.93	.00*
<b>Q7</b> (One of the few serious consequences of leaving this organization would be the scarcity of available jobs) .	3.80	.98	293.33	.00*
<b>Q8</b> (One of the major reasons I continue to work for this organization is that leaving would require considerable personal sacrifice) .	3.78	.97	260.73	.00*
<b>Over all (Mean, Std. Deviation and chi-square)</b>	<b>3.79</b>	<b>.72</b>	<b>492.92</b>	<b>.00*</b>
<b>Normative Commitment :</b>				
<b>Q1</b> (I think that employees these days move from organization to another too often) .	3.85	.91	316.98	.00*
<b>Q2</b> (I believe that employee must always be loyal to his or her organization) .	4.09	.78	203.61	.00*
<b>Q3</b> (Jumping from organization to another it seen at all unethical to me) .	3.51	1.15	162.32	.00*
<b>Q4</b> (I believe that loyalty is important and therefore, I feel sense of moral obligation to remain) .	3.82	.97	216.10	.00*
<b>Q5</b> (If I get another offer for a better job elsewhere I feel it was right to leave my organization) .	3.52	1.17	123.41	.00*
<b>Q6</b> (I was taught to believe in the value of remaining loyal to one organization) .	3.68	1.07	166.93	.00*
<b>Q7</b> (Things were better in these days when employees stayed with one organization for most of their careers) .	3.81	.96	281.33	.00*
<b>Q8</b> (I think that waiting to be “a organization man “or a organization woman “ is sensible any more) .	3.85	.95	288.05	.00*
<b>Over all (Mean, Std. Deviation and chi-square)</b>	<b>3.77</b>	<b>.68</b>	<b>273.33</b>	<b>.00*</b>

\*significant at 1% level

Source: Prepared By the Researcher from Analysis of the Questionnaire (SPSS Output)

### Correlation Analysis among all Variables in the Model

**Table (5)** below illustrates the results of intercorrelation between variables. The correlation analysis is conducted to see the initial picture of the interrelationships between variables under study (Sekaran and Bougie, 2010). Another benefit of the correlation matrix is to determine multicollinearity between the variables of the study.

The inter-correlation **Table (5)** below demonstrates that job satisfaction (**JS**) is positively and significantly correlated with affective commitment (**AC**) ( $r=.647$ ,  $p\text{-value} < 0.01$ ), also **JS** is positively and significantly correlated with continuous commitment (**CC**) ( $r=.647$ ,  $p\text{-value} < 0.01$ ). Finally, job satisfaction (**JS**) is positively and significantly correlated with normative commitment (**NC**) ( $r=.653$ ,  $p\text{-value} < 0.01$ ). Therefore, multicollinearity is not a problem in this study.

**Table (5)**

**Inter-Correlations among all Variables in the Model (N=375)**

	JS	AC	CC	NC
JS	1	.647(**)	.647(**)	.653(**)
AC	.647(**)	1	1.000(**)	.639(**)
CC	.647(**)	1.000(**)	1	.639(**)
NC	.653(**)	.639(**)	.639(**)	1

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 1% level (2-tailed).

Source: Analysis Prepared By the Researcher (SPSS Output)

**Hypotheses Testing of Job Satisfaction (JS) with Organizational Commitment (OC) (affective commitment, continuous commitment and normative commitment)**

Simple linear regression equation is expressed with OC as dependent variable. Then the equation tests the impact of independent variables (JS) on OC (affective commitment, continuous commitment and normative commitment).

Table (6) below shows the results of the regression equation testing the effect of JS on AC. Obviously, from Table (6), JS contributes (41.8%) of the variance in AC. Clearly, JS is positively correlated with AC (64.7%). The adjusted R<sup>2</sup> in the model is (41.7%) .

**Table (6)**

**Regression Analysis of Job Satisfaction and Affective Commitment**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square	F	df1	df2	Sig. F
1	.647	.418	.417	.55689	83.16	268.16	1	373	.00*
<b>a. Predictors: (Constant), Job Satisfaction</b>									
<b>a. Dependent Variable: Affective Commitment</b>									
*significant at 1% level									

Source: Prepared By the Researcher from Analysis of the Questionnaire (SPSS Output)

Table (6) above shows an F value of (268.16) at (p=0.00) level of significance. This result accepts the hypothesis that JS has a statistically significant positive direct effect on AC.

Moreover, the regression coefficients in Table (7) below indicates that the independent variable JS is explaining the variance in AC ( $\beta=.64$ ) ( $t= 16.37$ ), and P-value=.00).

**Table (7)**  
**Coefficients of Job Satisfaction Drivers on Affective Commitment**

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.00	.17		5.86	.00*
	Job Satisfaction	.71	.04	.64	16.37	.00*
<b>a. Dependent Variable: Affective Commitment</b> *Significant at 1% level						

Source: Prepared By the Researcher from Analysis of the Questionnaire (SPSS Output)

The **t** statistic test in **Table (7)** above shows that there is a statistically significant positive relationship between **JS** and **AC**.

**Hypotheses Testing of Job Satisfaction (JS) with Continuous Commitment (CC)**

Table (8) below shows the results of the regression equation testing the influence of JS on CC. Obviously, from Table (8), JS contributes (41.8%) of the variance in CC. Clearly, JS is positively correlated with CC (64.7%). The adjusted R<sup>2</sup> in the model is (41.7%) .

**Table (8)**  
**Regression Analysis of Job Satisfaction and Continuous Commitment**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square	F	df1	df2	Sig. F
1	.647	.418	.417	.55689	83.16	268.16	1	373	.00*
<b>a. Predictors: (Constant), Job Satisfaction</b>									

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square	F	df1	df2	Sig. F
1	.647	.418	.417	.55689	83.16	268.16	1	373	.00*

**b. Dependent Variable:** Continuous Commitment  
\*Significant at 1% level

Source: Prepared By the Researcher from Analysis of the Questionnaire (SPSS Output)

**Table (8)** above shows an **F** value of (268.16) at (p=0.00) level of significance. This result accepts the hypothesis that **JS** has a statistically significant positive direct effect on **CC**.

Moreover, the regression coefficients in **Table (9)** below indicates that the independent variable **JS** is explaining the variance in **CC** ( $\beta=.64$ ) ( $t= 16.37$ ), and  $P\text{-value}=0.00$  .

**Table (9)**  
**Coefficients of Job Satisfaction Drivers on Continuous Commitment**

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.00	.17		5.88	.00*
	Job Satisfaction	.71	.04	.64	16.37	.00*

**a. Dependent Variable:** Continuous Commitment  
\*significant at 1% level

Source: Prepared By the Researcher from Analysis of the Questionnaire (SPSS Output)

The t statistic test in the Table (9) above shows a statistically significant positive relationship between **JS** and **CC**.

**Hypotheses Testing of Job Satisfaction (JS) with Normative Commitment (NC)**

Table (10) below shows the result of the regression equation testing the effect of **JS** on **NC**. Obviously, from Table (10), **JS** contributed (42.6%) of the variance in **NC**. Clearly, **JS** is positively correlated with **NC** (65.3%). The adjusted  $R^2$  in the model is (42.5%) .

**Table (10)****Regression Analysis of Job Satisfaction and Normative Commitment**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square	F	df1	df2	Sig. F
1	.653	.426	.425	.51977	47.80	276.80	1	373	.00*
<b>a. Predictors: (Constant), Job Satisfaction</b>									
<b>b. Dependent Variable: Normative Commitment</b>									
*significant at 1% level									

Source: Prepared By the Researcher from Analysis of the Questionnaire by (SPSS Output)

Table (10) above shows an F value of (276.80) at (p=0.00) level of significance. This result accepts the hypothesis that JS has a statistically significant positive direct effect on NC .

Moreover, the regression coefficients in Table (11) below indicates that the independent variable JS is explaining the variance in NC ( $\beta=.65$ ) ( $t= 16.64$ ), and P-value=.00) .

**Table (11)****Coefficients of Job Satisfaction Drivers on Normative Commitment**

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.13	.16		7.05	.00*
	Job Satisfaction	.67	.04	.65	16.64	.00*
<b>a. Dependent Variable: Normative Commitment</b>						
*Significant at 1% level						

Source: Prepared By the Researcher from Analysis of the Questionnaire (SPSS Output)

The t test statistic in Table (11) above shows a statistically significant positive relationship between JS and NC. Thus, we can summarize the results of hypotheses testing as follows :

Table (12)

**Hypotheses Testing of Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment**

No.	Statement of Hypotheses	Result
<b>H1.1</b>	There is a statistically positive relationship between <b>JS</b> and <b>affective commitment</b> .	Accepted
<b>H1.2</b>	There is a statistically positive relationship between <b>JS</b> and <b>continuous commitment</b> .	Accepted
<b>H1.3</b>	There is a statistically positive relationship between <b>JS</b> and <b>normative commitment</b> .	Accepted

Source : Compiled by the Researcher

**Conclusions, Implications and Recommendations**

Job is a necessary component of life, where various factors affect community. Work life is one of the vital parts of our everyday life which create a great deal of pressure if worker is not happy with his/her work. Generally people are more concerned about result of their job but not consider facts that in fact impede their effectiveness and influence overall characteristic of their life (Manzoor et al., 2011).

Although job, organization and person related variables are universal in their existence as predictors of job satisfaction however, they all 'read' differently from person to person, job to job, organization to organization and location to location. The same factors operate in every study of job satisfaction but their impact on workers' contentment and performance vary significantly in multiple manners. Given this, neither the same explanation/definition can portray all the situations nor the single solution model can be implemented everywhere. There is need to understand every individual organizational situation separately in terms of job, organization and person related factors.

There exists a significant relationship among independent variable (Job Satisfaction) and dependent variables (Affective Commitment, Continuance Commitment, Normative Commitment). Correlation matrix showed that the job satisfaction has a significant positive relationship with the dimensions of organizational commitment, (i.e. affective commitment, continuance commitment and normative commitment) This shows that increased job satisfaction leads to an increased affective, continuance and normative commitment among the employees of banking sector in Sudan .

This study provided the first rough picture on job satisfaction and organizational commitment of employees in banking sector in Sudan. Three factors of organizational commitment were identified: affective, continuous and normative commitment. Taking into account all the benefits and weaknesses of this study, it can be said that it serves as a good foundation for future studies of these multifactorial phenomena. Also, the results have great practical value and can be of great benefit to managers in banking systems both in Sudan and in other developing countries.

The results of this study clearly indicate the factors that must be taken into account when hiring new staff, preventing the departure of the existing trained personnel to developed countries, and in the process of overall improvement of working quality. Positive professional identification, which is the most important factor that has been identified in this study, must be the basis for the recruitment of new staff. In addition, the results of this study clearly point out that it is necessary to improve organizational system in order to avoid the appearance of role conflict and ambiguity. Furthermore, significant efforts should be aimed at the overall satisfaction of employees with the purpose of making progress in the quality of work.

**References**

- 1- Abdullah and M.I. Ramay, 2012. Antecedents of Organizational Commitment: A Study of Banking Sector of Pakistan. *Serbian Journal of Management*, 7 (1): 89-102.
- 2- Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1996). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: An examination of construct validity. *Journal of vocational behavior*, 49(3), 252-276.
- 3- Aydogdu, S., & Asikgil, B. (2011). An Empirical Study of the Relationship among Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment and Turnover Intention, *International Review of Management and Marketing*.1 (3):43-53. Available at: <https://docs.google.com/viewer?a=v&q=cache:2P1FCQ6OzhsJ:www.econjournals.com/index.php/irmm/article/download>. Retrieved August 4, 2012.

- 4- Bashir, S; & Ramay, MI (2008). Determinants of Organizational Commitment A Study of Information Technology Professionals in Pakistan Mohammad Ali Jinnah University, Islamabad. Institute of behavioral and applied management. 9(2). Available at: [http://www.ibam.com/pubs/jbam/articles/Vol9/no2/JBAM\\_9\\_2\\_7.pdf](http://www.ibam.com/pubs/jbam/articles/Vol9/no2/JBAM_9_2_7.pdf). Retrieved December 29, 2011.
- 5- Bemana, S., H. Moradi, M. Ghasemi, S.M. Ghasemi and A.H. Ghayoor, 2013. The Relationship Among Job Stress and Job Satisfaction in Municipality Personnel in Iran. *World Applied Sciences Journal*, 22(2): 233-238.
- 6- Bodla, M.A., & Naeem, B. (2008). What satisfies pharmaceutical sales -force in Pakistan? *The International Journal of Knowledge, Culture, & Change Management*, 8.
- 7- Fatima, A., R. Imran and A. Zaheer, 2010. Emotional Intelligence and Job Satisfaction: Mediated by Transformational Leadership. *World Applied Sciences Journal*, 10(6): 612-620.
- 8- Khan, A. (2006). Performance Appraisal's Relation with Productivity and Job Satisfaction, *Journal of Managerial Sciences*, 1(2):114, Available at: [http://www.qurtuba.edu.pk/jms/default\\_files/JMS/1\\_2/7\\_ayaz.pdf](http://www.qurtuba.edu.pk/jms/default_files/JMS/1_2/7_ayaz.pdf) Retrieved January 17, 2012.
- 9- Kotze, K. & Roodt, G. (2005). 'Factors that affect the retention of managerial and specialist staff: An exploratory study of an employee commitment model', *South African Journal of Human Resource Management*, 3(2): 48-55.
- 10- Lu, H., A.E. While and K.L. Barriball, 2005. Job Satisfaction Among Nurses: A Literature Review. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, 42(2): 211-227.
- 11- Luthans, F. (2005). *Organizational behavior*. McGraw-Hills International Edition.
- 12- Manzoor, M.U., Usman, M., Naseem, M.A., & Shafiq, M.M. (2011). A Study of Job Stress and Job Satisfaction among Universities Faculty in Lahore, Pakistan *Global Journal of Management and Business Research*, 11(9):1 September 2011.
- 13- Manzoor, M.U., Usman, M., Naseem, M.A., & Shafiq, M.M. (2011). A Study of Job Stress and Job Satisfaction among Universities Faculty in Lahore, Pakistan *Global Journal of Management and Business Research*, 11(9):1 September 2011.
- 14- Meyer, J. P., Allen, N. J., Smith, C. A., 1993. Commitment to Organizations and Occupations: Extension and Test of a Three-Component Conceptualization. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78(4), 538.
- 15- Meyer, J.P. and N.J. Allen, 1984. Testing the "Side-Bet Theory" of Organizational Commitment: Some Methodological Considerations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 69: 372-378.
- 16- Mowday, R.T., Porter, L.W., & Steers, R.M. (1979). "The Measurement of organizational commitment, *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 14, 224-227.
- 17- Moynihan, D.P., & Pandey, S.K. (2007). Finding Workable Levers over Work Motivation Comparing Job Satisfaction, Job Involvement, and Organizational Commitment. University of Wisconsin–Madison, the University of Kansas, Lawrence. Available at: <http://aas.sagepub.com> Retrieved January 17, 2012.
- 18- Riggio, R.E. (2009). *Introduction to Industrial/Organizational Psychology*. London: Pearson.
- 19- Robbins, S. (1998). *Organizational Behavior: Contexts, Controversies, Applications*; Prentice- Hall, USA. Page 142.
- 20- Robbins, SP. & Coulter, M. (2005). *Management*. Pearson Education. Inc; and Dorling Kindersley Publishing Inc, India.
- 21- Sabri, P.S., Ilyas, M., & Amjad, Z. (2011). Organizational Culture and Its Impact on the Job Satisfaction of the University Teachers of Lahore. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*. 2(24) [Special Issue – December 2011] 121.
- 22- Singh, Y., & Pandey, M. (2004). *Principles of Organizational Behavior* AITBS Publishers and Distributors (Regd) J-5/6 Krishan Nagar Delhi-110051 India.
- 23- Sekaran, U. (2006). *Research methods for business: A skill building approach*: John Wiley & Sons.
- 24- Spector, P. E. (1997). *Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, cause, and consequences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- 25- Tella, A., Ayeni, C.O., & Popoola, S.O. (2007). Work Motivation, job satisfaction and organizational commitment of Library personnel in Academic and Research Libraries in OYO State Nigeria. *Practice of Library and philosophy*. Available at: ([www.accessmylibrary.com](http://www.accessmylibrary.com)). Accessed on 23rd, March, 2009.
- 26- Tsai M-T, Huang CC (2008); "The relationship among ethical climate types, facets of job satisfaction, and the three components of organizational commitment: a study of nurses in Taiwan *Journal of Business Ethics* 80:565-81.
- 27- Werther, W.B., & Davis, K. (1999) *Human Resources & Personnel Management*, Fifth edition (International Edition) McGraw-Hill Inc, USA. p. 501.