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Abstract

The main purpose of this study is the comparison job satisfaction and organizational commitment in employees, managers and members of the delegation in Islamic Azad University of Kogiluyeh & Boyer Ahmad province. Directors, employees, faculties are scientific. The nature of this research is survey methodology. The statistical population is all of employees (including managers, staffs and faculties), student areas, education, research, financial and administrative branches at the University of Kogiluyeh & Boyer Ahmad total of three Branches (Gachsaran - Dehdasht - Yasuj). Based on a regional classification into three Universities were randomly selected. Then, the affordable number of samples was randomly selected in terms of frequency of employees at the IAU. The estimated size samples were 223, when the Cochran formulas of calculating size samples were used. The results show that faculty's job satisfaction is more than employees, employee's job satisfaction is as same as managers, and organizational commitment of all three groups is same.
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INTRODUCTION

People bring mental and physical abilities and time to their jobs. Many try to make a difference in their lives and in the lives of others through working. The reason for wanting a job is often considerably more than just a paycheck. Jobs can be looked at as the means used to achieve personal goals. When a job meets or exceeds an individual’s expectation, the individual often experiences positive emotions. These positive emotions represent job satisfaction. Job satisfaction in turn is a major contributor to life satisfaction (Smith, 1992), a personal goal that many find worth pursuing.

Job satisfaction may be compared to another source of life satisfaction—marriage. When people lack marriage satisfaction or experience dissatisfaction in their union, they often get a divorce. It is similar with the relationship between employee and employer. “Take this job and shove it!” is not only a recorded blue-collar anthem by Johnny Paycheck during the 1980s, but also an illustration of the sentiments and actions of many people who are dissatisfied with their jobs overall or with certain aspects of their jobs.

To grasp the meaning of a construct like job satisfaction, it seems logical to look at how it is defined in the literature. The search for a universal definition of job satisfaction is not difficult one; it is an impossible one. Even though many researchers define job satisfaction, the definitions vary. The three definitions most commonly referred to among researchers are...
Hoppock’s, Locke’s, and Vroom’s. In the thirties, Hoppock’s (1935) response to the question ‘What is job satisfaction?’ was: “…any combination of psychological, physiological, and environmental circumstances that causes a person truthfully to say, ‘I am satisfied with my job’” (p. 47). Locke’s (1976) answer to the same question in the seventies was: “…a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job or job experiences” (p. 1300).

Vroom (1982), who used the terms “job satisfaction” and “job attitudes” interchangeably, defined job satisfaction as “…affective orientations on the part of individuals toward work roles which they are presently occupying” (p. 99). Even though the definitions vary, a commonality among them seems to be that job satisfaction is a job-related emotional reaction.

Spector (1997) presented three reasons to clarify the importance of job satisfaction. First, organizations can be directed by humanitarian values. Based on these values they will attempt to treat their employees honorably and with respect. Job satisfaction assessment can then serve as an indicator of the extent to which employees are dealt with effectively. High levels of job satisfaction could also be a sign of emotional wellness or mental fitness. Second, organizations can take on a utilitarian position in which employees’ behavior would be expected to influence organizational operations according to the employees’ degree of job satisfaction/dissatisfaction. Job satisfaction can be expressed through positive behaviors and job dissatisfaction through negative behaviors. Third, job satisfaction can be an indicator of organizational operations. Assessment of job satisfaction might identify various levels of satisfaction among organizational departments and, therefore, be helpful in pinning down areas in need of improvement. Spector (1997) believed that each one of the reasons is validation enough of the significance of job satisfaction and that the combination of the reasons provides an understanding of the focus on job satisfaction.

Organizational scientists have developed many definitions of organizational commitment, and numerous scales to measure them. Exemplary of this work is Meyer & Allen's model of commitment, which was developed to integrate numerous definitions of commitment that had proliferated in the research literature. According to Meyer and Allen's (1991) three-component model of commitment, prior research indicated that there are three "mind sets" which can characterize an employee's commitment to the organization:

Affective Commitment: AC is defined as the employee's emotional attachment to the organization. As a result, he or she strongly identifies with the goals of the organization and desires to remain a part of the organization. This employee commits to the organization because he/she "wants to". In developing this concept, Meyer and Allen drew largely on Mowday, Porter, and Steers's (1982) concept of commitment.

Continuance Commitment: The individual commits to the organization because he/she perceives high costs of losing organizational membership (cf. Becker's 1960 "side bet theory"), including economic losses (such as pension accruals) and social costs (friendship
ties with co-workers) that would have to be given up. The employee remains a member of the organization because he/she "has to".

Normative Commitment: The individual commits to and remains with an organization because of feelings of obligation. For instance, the organization may have invested resources in training an employee who then feels an obligation to put forth effort on the job and stay with the organization to 'repay the debt.' It may also reflect an internalized norm, developed before the person joins the organization through family or other socialization processes, that one should be loyal to one's organization. The employee stays with the organization because he/she "ought to".

Note that according to Meyer and Allen, these components of commitment are not mutually exclusive: an employee can simultaneously be committed to the organization in an affective, normative, and continuance sense, at varying levels of intensity. This idea led Meyer and Herscovitch (2001) to argue that at any point in time, an employee has a "commitment profile" that reflects high or low levels of all three of these mind-sets, and that different profiles have different effects on workplace behavior such as job performance, absenteeism, and the chance that they will quit.

The aims of this study is recognition relationship of organizational commitment and that’s component with job satisfaction in manager's, employees, faculty Member, and compare them together to compare manager's organizational commitment, employee and faculty members.

LITERATURE REVIEW

A) Organizational commitment

As the construct develops and evolves over the years, scholars from the various disciplines give their own conceptual definitions as to how the construct should be conceptually defined. Hall, Scheider and Nygren (1970) define organizational commitment as the “process by which the goals of the organizations and those of the individual become increasingly integrated and congruent”. Sheldon (1971) defines organizational commitment as an attitude or an orientation towards the organizations, which links or attracts the identity of the person to the organizations. Salancik (1977) defines organizational commitment as “a state of being in which an individual becomes bound by actions to beliefs that sustains activities and involvement”. Porter, Steers, Mowday and Boulian (1974), define organizational commitment as “the strength of an individual’s identification with and involvement in a particular organization”.

They characterize it by three psychological factors: desire to remain in an organization, willingness to exert considerable efforts on its behalf and belief in and acceptance of its goals and values hold.

Meyer and Allen (1991) hold that organizational commitment is a multidimensional construct comprising three components: affective, continuance and normative. Affective commitment has been defined as an employee’s emotional attachment to identification with and involvement in the organization. Employees with a strong affective commitment will remain in the organization because they want to.

Continuance commitment on the other hand has to do with one’s awareness of the costs associated with leaving the present organization. Employees whose commitment is in the nature of continuance will remain in the organization because they have to. The third
component, normative commitment has to do with feeling of obligations to the organization based on one’s personal norms and values.

Employees whose commitment to the organization is said to be of the normative type remains in the organization simply because they believe they ought to. The factor structure of Allen and Meyer’s (1996) organizational commitment scale has been examined in several studies. Some of these studies include measures from all the three components (affective, continuance, and normative) whilst others focus only on affective commitment measure and/or continuance commitment measure.

Studies have provided empirical support to demonstrate that the components are indeed distinguishable from one another (Dunham, Grube & Castaneda, 1994; Mc Gee & Ford, 1987 and Reilly & Orsak, 1991). To date, no empirical effort has been made to test and validate Allen and Meyer’s (1996) organizational commitment scale in a library setting, let alone in a Malaysia academic library setting. Only two studies have been reported in the library and information science literature that dealt with the topic of organizational commitment (Hovekamp, 1994; Rubin & Buttlar, 1992).

Rubin and Buttlar (1992) conducted a study to examine the organizational commitment of high school library media specialists in Ohio. They employed Mowday, Porter and Steers’s (1979) organizational commitment questionnaire.

B) Job Satisfaction

Three theoretical frameworks of job satisfaction can be identified in the literature. Framework one is based on content theories of job satisfaction. Framework two is grounded in process theories of job satisfaction. Framework three is rooted in situational models of job satisfaction (Thompson & McNamara, 1997).

**Framework One: Content Theories**

Content theorists assume that fulfillment of needs and attainment of values can lead to job satisfaction (Locke, 1976). Maslow’s (1954) need hierarchy theory and Herzberg’s motivator-hygiene theory (Herzberg, 1966) is examples of content theories.

Maslow’s Need Hierarchy Theory. According to Maslow’s (1954) view of individual needs, job satisfaction is said to exist when an individual’s needs are met by the job and its environment. The hierarchy of needs focuses on five categories of needs arranged in ascending order of importance. Physiological, safety, belongingness and love are the lower-level needs in the hierarchy. The higher-level needs are esteem and self-actualization. When one need is satisfied, another higher-level need emerges and motivates the person to do something to satisfy it. A satisfied need is no longer a motivator.

Whaba and Bridwell (1976) did an extensive review of the research findings on the need hierarchy concept. The results of their review indicate that there was no clear evidence showing that human needs are classified into five categories, or that these categories are structured in a special hierarchy. Even though hardly any research evidence was discovered in support of the theory, it enjoys wide acceptance.

Herzberg’s Motivator-Hygiene Theory. The study of job satisfaction became more sophisticated with the introduction of Herzberg’s motivator-hygiene theory (Herzberg, 1966; Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1959). This theory focuses attention upon the work itself as a principal source of job satisfaction. To Herzberg the concept of job satisfaction has two dimensions, namely intrinsic and extrinsic factors. Intrinsic factors are also known as
motivators or satisfiers, and extrinsic factors as hygenes, dissatisfiers, or maintenance factors. The motivators relate to job content (work itself) and include achievement, recognition, work itself, responsibility and advancement. The hygienes relate to job context (work environment) and involve, for example, company policy and administration, supervision, salary, interpersonal relations, and working conditions. Motivators are related to job satisfaction when present but not to dissatisfaction when absent. Hygienes are associated with job dissatisfaction when absent but not with satisfaction when present.

Before the emergence of the motivator-hygiene theory, only single scales had been used to measure job satisfaction. Scores on the high end of the scale reflected high levels of job satisfaction, whereas scores on the low end represented high dissatisfaction. Research based on the motivator-hygiene theory should apply different scales for job satisfaction and dissatisfaction because the opposite of job satisfaction is no job satisfaction and the opposite of job dissatisfaction is no job dissatisfaction (Iiacqua, Schumacher, & Li, 1995).

Assessing the motivator-hygiene theory, Locke, Fitzpatrick, and White (1983) pointed out that Herzberg’s theory is method dependent. Herzberg used what is known as the critical incident technique in the development of his theory. This type of research approach has been the only one consistently leading to results confirming the theory. The results of other applied methods have indicated that hygienes indeed can be associated with job satisfaction and motivators with job dissatisfaction.

**Framework Two: Process Theories**

Process theorists assume that job satisfaction can be explained by investigating the interaction of variables such as expectancies, values, and needs (Gruneberg, 1979). Vroom’s expectancy theory (1982) and Adams’ equity theory (1963) are representative of the second framework.

**Vroom’s Expectancy Theory:** Vroom’s (1982) expectancy theory suggests that people not only are driven by needs but also make choices about what they will or will not do. The theory proposes that individuals make work-related decisions on the basis of their perceived abilities to perform tasks and receive rewards. Vroom established an equation with three variables to explain this decision process. The three variables are expectancy, instrumentality, and valence.

Expectancy is the degree of confidence a person has in his or her ability to perform a task successfully. Instrumentality is the degree of confidence a person has that if the task is performed successfully, he or she will be rewarded appropriately. Valence is the value a person places on expected rewards.

Expectancy, instrumentality, and valence are given probability values. Because the model is multiplicative, all three variables must have high positive values to imply motivated performance choices. If any of the variables approaches zero, the probability of motivated performance also approaches zero. When all three values are high, motivation to perform is also high. Vroom’s (1982) expectancy theory suggests that both situational and personality variables produce job satisfaction.

**Adams’ Equity Theory:** The primary research on equity theory was done by Adams (1963). Equity theory proposes that workers compare their own outcome/input ratio (the ratio of the outcomes they receive from their jobs and from the organization to the inputs they contribute) to the outcome/input ratio of another person. Adams called this other person “referent.” The referent is simply another worker or group of workers perceived to be similar to oneself. Unequal ratios create job dissatisfaction and motivate the worker to restore equity.
When ratios are equal, workers experience job satisfaction and are motivated to maintain their current ratio of outcomes and inputs or raise their inputs if they want their outcomes to increase.

Outcomes include pay, fringe benefits, status, opportunities for advancement, job security, and anything else that workers desire and receive from an organization. Inputs include special skills, training, education, work experience, effort on the job, time, and anything else that workers perceive that they contribute to an organization.

Framework Three: Situational Models

Situational theorists assume that the interaction of variables such as task characteristics, organizational characteristics, and individual characteristics influences job satisfaction (Hoy & Miskel, 1996). Examples of models are the situational occurrences theory of job satisfaction (Quarstein, McAfee, & Glassman, 1992) and Glisson and Durick’s (1988) predictors of job satisfaction.

Situational Occurrences Theory; The situational occurrences theory of job satisfaction was proposed by Quarstein, McAfee, and Glassman (1992). The two main components of the theory are situational characteristics and situational occurrences. Examples of situational characteristics are pay, promotional opportunities, working conditions, company policies, and supervision. Individuals tend to evaluate situational characteristics before they accept a job. Situational occurrences tend to be evaluated after accepting a job. Situational occurrences can be positive or negative. Positive occurrences include, for example, giving employees some time off because of exceptional work or placing a microwave in the workplace. Negative occurrences include, for example, confusing email messages, rude remarks from coworkers, and copiers which seem to break down a great deal. Quarstein et al. (1992) hypothesized that overall job satisfaction is a function of a combination of situational characteristics and situational occurrences. The findings of their study supported the hypothesis. According to the researchers, a combination of situational characteristics and situational occurrences can be a stronger predictor of overall job satisfaction than each factor by itself.

Predictors of Job Satisfaction; Glisson and Durick (1988) examined simultaneously the ability of multiple variables from three categories (worker, job, and organizational characteristics) to predict both job satisfaction and organizational commitment. They proposed that job tasks would be excellent predictors of job satisfaction, characteristics of workers poor predictors, and characteristics of the organization moderate predictors. Their findings supported the traditional emphasis on job characteristics as determinants of job satisfaction, and to a lesser extent, the more recent examinations of organizational determinants.

RESEARCH HYPOTHESIS

1. There is a significant difference between amount of managers job satisfaction, faculty members, and employees.
2. There is a significant difference between amount of managers organizational commitment, faculty members, and employees.
3. There is a significant difference between amount of organizational commitment and job satisfaction.
4. There is a significant correlation between amount of organizational commitment and job satisfaction of faculty members.
5. There is a significant correlation between amount of organizational commitment and job satisfaction of managers.

6. There is a significant correlation between amount of organizational commitment and job satisfaction of employees.

6-1- There is a significant correlation between amount of organizational commitment (under affective scale) and job satisfaction of employees.

6-2- There is a significant correlation between amount of organizational commitment (under continuance scale) and employees job satisfaction.

6-3- There is a significant correlation between amount of organizational commitment (under normative scale) and employees job satisfaction.

**METHODOLOGY**

This study is descriptive and correlation. For collection and analyzing data is using the survey Research, scientific inference, by exact compare different particulars this study to ward It's objective is Applied Research.

**Tools of Research**

Data collection was done using the distributed questionnaires, that Meyer & Allen's questionnaires include 3 aspect (affective, continuance and normative) to measurement organizational commitment and measurement job satisfaction used (MSQ) Questionnaire.

1- **Meyer & Allen's Organizational commitment Questionnaire**

Meyer & Allen Questionnaires includes 24 question and 5 point that numbering on likert scale. The mark of each test is vacillation on 1 to 5.

Based on cronbach's alpha; the reliability and Reliability of this test were calculated and confirmed In Iran by Jafarzadeh (1384) as organizational commitment 84%, normative commitment 73 %, and affective commitment 70 %.

Meyer & Allen Report that validity of this scale are as affective commitment 87 % continuance commitment scale 75 % and normative commitment scale 79 %.

Analysis factor also showed that these there factor in ordering 58/8%, 4/8 %, 15/25 % combined total variance.

2- **Job satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) by Davis & et al**

Psychology professor of federal university with Veiling Green in Ohayo Evaluated This Questionnaire and rendered that this Questionnaire have high internal consistency. According to Malekzadeh study (1380), Reliability coefficient is 7 % and Salehi (1386) evaluation showed that reliability coefficient is 85 %.

**Ecology Population Questionnaire**

This Questionnaire comprises information as record service, sexuality. Education, service area, the statistical Population of this study were all of the employees as (managers, employees and faculty member) student area, education and research, administrate and financial in Azad.

University of Kohkiluyeh and Boyer Ahmad prefecture (Yasuj – Dehdasht – Gajsaran).
All of these three university unit were 642 people. Using stratified sampling method 223 people (23 manager, 105 employees, and 95 faculty member) were selected randomly.

**Implementation method**

First defined of testing ration in all three unit (yasuj – Dehdasht – Gajsaran) next classified all statistical Population in 3 level (managers , employees and faculty member ) in these step used stratified sampling method. Asked from all samples to answer the three Questionnaires exactly.

**DATA ANALYSIS METHOD**

Pearson's correlation coefficient used to finding relationship and intensity between organizational commitment and employee job satisfaction and organizational commitment's components among the managers , faculty member and employee.

Variance analysis used to study difference between amount of organizational commitment and sample job satisfaction.

**Results of testing Research hypothesis**

**H1**, There is a significant difference between amount of manager job satisfaction, faculty members and employees

To testing these hypothesis used Variance analysis (ANOVA) to study difference between amount of manager job satisfaction, faculty members and employees.

Table1 compares managers, faculty members and employees according amount job satisfaction. Difference between groups is significant (p<%1)

Thus there is difference between amount of job satisfaction groups and used least significant difference (LSD) test. Result showed that difference between faculty member's whit employees is significant. But difference between faculty members and employees with managers is not significant. Thus amount of faculty member's job satisfaction is more than the amount of managers and employee satisfaction is near together.

Also the amount of managers and faculty member's job satisfaction are near together.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>LSD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>80/18</td>
<td>11/090</td>
<td>6/628</td>
<td>2.210</td>
<td>0/002</td>
<td>1&gt;3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>managers</td>
<td>77/14</td>
<td>10/631</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>74/31</td>
<td>11/367</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**H2**, There is a significant difference between amount of manager's organizational commitment faculty members and employees.
To test hyp2 and to study difference manager and employees used Variance analysis (ANOVA).

Result showed in table 2, this table compares managers, faculty members and employees according to amount organizational commitment.

This table showed that there is no significant difference between (p>5%). Otherwise the amount of manager's organizational commitment, faculty members and employees era nearly same.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>LSD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>78/33</td>
<td>7/377</td>
<td>1/278</td>
<td>2.210</td>
<td>0/281</td>
<td>1&gt;3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>managers</td>
<td>81/00</td>
<td>7/443</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>78/02</td>
<td>8/279</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**H3, There is a significant correlation difference between amount of organizational commitment and employee's job satisfaction.**

Table3, shown organizational commitment's correlation and that's subsets with employees job satisfaction.

To study relationship used Pearson correlation test.

These table shown a satisfaction correlation (p<%5) between employees job satisfaction with affective and normative commitment and total score of organizational commitment

When organizational commitment (affective and normative commitment) increase those job satisfaction increase too. And when organizational commitment (affective and normative commitment) decrease employee job satisfaction decrease too.

And also correlation between organizational commitment (continuance) and employee job satisfaction is not satisfaction (p<%5).

It is means that increase or decrease of employee has no effect on there.
**H4**, There is a significant correlation difference between amount of organizational commitment and Faculty Member's job satisfaction.

Table 4, shown organizational commitment's correlation and that's subsets with Faculty Member's job satisfaction.

To study relationship used Pearson correlation test.

These table shown a satisfaction correlation (p<%5) between Faculty Member's job satisfaction with affective and normative commitment and total score of organizational commitment.

When organizational commitment (affective and normative commitment) increase those job satisfaction increase too. And when organizational commitment (affective and normative commitment) decrease Faculty Member's job satisfaction decrease too.

And also correlation between organizational commitment (continuance) and Faculty Member's job satisfaction is not satisfaction (p<%5).

It is means that increase or decrease of Faculty Member's has no effect on there.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0/699(**)</td>
<td>0/655(**)</td>
<td>0/670(**)</td>
<td>Total organizational commitment</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0/168</td>
<td>0/018</td>
<td>0/205(*)</td>
<td>Total job satisfaction</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0/228(*)</td>
<td>Subscale of organizational commitment (affective)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0/314(**)</td>
<td>Organizational commitment subscale (continued)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**H5**, There is a significant correlation difference between amount of organizational commitment and manager's job satisfaction.

Table 5, shown organizational commitment's correlation and that's subsets with manager's job satisfaction.

To study relationship used Pearson correlation test.

These table shown a satisfaction correlation (p<%5) between manager's job satisfaction with affective and normative commitment and total score of organizational commitment.

When organizational commitment (affective and normative commitment) increase those job satisfaction increase too. And when organizational commitment (affective and normative commitment) decrease manager's job satisfaction decrease too.

And also correlation between organizational commitment (continuance) and manager's job satisfaction is not satisfaction (p<%5).
It is means that increase or decrease of managers has no effect on there.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Total organizational commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0/699(**)</td>
<td>0/541(*)</td>
<td>0/647(**)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0/245</td>
<td>0/340</td>
<td>0/046</td>
<td>-0/015</td>
<td>Total job satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Subscale of organizational commitment (affective)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0/156</td>
<td>Subscale of organizational commitment (normative)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0/124</td>
<td>0/306</td>
<td>Organizational commitment subscale (continued)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**H6.** There is a significant correlation between amount of organizational commitment and employee's job satisfaction.

Table 6 shows the correlation coefficient between job satisfaction and organizational commitment 24 %. And is significant (p<%01). Employee have more commitment are more satisfaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>variables</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>p-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>job satisfaction and organizational commitment</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0/001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONCLUSION**

To test hypothesis 1 for study difference between managers job satisfaction, faculty member, and employee used for variance analysis (ANOVA).

Result of this study showed that the difference between job groups is significant (p<%1)

Least significant difference (LSD) test showed that the difference between faculty members with employee is significant, but difference between faculty and also employee with managers is not significant. The result of this study is same with the finding of Hack Man 1975. This study showed factor as skills, type of labor, amount of salary have effect in employee job satisfaction. This study indicates that the amount of faculty member's satisfaction is more than the amount of employee. And also amount of job satisfaction of managers faculty members are same. it is seemed that one of these factors (authority, Revenue, facilities)have effect on satisfaction of faculty members and managers. to test hypothesis 2 for study difference between amount of managers organizational commitment, faculty member and employee used variance analysis. result of variance analysis (ANOVA) showed that difference between all groups is not significant(p>%5).factors as type of job cannot direct organizational commitment, faculty member and employees are nearly same .to test hypothesis 3,4,5, used Pearson correlation test the relationship between organizational commitment and its remoteness with managers, faculty members and employees job satisfaction.

Result of testing hypothesis 3 showed that correlation between employees job satisfaction with effective, normative organization, commitment is significant. (p<%5) with increasing and decreasing organizational commitment of employee their job satisfaction increase and decrease too. Also correlation between organizational commitment and job satisfaction is not
significant (p<.05) increase and decrease employees organizational commitment (continued) have no effect on employees job satisfaction. To test hypothesis 4, the correlation between faculty members job satisfaction with normative commitment is significant (p<.05) the result showed that when organizational commitment of faculty members increase, their job satisfaction increase too and vice versa. And correlation between organizational commitment with faculty members job satisfaction is not significant (p<.05). According hypothesis 5 organizational commitments correlation is not significant in managers job satisfaction (p<.05) result of hypothesis 6 specified that between organizational commitment and employee job satisfaction is significant (p<.001). Employees with more organizational commitment are more satisfaction and also correlation coefficient of this two variable is 24%. The finding of this study is same with finding of Batman, Starter, 1998, Moody, Porter 1982, Vang 2002.

The result of this study showed that the relationship between employee job satisfaction and employees organizational commitment is direct and significant.
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