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Abstract

The purpose of the study was to examine the relationship of job satisfaction and turnover intention in predicting organizational commitment, both overall and dimensional perspectives. The study population was 1113 (only technical personnel) and participants were taken 260 (m=178, f=82) full time employees selected by stratified random sampling from four locations. The study utilized adapted forms of GJSQ, TIQ and OCQ in order to measure job satisfaction, turnover intention, and organizational commitment respectively. The result of the study showed gender difference in general commitment and normative commitment dimensions. The correlation result indicated that job satisfaction and organizational commitment have inverse relationship with turnover intention. Furthermore, selected socio-demographic, job satisfaction and turnover intention variables in explaining the criterion variable (organizational commitment), showed an explanation power of 24.3%. 24.3% of the variance in organizational commitment was due to the variables included in the model. However, when the independent contribution of each variable in the study was examined, only job satisfaction and gender contributed significantly to the variability of organizational commitment and the MANOVA analysis indicate that job satisfaction affect significantly to the components of commitments (Affective, continuance and normative).
Chapter One

1. Introduction

This chapter will provide the introduction of this research project, which consist of several sections. The first section will share the background and view of the research scheme. Purpose of study, research questions, research objectives and the significance of this research are presented in the following sections.

1.1 Background of the Study

In this dynamic world organizations face multiple challenges and opportunities. For that matter numerous researches were conducted to maximize the efficiency of organizations working on different sectors but the focus of earlier time researches were on non-human variables (Schermernhorn, Hunt and Osborn, 2002). Many of the traditional researches done according to classical management perspective are misguided in defining what organization is and due to this the answer to the problems of the organizations faced is believed to be either mechanistic or non-human issues. Industries were worried about how to increase productivity and they tried to solve this problem by giving due emphasis to hours of working, structure of the organization, illumination etc. Most attention was initially on physical working conditions, principles of administration, and industrial engineering principles. By the 1940s the focus had broadened to include the essential human factor. An organization is not a blend of chairs, structure or something that non-human things mobilize. At center of any organization human beings play a leading role for the success and failure of an organization (Schermernhorn, et al., 2002).

Among the many variables organizational commitment can be mentioned. Despite hiring employees needed for executing the organization tasks, organizations want committed employees who are eagerly strive for the successes of their company. Organizational commitment is the psychological attachment an employee experiences towards the organization and its goals (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990). Organizational commitment has been conceptualized and measured in a variety of different ways including but not exclusive to: attitudinal commitment, calculated commitment, and normative commitment (Cooper-Hakim & Viswesvaran, 2005; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990). The commonly used operational definition of organizational commitment is in terms of identification and involvement with a
particular organization (Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982). More simply put it is the general attitude or belief towards the organization as a whole. Similarly, Organizational commitment (OC) is a psychological state that binds an employee to an organization, and the three-Component Model of organizational commitment (Meyer & Allen, 1996) posits that employees bind with their organizations as a result of desire (affective commitment), need (continuance commitment) and obligation (normative commitment). It is an important postulation of the research that job satisfaction and organizational commitment are dissimilar variables even though a common sense outlook would suggest that they are ‘close companions’. They have a separate lineage with job satisfaction coming from motivational research based on psychological needs and information processing, whilst organizational commitment developed later out of new perceptions of organizational functioning which brought about a new prominence on keeping core workers. The study of organizational commitment has improved the study of job satisfaction by introducing a variable with external validity, the intention to leave or stay. Both empirical traditions have, thus, come to share it and both have adopted the measure. Whether organizational commitment is a variable overriding between job satisfaction and the intention to leave or stay, or an independent variable in its own right, is the subject of empirical dispute (Graham, 1978).

Having this paradox in mind this study studied organizational commitment as a dependent variable as it is related to long term organizational goals and represent as whole of organization (McMahon, 2007).

Hrebiniak and Alutto (1972), based on transactional costs and side-bets, formulate connections with job satisfaction by alluding to the idea of satisfaction as a gain. The empirical evidence is conflicting and questionable. For the most part, the empirical studies have attempted to link job satisfaction and organizational commitment through performance variables and through work values. Meyer et al. (1997) found that emotional attachment correlated with work performance variables, but that job satisfaction scores did not. Steers (1977) found that performance was not related to commitment. Commitment was more related to work values than to extrinsic rewards and was, therefore, an influence on the level of performance.

When turnover is used as the performance variable, the empirical evidence is more emphatic, but similarly inconclusive. The idea that turnover would be an indicator of
commitment and satisfaction is based on the assumption that both concepts are determinants of the intention to attend and remain in one company. Later research suggested that organizational commitment mediates the influence of satisfaction on labor turnover. This places satisfaction as a determinant of commitment. Job satisfaction is a predictor of labor turnover is confirmed by Taylor and Weiss (1972), but this does not help resolve the problem of causal ordering. Ben-Bakr et al. (1994) found that organizational commitment was a better predictor of labor turnover than job satisfaction although both variables were significant predictors. The notion that both variables might work together as predictors of turnover was examined by Farkus and Tetrick (1989) who concluded, from a longitudinal study, that causal ordering was a reciprocal process in which the two variables exchanged primacy in sequence over time. Hence this validates to use the concept of organizational commitment as criterion variable with job satisfaction and turnover intention.

Thus, the current organizational studies devoted time and resources to the above mentioned three variables namely job satisfaction, turnover intention and organizational commitment. Among the many of human related issues, this study largely deals with job satisfaction, turnover intention in relation with employees’ organizational commitment. Moreover these variables are studied by considering the business of the i.e. in Ethio-Telecom -formation technology as it is indicated in the flowing model of the problem at hand.

Figure1:-Interaction between Dependent and Independent Variables

Model one: A model which depicts the interaction and problem connectedness and independent shares.
1.2. Statement of the Problem

Specific employee attitudes relating to job satisfaction, turnover intention and organizational commitment are major interest to the field of organizational behavior and the practice of human resources management (Tella, Ayine, and Popoola, 2007). Commitment is a multidimensional construct and that the antecedents, correlates, and consequences of commitment vary across dimensions. And it is a process that is inculcated upon each employee. An effective organization will make sure that there is a spirit of cooperation and sense of commitment and satisfaction within the sphere of its influence (Tella, et al., 2007). In this regard many complains coming from the Public to Ethio-Telecom due to some employees are not cooperative enough to respond to the demands of the customers and they lack sense of commitment and responsibility towards their job.

As it mentioned earlier several variables contribute to the development of committed employees. Organizations are worrying about as to how to pound their values and how to produce committed employees. Hence, Ethio-Telecomeis obliged to look at itself and adjust the overall working environment. On the other hand employees require different benefit packages to be given in order to provide their skill. Turnover Intention becomes a major obstacle towards the organization as it might impact the productivity and long-term plan of the organization (Abrahman, 2012). In this case there evidences of much rate of switchovers in technical employees of Ethio-telecom employees due to several reasons. One can be mentioned as a significant factor i.e. the existence of high job alternatives with attractive salamis. In similar fusion job satisfaction will have an adverse or beneficial effect on employees’ commitment to the organization. Information Technology Agencies such as Ethio-telecom face high competition from external environment (Rahman, 2012). Studies indicate that turnover intention and job satisfaction have got negative relation (Cho and Son, 2012). Thus, understanding how such variables affect employees commitment is crucial to study in Ethio-Telecom. This study will thoroughly expounds about how the two variables (job satisfaction and turnover intention) affect organizational commitment hierarchically. In trying to assess these relationships, the following research questions will be addressed:

1. Is there a significant Gender difference in job satisfaction, turnover intention and organizational commitment?
2. Is there a significant relationship among job satisfaction, selected socio-demographic variables, turnover intention and organizational commitment (affective, continuance and normative)?

3. What are the joint and separate/independent contributions of job satisfaction, socio-demographic variables and turnover intention to the variability of organizational commitment?

4. What are the joint and separate effects of independent variables, job satisfaction, and turnover intention on the components of organizational commitment (Affective, continuance, and Normative).

1.3. Objective of the Study
The main objective of this is to assess the linear interaction of job satisfaction, turnover intention, and organizational commitment by taking job satisfaction and turnover intention as an independent variable the relation, prediction and effect on organizational commitment and its components are going to be assessed.

1.4. Delimitation of the Study
Even despite the fact that, organizational commitment is affected by different contingent and behavioral factors, this study is delimited to assess only the role of turnover intention and job satisfaction. Moreover, the part of job satisfaction and turnover intention might differ across jobs and industry groups. This is to mean that, different job position require poles apart qualities. Therefore, this study is limited to two occupational groups (information system and Networking). In terms of study area, in four locations (head office, Legihar, Microwave and Arada branches).

1.5. Significance of the Study
The outcomes of the study will be useful to employees, managers and the organization as an entity information technology area and related spectrum. For employees, this study will be a significant endeavor in increasing their awareness of self and organizational behavior. They understand the value of many variables important for their work behavior and consider things from the point of view of themselves and others.
The study not only serves employees but has many functions for managers as well. First, effectively understanding and managing turnover and job satisfaction facets variables and their impact on organizations. Second, it will serve to guide working policies and procedures more efficient since it will prove an understanding of employees need and how to boost work performance and more over human resource management practices. With this understanding of the benefit of this study to employees and managers as an input to the organization, the study also has many values to the organization as whole. First, the result of the study will enable Ethio-telecome to know turnover intention and job satisfaction levels that predicted employees’ organizational commitment across the already mentioned occupational tasks in information technology business. In addition, the study will provide understanding of the general trend of the organization and will alert managers to take swift action to the concerns of employees.

1.6. Limitations of the Study

This study as most other scientific studies, is not lacking some shortcomings. Below listed are the limitations of the present study.

First, samples of the study were more or less belonging to relatively similar on the socio-demographic variables (Educational background, experience and marital status). For example, most of the participants were with similar educational background and mostly single. For that reason, results of alternative studies with representative samples from different setting may show different results in some ways, from the present study. Second, related to the first limitation, the industry that Ethio-Telecom engaged (i.e. information security) is unique as companies work behavior and requirement. Therefore, the most obvious limitation would relate to the ability to draw inferential conclusions from sample data obtained from Ethio to other organizational context, other jobs and occupational groups.

Third, the present results are based primarily on self-report job satisfaction, turnover intention and organizational commitment data. This might have affected the result of the study through measurement error because people might have been responded dishonestly and people might lack accurate self-concept.
Fourth the study used the general version of job satisfaction measure (GJSQ) so this might have affected the study since it doesn’t go deep into every facet of job satisfaction dimensions that treat job satisfaction level up to the grass root level.

1.7. Operational Definitions

**Job satisfaction**: Having this concept as benchmark the study utilize job satisfaction as a general attitude towards once job such as satisfaction about promotion, whether the job is pleasing, the chances that are given, etc that indicate employees job satisfaction are the defining factors. (Appendix A).

**Turnover intention**: Behaviorally looking for a job, talking about leaving and even thinking about quitting are major indicators. (Appendix B).

**Organizational commitment**: The multidimensional states were (1) affective (the feeling towards the tasks or the emotions or feelings towards a given organization), (2) continuance (missing our friends if we leave), and (3) normative organizational commitment (the obligation that we have for the company such as years of services expected from us), as measured by the total subscale scores on the Affective, Continuance and Normative Commitment Scales (Appendix C).
Chapter Two

2. Review of Related Literature

An Overview

In this section literatures with respect to aim of the study thoroughly expounded. The first variables, job satisfaction, turnover intention and organizational commitment are going to be dealt starting from the conceptual framework up to local studies with their expressive dimensions are elaborated in detail. Several researches are going to be discussed in relation to the intended purpose will be expounded very briefly.

2.1. Job Satisfaction:

2.1.1 Definition of job satisfaction

Job satisfaction has been defined in a variety of different ways. A general definition of job satisfaction is how much one is fond of one’s job (Spector, 1997). Job satisfaction has been defined as an appraisal of one’s job (i.e. a cognitive variable), an affective reaction to one’s job, or an attitude towards one’s job (Spector 1997; Brief, 1998; Weiss & Brief, 2001; Weiss, 2002). Weiss (2002) has argued that job satisfaction is an attitude, and research should distinguish the objects of cognitive evaluation such as emotions, beliefs, and behaviors. He argues that previous measures of job satisfaction confound job cognitions with job satisfaction, the former being cognitive evaluations and the latter being affective. Job satisfaction can also be discussed in global or facet aspects (Spector, 1997). Global job satisfaction refers to the overall feeling towards the particular job. Global job satisfaction is a predictor of organizational citizenship behaviors.

2.1.2 Conceptual and theoretical Framework

One of the major tasks organizational psychologists perform is assessing employee job satisfaction so that organizations can take steps to improve it. Organizational researchers have extensively studied the causes and consequences of job satisfaction since the beginning
of organizational psychology (Graham, 1978 and Leonard and Strauss, 1966, and Hanlin, 1982). It is undoubtedly the most studied variable in organizational psychology. Job satisfaction has been posited as a cause of important employee organizational outcomes ranging from job performance to health and longevity (Spector, 2000). Job satisfaction is the affective orientation that an employee has towards their work. What makes a job satisfying or unsatisfying does not depend only on the nature of the job, but also on the expectations that individuals have of what their job should provide. Satisfied employees tend to be more productive, creative, and committed to their employers (Sarah, 2013).

**Theories of job satisfaction**

Loche’s (1976) range of Affect theory as cited by Sarah (2013), suggested that the difference between what we want and what we actually get in the job determines our satisfaction level. It is heavily reliant on how expectations are met and our level of autonomy (and whether we even want autonomy).
Herzberg’s two factor Theory

Two stage approaches to understanding staff satisfaction was the result of surveying people’s reasons for feeling negative and / or positive at work.

Figure 2: The motivating and De-motivating Factors of Job satisfaction

**Motivators**
- varied work
- sense of achievement
- recognition

**De-motivators**
- poor pay
- company policy
- continual pressure

Figure 2: The motivating and De-motivating Factors of Job satisfaction
Hackman and oldham’s job characteristics Model

This model describes 5 core job dimensions that result in 3 critical psychological states which in turn influence outcomes of job satisfaction.

**Job Characteristics**
- Dealing with Others
- Work Significance - Self
- Feedback from Agents (Coworkers & Supervisors)
- Emotional Labor

**Critical Psychological States**
- Emotional Dissonance

**Categories of Moderators**
- Identity as a Worker
- Skill Match
- Facet Satisfactions
- Needs Satisfaction
- Specific Issues for Workers in Vocational Programming

**Individual & Outcomes**
- Commitment to Supervisor
- Empowerment
- Career Maturity, Job & Worker
- Perceived Improvement – Health & Mental Health
- Job Strain

**Figure 3:** The Job Characteristics Model
Dispositional theory

This theory suggests that our level of satisfaction is ‘part of us’ and has very little to do with the job that we do. Those of us with lower levels of neuroticism and self-concept report higher levels of job satisfaction (Sarah, 2013).

Field’s job satisfaction model

Field’s model describes ‘push’ factors that makes staff dissatisfied and ‘pull’ factors that conversely make staff more satisfied. Given that main reason staff leave an organization is due to their level of satisfaction, this model can hold a great deal of personal and organizational significance. This model is more suitable to the current problem in that it sees commitment in wide was and the problem addressed are very much related.

Figure 4: Field’s Job Satisfaction Model
2.1.3 The nature of job satisfaction

Here the researcher treated how it is measured, its potential causes, and possible consequences are being discussed. Job satisfaction is an attitudinal variable that reflects how people feel about their jobs overall as well as various aspects of them. In simple expression, job satisfaction is the extent to which people like their jobs; job dissatisfaction is the extent to which they dislike them (Spector, 2000). There have been two approaches to the study of job satisfaction—the global approach and the facet approach. The global approach treats jobs as a single overall feeling toward the job. Many studies assess people's overall satisfaction, and many of the issues discussed in this research reflect this globally. The alternative approach is to focus on job facets or different aspects of the job such as rewards (pay or fringe benefits), other people on the job (supervisors or co-workers), job conditions and the nature of the work itself (Bruce and Blackburn, 1992).

Although common sense might lead us to expect that a worker who found his job satisfying would produce more than one who was not satisfied, investigations have shown that it is possible for any degree of job satisfaction to be associated with any degree of productivity, that is, a satisfied worker may have low productivity or vice versa (Graham, 1978).

2.1.4 The importance of job satisfaction

Human beings require high levels of egoistic and self-actualizing need satisfaction from their jobs. The process of growing up involves accepting more and more challenge and autonomy and belonging more independent (Leonard and Strauss, 1966 as cited in Jonathan, Darroux and Thibeli, 2011). Those who don’t have those opportunities (in particular those who are unable to express themselves meaningfully through work) never reach psychological maternity. Since the average man spends nearly a third of job doesn’t provide challenge and autonomy he may suffer real frustration, with results that are costly both to himself and his employer. Thus, in fact many individuals’ have boring, meaning less jobs may lead to sever job dissatisfaction. Companies that do satisfy employees’ desires for good managerial relations, respect, fair and adequate compensation and opportunities for growth and development through training, are reaping benefits (Bruce and Blackburn,
Moreover, the notion that satisfied employees make a difference was spurred by what has been called the “Third IR,” which began with the Hawthorne studies of the 1930s calling for a humanization of workplace. Designing “enriched” jobs that created employee satisfaction, as opposed to providing only a display for a day’s work, become one part of the workplace humanization movement. This movement is based on the premise that “the work force assures long term productivity if it is well cared for”. This movement presupposes the desirability of having satisfied employees (Hanlin, 1982).

2.2 Turnover intention

2.2.1 Definition

Employee turnover has been defined as a permanent movement of the employee beyond the boundary of the organization. Interest in the topic has gained momentum in the recent past among organizational psychologists, economists, and sociologists with different perspectives being adopted to study the phenomenon (Hart & Griffeth, 1995). While the above by large focuses on the behavioral expression of turnover, on the other hand, components of withdrawal cognitions include an employee’s thoughts of quitting, intention to search for other employment, and intention to quit the current organization (Dalessio, Silverman, & Shuck, 1986 as cited by Sean D. Robinson, 2011). Thus, Turnover intention is defined as an employee’s voluntary intent to find a new job with another employer within the next year. Generally, it is accepted that job satisfaction and employee turnover intention are inversely related (Medina, 2012).

2.2.2 Conceptual framework

An employee needs to be handled very critically and skillfully. Thus, organizations should understand their employees and take care of them in ways that are productive for the organization and beneficial to employee’s values. Excessive turnover can provide a very reliable (but not perfect) indication that something is dreadfully wrong in a company (Malone, and Petersen, 1979). This implies that the issue either being ignored or treat as insignificant to consider it as a problem. One reason for this is many firms and their management does not realize the extent of their turnover problem. Obviously, if a manager has no idea that a problem exists, he cannot do anything to remedy it. On the other hand,
organizational managers have got mistaken perception that if one employee leaves, it will be replaced with other new entry. But as Malonand and Peteresen (1979) described it, they will replace it with a less experienced person, which may bring about a corresponding loss of efficiency. This will increase the costs of recruitment and selection, job training, increases accidents, inspection, selection, job training and unemployment. There is a question that we need to ask here "How turnover costs a company? Turnover costs vary widely. Some of the major components of turnover costs involve recruitment, selection ad hiring. Of course, it costs more to recruit a professional or technical candidate than unskilled blue collar workers (Robinson, 2011). Furthermore; most organizations viewed the presence of a long serving group of employees as an indication of internal efficiency. However, with economic liberalization opening up new career horizons for professionals in most industries, and thereby tremendously enhancing their prospects for mobility from one organization to another, turnover has come to be understood as a negative ‘spill over’ effect of industrial growth. This phenomenon commonly called turnover had been of secondary interest to most researchers but increasingly more and more attention is beginning to pour in this direction. Some employees do not go through the complex decision making process and quit impulsively. It is recognized that other factors not included in the model, such as occupational demand, work orientation, and family situations, may also cause an employee to quit without securing an alternative job (Robinson, 2011).

2.2.3. Extrinsic and Intrinsic causes of turnover intention

Any simple explanation of various causes of turnover would be inadequate. Causes may be broken up into two categories, "extrinsic and intrinsic". The extrinsic factors deal with situations outside of the individual and are not necessarily job related; whereas, the intrinsic factors are those feeling and attitudes employees which are job related (Medina, 2012). The major extrinsic cause of turnover has traditionally been low wages (of course what constitute "low" is relative). Age and Sex have also been related to turnover. Younger employees and women employees will usually have high turn rates than older employees and male employees (Mallon and Petersen, 1979, Fink, 1992 and Hanlin, 1982). The intrinsic factors are not as important as the extrinsic or psychological factors affecting worker’s perception of job and management. The firs factors are responsibility. Some managers seemed to be ordinary busy; the phone was constantly ringing and his
subordinates were dashing up him for his approval on various pieces of work. Hence, in this case, the subordinates’ need of responsibility was not being satisfied. The other factor is recognition, was it could be a positive force for reducing turnover, or wrongly used, it can be a negative one for increasing them. A good manager always recognizes the accomplishments of his subordinates. Recognizing who? If misused and use it for wrong employees (poor performer), the company will face losing several key people (Medina, 2012; Susan, Mark, Melissa, Michael, 2007).

Final factor for turnover is advancement; in this regard employee likes to know the avenues available for promotion. That is why some companies leaned towards a policy of promotion from within. A wise manager learn understand aspiration of his subordinates and tries give them as much as responsibility as possible in order to develop their potential. A survey made indicated that most employees leave their organization because of lack of opportunity for growth and advancement (Taylor, 1975). Once the causes for turnover determined, the next step is to eliminate them as nearly as possible, this, of course is the difficult part of the process. This requires understanding the physical, security, status and social needs of employees (Hom&Griffeth, 1995).

2.2.4. Measuring Turnover

The commonly used formula to calculate a crude turnover rate for any given period is described as shown below by the United Kingdom based Chartered Institute of Personnel & Development (CIPD), 2007 report.

$$\frac{\text{Total number of leavers over a period}}{\text{Average number of staffs employed over a period}} \times 100$$

However, Loquercio, Hammersley and Emmens(2006) suggest that number of leavers should encompasses all leavers, including people who left due to dismissal, or retirement, but it typically excludes those leaving at the end of fixed contract. The main purpose of excluding fixed term employees from the calculation is that it does not indicate the real problem of the organization.
2.2.5. Factors Affecting Turnover

Employees move from one organization to the other and from one industry to the other for different reasons. Sometimes it is the attraction of a new job or the prospect of a period outside the workforce which 'pulls' them like higher salary or better benefits; on other occasions they are 'pushed' due to dissatisfaction in their present jobs to seek alternative employment. Sometimes it is mixtures of both pull and push factors (Schermerhorn, Hunt and Osborn, 2002).

According to the recent research conducted by CIPD in 2007 in UK, push factors play a major role in most resignations than pull factors. CIPD also emphasized that it is relatively rare for people to leave jobs in which they are happy, even when offered higher pay somewhere else.

In general, employees leave on their own stand or they are discharged. Each disjointing of an employee from an organization whether intentional or involuntary is serious problem for the organization. Despite the fact that some degree of staff turnover is tolerable, it affects the well-functioning of an organization if they have surplus turnover. Therefore, human resource management is one of the most important functions that should be carried out with care and consciously in order to motivate staffs for better productivity and serve the organization for long time. The cause of staff turnover should be studied by management carefully. From the control point of view the staff turnover may either be avoidable or unavoidable. They also further elaborated that unavoidable causes are not fault of management but due to other factors which are not under organizations control like employees personal betterment, domestic affairs such as marriage and pregnancy, illness, retirement, death, etc. and avoidable causes are like employees dissatisfaction with job, low remuneration, long hour of work and poor working conditions, bad relation with supervisors and fellow workers and redundancy of activities (Medina, 2012).

2.2.6 Types of Turnover

Though there are many causes for staff turnover in an organization, all of them have not negative impact on the well-functioning of an organization. Organizations should differentiate between voluntary and involuntary turnovers and take actions on the one that they have control. Voluntary turnovers are those caused by the interest of the employee (e.g.
to take job in other organization for better salary) while involuntary turnovers are the decision of management to quit employees from work (e.g. dismissal for gross misconduct). In general, all resignations not formally initiated by employers are voluntary resignations. Voluntary turnovers are further distinguished between functional and dysfunctional turnovers (Schermerhorn, et.al, 2002).

Functional turnovers are the resignation of substandard performers and dysfunctional turnovers are refers to the exit of effective performers. They also classified dysfunctional turnover, which is the most concern of management due to its negative impact on the organization’s general performance, into avoidable turnover (caused by lower compensation, poor working condition, etc) and unavoidable turnovers (like family moves, serious illness, death, etc) over which the organization has little or no influence. Therefore, management should give special attention to avoidable turnover (Loquercio, et al, 2007).

The following chart adapted from Loquercio et al (2007) gives a clear picture of staff turnover ladder.

![Turnover Chart](image)

**Figure 5 Types of Turnover**

2.7. Voluntary Turnover Decision Process

It is believed by literatures that employees make decision for resignation after making some analysis and there is a very wide variety of possible explanations for their voluntary resignations. People become dissatisfied with their jobs for a range of reasons; as explained by Stephen, employees may become bored with the content of job, frustrated by lack of promotion, fed up with their supervisors or irritated by changes in their working environment. In some cases the job may simply fall short of their expectations at the time of appointment. However, Stephen also suggests that, such phenomena are only half the story in most cases, for a resignation to occur the individual concerned must first perceive that there are better opportunities elsewhere and then secure another position (Schermerhorn, 2002).

The following ten steps are the decision process for the voluntary turnover.

a. Evaluate existing job,
b. Experience job dissatisfaction,
c. Think of quitting,
d. Evaluate expected utility of search for a new job and the cost of quitting,
e. Decide to search for alternatives,
f. Search for alternatives,
g. Evaluate alternatives
h. Compare best alternative with present job
i. Decide whether to stay or quit
j. Quit

It is therefore important, when assessing the reasons for turnover and devising remedial plans, to take account not just of employee dissatisfaction, but also of the possible alternatives open to employees, as well as the relative ease with which any such opportunities can be taken up(CIPD,2007).
2.2.8. Effects of Turnover

There is some argument in the literature about how far employers should be concerned about turnover levels. Some writers have emphasized the potentially positive effects of a continuous transfusion of fresh blood into the organization. As cited by Stephen Taylor, Careell et al (1975), distinguish between functional and dysfunctional turnover, and suggest that the former serves to promote innovative ideas and methods and can renew a stagnating organization, while Hom and Girffeth (1995) also draw attention to research that has shown functional turnover to be commoner than the dysfunctional form. The net result is an improvement in productivity as poorer employees quit, leaving a higher proportion of good performers to enhance organizational effectiveness. They also note that high turnover gives employers more opportunity to promote and develop valued staffs and reduces the need to make costly redundancy when there is a downturn in business.

2.3 Organizational commitment

2.3.1. Definition

A webster dictionary defines commitment as “the state or an instance of being obligated or emotionally implied”. By that definition, commitment is defined as a multi-dimensional concept. Being “obligated” and being “emotionally impelled” are two different reasons for remaining in an interpersonal relationship. However, most interpersonal relationships probably involve both of those dimensions. Humans spend much of their lives working and living in groups. And as with interpersonal relationships, there are many different reasons why people join and remain in group (family, love and emotions, mutual benefit and safety, etc.) and the relationships that members have with their groups can be long or short term, can be deep or superficial, and can change over time. The concept of commitment to a group or organization are similar in many ways to commitment to an interpersonal relationship— including the multi-dimensional nature of the concept (Pattersone, 2010). Moreover, researchers John Meyer and Allen (1997) defined organizational commitment as a psychological state characterizing an employee’s relationship with organization and
affecting his or her decision to remain with the organization. Similarly Mowday et al. (1979) define organizational commitment as “as the relative strength of an individual’s identification with, and involvement in, a particular organization,” Meyer and Allen (1997) identified three types of organizational commitment: affective, continuance, and normative commitment.

Affective Commitment reflects commitment based on emotional ties with the employee and develops with the organization primarily via positive work experiences. It is rooted in a member’s emotional attachment to an organization. It forms because the individual identifies with goals of the organization and willingly assets the organization in achieving those goals. Continuance commitment is based in the real and perceived costs and benefits of leaving or remaining with an organization. Lost friendships and social interaction are social costs of leaving an organization and contribute to continuance commitment. Continuance Commitment reflects commitment based on the perceived costs, both economic and social, of leaving the organization.

Normative Commitment reflects commitment based on perceived obligation towards the organization, for example rooted in the norms of reciprocity. Feeling that “that you ‘owe’ the company something in return for what it has done for you or sense that you have moral obligation to remain with the organization characterize this form of commitment.

In general according to Allen and Mayer (1997) Employee commitment can become a vehicle by which individuals manifest loyalty to and identification with the organization. Committed employees identify with and feel loyal toward the organization; they share the values of the organization and have a personal sense of importance about the company's mission. Affective, continuance, and normative commitments refer to “want to,” “have to,” and “ought to” orientations toward organizational membership. They suggest that all three types of commitment operate on organizational members simultaneously. An employee can be committed to an organization because of affective, countenance and normative senses at the same time.
2.3.2 Conceptual framework

Organizational commitment on the other hand, focuses on their attitudes towards the entire organization (Tella, et al., 2007). In an organization, employees are likely to exhibit affective commitment when they have a strong identification with their organizational goals and values, or have a strong willingness to work hard for their organization (DeCotiis and Summers, 1987 as cited by Hung and Cheng, 2012). There for this is a kind of commitment that hope to see flourished and understanding it will help Ethio-Telecom a lot. On the opposite side, Individuals become committed to their organizations because the costs associated with leaving are too high not because they have an affective commitment to their employing organization (Hung and Cheng, 2012). Employees stay in organization for long and show a kind of great commitment but the underlying reason for their staying is not because they love the organization rather they have no were to go as an alternative.

Organizational commitment has three major components:

1. A strong belief in and acceptance of the organization's goals,
2. A willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization, and
3. A definite desire to maintain organizational membership.

Committed employees have a stronger sense of belonging to the organization and a greater desire to remain organizational members; they are willing to make extra efforts for the organization; and, in most work situations, they put the organization's interests before their personal concerns. There has been, of course, an extensive stream of academic research providing evidence that committed employees are less likely to leave the organization and more likely to make extra efforts on its behalf than other, less committed employees (O'Reilly & Chatman, 1986, pp. 492-499).
2.3.3 Types of Commitment

According to Meyer and Allen's (1991) there are three "mind sets" this can characterize an employee’s commitment to the organization.

**Affective Commitment:** 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".

**Continuance Commitment:** The individual commits to the organization because he/she perceives high costs of losing organizational membership, 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". Meyer and Allen, (1991) assert that 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.
2.3.4 Impact of Organizational Commitment on Turnover and Performance

Meyer et al (1989) explain that organizational commitment has been stimulated largely by its demonstrated negative relation to turnover: Committed employees have been found to be less likely to leave an organization than those who are uncommitted. Because turnover can be costly to organizations, commitment is generally assumed to be a desirable quality that should be fostered in employees (pp.152-156).
Moreover, according to Meyer et al (1997) organizational commitment correlates positively with individual and group level of performance and they concluded that, employees who are committed to the organization tend to perform at a higher level than those who are not. (p.152). Balfour and Wechsler (1991) claim that higher levels of performance and productivity result when employees are committed to the organization, take pride in organizational membership, and believe in its goals and values.

2.3.5 Relationship between study variables (job satisfaction, turnover intention, and commitment)

It is not irrational to assume that the potency and nature of the commitment someone experiences in a personal relationship informs the manner in which that same person commits to an organization or work group. If an organization were to request that employees direct their efforts toward long-term goals, the message may be better understood by workers who have been engaged in strongly committed relationships over a long period of time (McMahon, 2007). One of the major tasks of organizational Psychologists perform is assessing employee’s satisfaction so that organizations can take steps to improve it. According to studies job satisfaction and in fact many constructs have an impact on organizational commitment. In terms of relation job satisfaction have got appositive and significant general effect employees on motivation and job satisfaction (Henry, Casius and Motena, 2013). This relation in which when job satisfaction is higher, it will resulted in increment of the general satisfaction is evident among many researchers (Marsden, Kallberg, Cook, 1992, and Toby and Catley, 2007). When particular
dimensions of commitment viewed, job satisfaction had a significant positive effect on normative commitment and affective commitment while job satisfaction dimensions had no effect on continuance commitment. It is suggested here, that, as job satisfaction levels increases, organizational commitment (affective and normative) increases as well but it does not alter the level of continuance commitment (Gunlu et al, 2009). With regard to turnover, various factors influence turnover through their impact on organizational commitment and job satisfaction, which in turn influence intent to leave, which then leads to voluntary turnover. First, less satisfied and less committed employees think about leaving, look for alternative jobs, are more likely to quit, and do each of these to a greater degree when they believe that desirable job alternatives exist (Cho, D.H and Son, J.M, 2012).

2.4. Local studies on job satisfaction, turnover and commitment

Under this section the researcher treated local (Ethiopian) studies that are related to this research. Though, these are not the only studies conducted, the researcher selected few and presented them logically beginning from criterion variables (job satisfaction and turnover intention) to organizational commitment respectively.

Unless employees are satisfied by the job they are assigned to work, the output of the organization will be affected either directly or indirectly (Sebisibe, 2002). In one local study by Desalegn (2010) affirms that human resource development can be realized by employees’ satisfaction. On this study determinant factors that leading to Ethiopian electric power employees dissatisfaction were identified and measured as to how it affect the entire success of HRD practices. The study finds out that employees are not satisfied because the management’s unfair provision of opportunities for quit few sections of employees. In similar study by Abdu (2011) which compares nurses and midwives job satisfaction regarding BPR (processing re-engineering) in Hawassa University teaching Hospital, though, there is no huge gap in the dissatisfaction level of the two job sectors, still they are dissatisfied regarding the way such systems are imposed and implemented.

The issue of employee turnover is among the basic managerial decision area, as employees constitute the cornerstone of an organization. One study investigate the nature and extent of employee turnover in case of academic staff of Addis Ababa University, considering the department, professional rank, gender, and seniority of an employee. The result indicates
that in Addis Ababa University, academic staff with a rank of lecturers and female academic staff left the university more frequently during the past five years (Meskerem, 2010). According to one local study by Yared (2007) that the causes of staff turnover are a combination of factors. Family problems, poor leadership, dissatisfaction with the job, better opportunity in other organizations, dissatisfaction with the area, and educational opportunity are some of the causes. Professional employees’ turnover in organizations is more common than other organizations (Asmamaw, 2011).

Finally regarding the studies related to organizational commitment. Many studies indicated important findings. The quality of service delivery of any organization depends on the presence of committed and talented employees. Employees are main sources for organizations in meeting objectives in organizations. Therefore, giving emphasis for employees become a big issue particularly for organizations.

In one study, entitled as impact of intrinsic and extrinsic factors of motivation towards organizational Commitment in Private Colleges, affirms that instructors in private colleges were satisfied with intrinsic factors of work such as opportunity for achievement, challenging work, responsibility, and opportunity for growth and development. On the other hand, instructors were generally dissatisfied with extrinsic content of work such as salary, fringe benefits, incentives, job security, opportunity for training, and post employment security. Moreover, there was also structural inequity which is a perception of employees that they are required to do too much work for small pay. Consequently, employees were not committed to their organization which implies the availability of high turnover and lower performance (Birhanu, 2007).
Chapter 3

3. Research Methodology

This chapter describes the research design and methods for analyzing the linear and combined relationships between job satisfaction, and turnover intention with organizational commitment. The research instruments are described, and the study population and sample size are discussed. A discussion of the statistical methods used in analyzing the data concludes the chapter.

3.1 Design of the Study

This research was designed in cross-sectional way to gather, analyze and interpret data. This is to mean that, data was collected regarding three variables (i.e. job satisfaction, turnover intention and organizational commitment) at one point in time and inferences was made based on the findings. The reason for choosing this design was, first of all, its appropriateness to the research problem, to get abundant amount of data and also cross-sectional design has an advantage of being conducted easily and relatively quickly (Thisted, 2006).

3.2 The Study Setting

The introduction of telecommunication in Ethiopia dates back to 1894. Ethiopian Telecommunications Corporation is the oldest public telecommunications operator in Africa. In those years, the technological scheme contributed to the integration of the Ethiopian society when the extensive open wire line system was laid out linking the capital with all the important administrative cities of the country.

After the end of the war against Italy, during which telecommunication network was destroyed, Ethiopia re-organized the Telephone, Telegraph and Postal services in 1941. In 1952 the Imperial Board of Telecommunications (IBTE) was established by proclamation No. 131/52 in 1952. The Board had full financial and administrative autonomy and was in charge of the provision and expansion of telecommunications services in Ethiopia.

The Imperial Board of Telecommunications of Ethiopia, which became the Ethiopian Telecommunications Authority in 1981, was placed in charge of both the operation and regulation of telecommunication services in the wake of the market reforms.
In 1996, the Government established a separate regulatory body, the Ethiopian Telecommunication Agency (ETA) by Proclamation 49/1996, and during the same year, by regulation 10/1996, the Council of Ministers set up the Ethiopian Telecommunications Corporation (ETC).

Under the supervision of the ETA, the principal duty of ETC is maintaining and expanding telecommunication services in the country and providing domestic and international telephone, telex, and other communication services. In this respect, currently ETC is the only operator of any telecommunication related. It was replaced by Ethio-Telecom on December 2, 2010.

3.3. Participants and Sampling procedure

Assuming that the attribute to be measured in this study (job satisfaction, turnover intention and organizational commitment) are normally distributed among employees, such employees fall under two broader subcategories namely networking employees and information system employees. The total number of employees under technical work division is 3775 over all the country. Specific to Addis Ababa region the number would be reduced to 2213. Again excluding regional zones the total number of employees would be approximately 1113. Based on this final cumulative number of employees who are geographically dispersed in four working areas namely Arada, head office, Legihar and Macro-wave, the samples are selected using stratified sampling. Stratified sampling is used due to the researchers need to incorporate partisans based on department, sex and location work (Loh, 1999). The total number of sample size, out of 1113 employees, is determined using a sample size calculation technique formula (Krejcie and Morgan, 1970) $S = x^2NP(1-p) + d^2(N-1) + x^2p (1-p)$, where

$S$ = required sample size

$X^2$ = the table value of chi-square for 1 degree of freedom at desired confidence level (3.841)

$N$ = the population size

$P$ = the population proportion (assumed to be .05 since this would provide the maximum sample size)
The degree of Accuracy expressed as proportion(.05) 

Therefore the maximum number of samples need for the study is 285 employees.

**Table 1: stratified selection of representative sample (N=1113)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>gender</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>department</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Approximate quota (%)</th>
<th>Sample(n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>Legihar</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>IS</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Head office</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Networking</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Micro wave</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Arada</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>903</td>
<td>Legihar</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>IS</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Head office</td>
<td>217</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Micro wave</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>Networking</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Arada</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum(N)</td>
<td>1113</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1113</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1113</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proportion females from the total number of employees about 20% and the rest 80% are males. Having this in mind the research selected based on the distribution of employees, gender and departments that would be necessary for the research purpose. Accordingly from the total of female employees (210) from both departments and scattered locations 60% employees were taken as a sample. This is because since the number of females are small and to get the calculated sample size and similarly from the total of male employees (903) from both departments and scattered locations 20% of employees were taken as a sample to
meet the required sample sized amount only. Thus, a total of 300 samples (121 females and 180 males) were taken as a representative sample.

The researcher distributed the 300 hundred questionnaires with the help of capacity building officers according to the above mentioned way to include variety of qualities. But, from the total of questionnaires distributed (300), only 260 (82 females and 178) questionnaires returned back to the researcher due to displacement of head office and Legihar employees to different locations (some are gone to microwave and others changed offices in that same building) which characteristically information system female employees. This makes it very hard to find the whereabouts of the participants. Among the reasons why the researcher selected these 4 locations other than others: First it is for the researchers convinced that on those locations there will be availability of needed support in data distribution and collection. The nature of employees distributed across in Addis Ababa and other cities are more or less similar to the employees who are working on those locations. This means that the employees are engaged in same field of work, Ethio-Telecom working procedures, polices are same and also the same payment and also their age distribution and educational background also same. Thus, taking the 4 locations as representative sample would be legitimized and also the researcher can find significant amount of participants from information and networking department employees.
3.4. Data collection Instruments

3.4.1 Measures

The following instruments (tools) were used to measure the variables involved in the study.

General Job satisfaction Questionnaire (GBSQ): - general job satisfaction assessment tool was used to measure the satisfaction level of employees. This job satisfaction measure was developed by Warr, Cook and Wall (1979) as a robust instrument that is easily completed by employees at all levels and is psychometrically sound. It can be scored to provide a single index of overall Job Satisfaction. The number of items presented to samples is 16 in the form of likert scale in five ratings (starting from strongly satisfied upto strongly dissatisfied). ‘‘Overall, I feel I am pleased with my job’’, ‘‘the way my job provides for steady employment’’, etc are some of the items used in study.

Turnover intention: - Turnover Intention Questionnaire (TIQ) was used to measure employees’ future tendency to leave and this tool is taken from Medina (2012) with slight modification. The number of items used 15 presented as likert scale in 7 scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree and ‘‘I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career in this organization’’, ‘‘I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving this organization’’ and the like items are involved in the measure of turnover intention.

Organizational commitment:-this questionnaire is adopted from Mayer and Allen’s which is based on Three Component model(1991). Affective, continuance and normative commitments are included and the total number of items is 17. Presentes in the form of likert scale in 7 scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree and presented by including the three components. To mention some I really feel as if this organization’s problems are my own (Affective)’, I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving this organization (Continuance) and ‘‘this organization needs my loyalty (normative) are the items used in the study.

Socio-demographic data: - to measure the socio-demographic variable (age, gender educational level, work experience and marital status) a questionnaire was prepared by the researcher and administered together with the above instruments.
3.4.2 Validity and Reliability of Instruments

Depending on the pilot study and several mechanisms of too amendment procedures, the instruments validity and reliability has been checked as follows:

The **GJSQ** has 16 items used and the Cronbach alpha coefficient of the instrument in the present study was 0.762. The Cronbach alpha coefficient of the **TIQ** instrument in the present study was 0.628. Again, according to the pilot study, Organizational commitment (**OC**) has 17 items with reliability of 0.771. In further analysis Meyer, Stanley, Herscovich, and Laryssa (2002) in their meta-analysis regarding the three components of commitment, described that the components ASC, NSC and CSC have got a reliability of 0.82, 0.73 and 0.76 respectively.

To maintain the validity of the instruments attempt was made to adapt the GJSQ, TIQ and OCQ measurement tools to our cultural situation. First, assessment of relationship between the instruments and their underlying concept in the original setting was examined. In addition assessment was conducted to check if the items within the instrument are equally appropriate and acceptable in the study population as they are in the original population. This was achieved by through literature review.

3.5. Data collection procedure

First, Ethio-telecom human resource capacity building department was contacted to get permission and gather information about employees who are working in technical section (Information systems and networking division). The researcher met with the capacity building coordinators and explained the purpose and the importance of the proposed research. The researcher gave the sample instruments with explanation to them and appointed me for another day for confirming the permission. Than the head of the capacity building office gave the researcher the permission to continue and told coordinators to provide needed support for the researcher while distributing the questionnaire. Since this research is targeted towards information technology employees, the researcher took the record of employees from human resource and identified only technical employees. In order to gather information related to this research, using a self-administered technique together with the coordinators, the questionnaire was distributed to samples. Having this in mind, the
data administration was conducted into stage, the first was to collect data for the pilot study which is done around 40 employees and then after amendment done the second stage administration was conducted in such a way that is proportional to get the needed and amount qualities. With help of coordinators or officers, while administering the questionnaires, the researcher will give custody of collecting the questionnaires to each branch one employee or head and then by the time of collection the researcher contacted the assigned employees and received the questionnaires. After being collected all the data, the researcher used SPSS version 16 to manage and analyze the data.

3.6. Data Analysis Procedures

To address the first research question, which is related to gender difference in the study variables t-test was computed. Analysis of variance (one-way ANOVA) was employed to find out the difference in educational background across demographic variables and the study variables. Then, To determine the linear relationship among selected socio-demographic variables, job satisfaction, turnover intention and Employees commitment, Pearson Product-Moment Correlation technique was used. Regarding the research question i.e. the joint and separate/independent contribution of socio-demographic variables, job satisfaction and turnover intention to the variability of employees organizational commitment, multiple and stepwise regression analysis was computed. For the final question regarding the effect of gender, job satisfaction and turnover intention on the combined and separate impact of dependent variables (Affective, Normative and Continuance commitment), multivariate analysis of MANOVA and Several ANOVAs were used respectively. The aforementioned statistical analyses were conducted using statistical analysis package for social science (SPSS version 16).
3.7. Ethical consideration

The informed consent of all participants was obtained before starting the study. Respondents were given a clear explanation about the nature of the study and advised that they were free to withdraw from the study any time. In addition participants were informed about data collecting procedure. The anonymity of the subjects was protected and guaranteed by preventing to write their names and providing clear instruction. Furthermore, the information obtained thorough the aforementioned procedure was only used for the research purpose and the confidentiality was maintained.
Chapter Four

4. Results

This section presents the results of the statistical analyses (both parametric and non-parametric tests) carried out to answer the basic research questions forwarded in the study. First, descriptive statistics of the study variables is presented, followed by chi-square goodness of fit test and gender difference analyses among the variables were conducted. Then, Pearson correlation among the variables in the study, one-way analysis of variance (one-way ANOVA), multiple regression analyses and a multivariate analysis of MANOVA were undertaken involving job satisfaction, turnover intention, selected socio-demographic variables and employees’ organizational commitment to find out the joint and separate contribution and effect they have for predicting employees commitment towards their organization.

4.1. Background of the Respondents

Under this section the selected demographic characteristics of the study respondents such as age, work experience, gender, educational status, department and marital status are presented as follows:
Table 2: Background of the Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td>178</td>
<td>68.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>82</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-27</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>43.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-36</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37-45</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td></td>
<td>78</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td></td>
<td>150</td>
<td>57.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td></td>
<td>92</td>
<td>35.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorce</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSC</td>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSC</td>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work experience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td></td>
<td>154</td>
<td>59.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-11</td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-17</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-23</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-29</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As it is indicated in the above table, the percentage of female (68.5%) and females (31.5%). When we see their age distribution 85% of the people are youngsters with age range of 19-36. Again almost more than half the employees are single (58%) and 53% of the are at least degree and masters holders. More than 55% of them are with work experience ranging (0-5).

4.2. Descriptive Statistics of the Study Variables

The descriptive statistics (mean, standard deviation, and range) of the scores of the measures in the study are presented in Table 2 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std.Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>46.21</td>
<td>13.67</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover intention</td>
<td>22.29</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational commitment</td>
<td>47.88</td>
<td>13.54</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Affective commitment</td>
<td>19.45</td>
<td>7.61</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Continuance commitment</td>
<td>23.35</td>
<td>5.87</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Normative commitment</td>
<td>22.06</td>
<td>7.99</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3. Gender Difference among Variables in the Study

Two types’ of tests were computed to find out whether there were both significant distribution among male and female employees (chi-square goodness of fit) and independent sample t-test carried out to assess difference between male and female
participants in terms of job satisfaction, turnover intention and organizational commitment including the dimensions namely affective, continuance and normative commitment scores. The results are shown in Table 4 below.

Before conducting independent sample t-test, the researcher tested whether gender is evenly distributed in the sample and the chi-square goodness of fit used.

Table 4: (Chi-Square Goodness of Fit-test and gender Distribution)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENDER</th>
<th>Observed N</th>
<th>Expected N</th>
<th>Residual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>130.0</td>
<td>48.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>130.0</td>
<td>-48.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>130.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hence, there is significant difference in the distribution of males and females $X^2 (1, N = 260)$ = 35.446, $p < .05$ in samples. Which indicates that females are underrepresented in the sample.
Table 5: (T-Test and Descriptive Statistic for Gender Difference Among Variables in the Study)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std.Deviation</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.(2-tailed)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>Male(M)</td>
<td>47.16</td>
<td>12.72</td>
<td>1.645</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>0.101</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female(F)</td>
<td>44.17</td>
<td>15.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover intention</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>-1.625</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>22.92</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational commitment</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>49.56</td>
<td>12.41</td>
<td>2.782</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>44.23</td>
<td>15.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective commitment</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>26.41</td>
<td>14.40</td>
<td>1.074</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>0.284</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>24.30</td>
<td>15.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuance commitment</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>23.24</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>-0.440</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>0.661</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>23.61</td>
<td>6.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative commitment</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>23.24</td>
<td>7.73</td>
<td>3.199</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>19.86</td>
<td>8.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As it is clearly shown in the table above (table 4), there was significant difference between males (*Mean* = 49.56, *SD* = 12.41) and females (*Mean* = 44.23, *SD* = 15.16; *t* (258) = 2.782, *p* < .05) in overall organizational commitment. Similarly, on organizational commitment sub-element, Normative commitment, there was significant difference between males (Mean=23.24, SD=7.73) and females (Mean=19.86, SD=8.26). On contrary, Males’ score on turnover intention (*Mean* = 22.00, *SD* = 4.36) is no significantly different from females’
score ($Mean = 22.92, SD = 4.07; t (258) = -1.625, p < .05$). Regarding gender difference on employees’ general job satisfaction, males’ score ($Mean = 47.16, SD = 12.73$) was not significantly different from females’ score ($Mean = 44.17, SD = 15.43; t (258) = 1.645, p < .05$). Likewise, males Affective commitment score ($Mean = 26.41, SD = 14.40$) and females’ score ($Mean = 24.3, SD = 15.25; t (258) =1.074, p > .05$), and males score on continuance commitment ($Mean= 23.23, SD = 5.41$) and females score ($Mean = 23.61, SD = 6.81; t (258) = -0.440, p < .05$), were not significantly different.

4.4. Difference in Educational status

One way analysis of variance (one-way ANOVA) was used to compare means of the educational status across other independent variables (department, work experience, age, job satisfaction and turnover intention). The result of this analysis is presented in the following table.
Table 6: Analysis of Variance (one-way ANOVA) between Independent Variables i.e. Educational Status and with other IV's,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>4.144</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.381</td>
<td>6.802</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>75.709</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>.203</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56.138</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>1097.874</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>365.958</td>
<td>8.125</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>11531.187</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>45.044</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12629.062</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>835.916</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>278.639</td>
<td>9.358</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>7622.484</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>29.775</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8458.400</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>10.932</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.644</td>
<td>17.497</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>53.315</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>.208</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>64.246</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>1258.450</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>419.483</td>
<td>1.298</td>
<td>.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>47174.054</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>184.2744</td>
<td>2.276</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48432.504</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover intention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>39.532</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20.551</td>
<td>.710</td>
<td>.544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>4718.054</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>130.758</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4757.785</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>184.043</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As it is shown on the table above (table 10) one-way ANOVA was used to test mean differences of educational status across demographic and major study independent variables. The data shows that only major demographic variables (gender ($F(3, 256) = 6.802, p <.05$), Age ($F(3, 256) = 8.125, p <.05$), work experience ($F(3, 256) = 9.38, p <.05$) and department ($F(3, 256) = 17.497, p <.05$)) differed significantly across educational status, respectively. Mean differences in major study variables (job satisfaction and turnover intention) due to educational status categories were not significant.

Tukey post-hoc and Scheffe (only for Gender comparison) comparisons among the significant demographic variables across educational status were computed. The result indicated that there is significant gender difference ($F(3, 256) = 6.802, p <.05$). Consequently, the Scheffé test was used to compare pairs of educational status in order to assess where the difference lie. Thus, certificate male holders ($M=.033$) differ significantly with Masters female holders ($M=.342$) [-.2557, .9400]. There were no significant difference observed among other educational categories.

As to the main effect difference in age ($F(3, 256) = 8.125, p <.05$), Tukey test was compute and Masters holders ($M=.308$) significantly different from other educational categories (Certificate, BSC and diploma holder employs) which have no significant difference among them. Related to marital status the Tukey-HSD test indicated that only diploma ($M=.19298$) and BSC ($M=.11813$) holders differ significantly. Regarding work experience again the Tukey-HSD test indicated that significant difference existed between MSC ($M=.308$) and BSC (-.11813) and again MSC ($M=.308$) and diploma holder ($M=.19298$), $p<.05$. Finally in relation with department certificate holder employees ($M=.033$) differ significantly with masters holders ($M=.308$). Diploma holders ($M=.19298$) differ significantly with both Bsc ($M=.11813$) and Master holders ($M=.308$). Sequentially, Bsc holder ($M=.11813$) employees differ significantly with Masters holder employees ($M=.308$). The other major study variables job satisfaction and turnover intention were not statistically significant in their mean differences.
4.5 Relationship among Variables in the Study (Predictor Variables and the Criterion Variable)

In order to see the strength of relationship between predictor variables (job satisfaction, turnover intention, and selected socio-demographic variables) and the criterion variable (employees’ commitment), Pearson’s correlation coefficient was computed. Table 6 below indicated the inter correlation matrix among these variable.

**Table 7: Inter-Correlation Matrix among Variables in the Study**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>.128*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>-.269**</td>
<td>.154*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.326**</td>
<td>.193*</td>
<td>.279*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>-143*</td>
<td>-.088*</td>
<td>.259*</td>
<td>.231*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>.401**</td>
<td>-.039</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>.155*</td>
<td>-.064</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>-.077</td>
<td>-.067</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>-.127*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>.183**</td>
<td>-.119</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.473**</td>
<td>-.149*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>-.067</td>
<td>.180**</td>
<td>.141*</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>.228**</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.134*</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>-.060</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>.195**</td>
<td>-.056</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>-.071</td>
<td>.207**</td>
<td>-.031</td>
<td>.125*</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**correlation is significant at 0.01(2-tailed)**

*correlation is significant at 0.05(2-tailed)
The results displayed above indicated that job satisfaction is positively correlated with Affective commitment ($r = .228$, $p<.01$), organizational commitment ($r=0.473$, $P<.01$), age ($r = .155$, $p<.05$), educational status($r=.124,p<.05$) ,gender ($r=.401,p<.01$) and normative commitment($r =0.207$, $p<.01$) .

There is a positive relation between continuance commitment($r=.134,p<.05$);Age and Marital status($r=.193,p<.01$);department and educational status($r=.259,p<.01$);age with department($r=.231,p<.05$) and educational status($r=.279,p<.01$) and Affective commitment and Department($r=.198,p<.01$). Gender is negatively correlated with normative commitment($r=-195$, $p<.01$), and department($r=-.143$, $p<.05$). Similarly and most importantly, job satisfaction is negatively correlated with turnover intention($r=-.127$, $p<.05$) and same is also organizational commitment with turnover intention($r=-1.49$, $p<.0.05$).

4.6. The Contribution of Predictor to the Variability of the Criterion variable/s

The joint and separate contribution of the predictor variables on the criterion variable was explored using multiple regression analysis (as it is shown in Table 7, 8 and 9 below)

Table 8: Summary of Regression Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The regression model shows that the joint contribution of predictor selected socio-demographic ,job satisfaction and turnover intention variables in explaining the criterion variable (organizational commitment) was significant($R^2=.243$), which means 24.3% of the variability is explained by the regression model.
Table 9: Regression Coefficients for Predicting Job Performance from the Predictor variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>SEB</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turnover intention</td>
<td>-.255</td>
<td>-.081</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>-1.471</td>
<td>.142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>.454</td>
<td>.458</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>8.164</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>-.139</td>
<td>.890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational status</td>
<td>-1.324</td>
<td>-.082</td>
<td>.975</td>
<td>-1.358</td>
<td>.176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work experience</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.209</td>
<td>.501</td>
<td>.617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-3.511</td>
<td>-.121</td>
<td>1.755</td>
<td>-2.001</td>
<td>.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>-1.531</td>
<td>-.071</td>
<td>1.269</td>
<td>-1.207</td>
<td>.229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>2.118</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>1.643</td>
<td>1.289</td>
<td>.199</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The multiple regression analyses revealed that the model involving selected socio-demographic variables, turnover intention and job satisfaction (Predictor variables) on criterion variable (employees commitment) was statistically significant (F=11.75, P <.0.05), accounting for 24.3% of the variance in commitment. Yet, when the independent contribution of the variables was examined using stepwise multiple regression analyses, only job satisfaction and gender significantly predicted the variance in employees’ commitment (Table 9 displays the result).

Table 10: Independent Contribution of Predictor Variables on Criterion Variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steps</th>
<th>predictors</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R2</th>
<th>AR2</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SEB</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>.473</td>
<td>.224</td>
<td>.221</td>
<td>.544</td>
<td>11.96</td>
<td>.447</td>
<td>74.308</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>-5.330</td>
<td>13.34</td>
<td>-.183</td>
<td>-2.994</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Work experience</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.318</td>
<td>13.45</td>
<td>.134</td>
<td>2.172</td>
<td>.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.231</td>
<td>13.47</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>1.929</td>
<td>.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Turnover intention</td>
<td>.149</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>-.472</td>
<td>13.41</td>
<td>-.149</td>
<td>-2.426</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Educational status</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.524</td>
<td>13.56</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.518</td>
<td>.605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>2.118</td>
<td>13.54</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>1.030</td>
<td>.304</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As it is clearly visible from the table above job satisfaction added significantly higher to the prediction of organizational commitment (F (1,258) =74.308, P<.001), explaining the largest share (22.1%) of the variance on commitment. Similarly, Gender (F(1,258)=2.994, P<.001), work experience(F(1,258)=2.172) and turnover intention(F(1,258)=2.426, P<.001) have got relatively significant contribution. The addition of Age (F (1,258) =1.929, P<.001), educational status (F (1,258) =518, P<.001), department (F (1,258) =1.030, P<.001), and marital status (F (1,258) =-1.918, P<.001), have no significant contribution on the variability of organizational commitment score.

4.7. Multivariate Analysis (the effect of IV on DV)

Under this section a multivariate and univariate analysis of was computed to observe the joint effect using MANOVA effect and independent(one to one) effect using separate ANAVAs of the independent variables (turnover intention and job satisfaction) against the components of organizational commitments (Affective, continuance and Normative). First, the impact of job satisfaction on organizational commitment components were computed using a Multivariate Analysis of MANOVA was computed and result is displayed as follows:
Table 11. The Effect of IV’s on DVs’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Hypothesis df</th>
<th>Error df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>intercept</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pillai’s Trace</td>
<td>.941</td>
<td>1.113E3a</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>208.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks’ Lambda</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>1.113E3a</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>208.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotelling’s Trace</td>
<td>16.046</td>
<td>1.113E3a</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>208.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy’s Largest Root</td>
<td>16.046</td>
<td>1.113E3a</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>208.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pillai’s Trace</td>
<td>.668</td>
<td>1.228</td>
<td>147.000</td>
<td>630.000</td>
<td>.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks’ Lambda</td>
<td>.463</td>
<td>1.246</td>
<td>147.000</td>
<td>624.355</td>
<td>.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotelling’s Trace</td>
<td>.899</td>
<td>1.264</td>
<td>147.000</td>
<td>620.000</td>
<td>.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy’s Largest Root</td>
<td>.490</td>
<td>2.098c</td>
<td>49.000</td>
<td>210.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Exact statistic  
b. The statistic is an upper bound on F that yields a lower bound on the significance level.  
c. Design: Intercept + jobtotal. Computed using alpha = .05

As it clearly indicated in the computed MANOVA test, employee’s job satisfaction did have a significant effect on the three different commitment variables (Pillai’s $F(3, 256) = 1.228, p< .05$).

To go to deep into the above result, the relative importance of job satisfaction on separate effects of affective, continuance and normative commitments, the following ANOVA results were founded as follows:
### Table - 12. Test of between independent variables effect on the DV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>Affective commitment</td>
<td>16116.972</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>328.918</td>
<td>1.721</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continuance commitment</td>
<td>1777.253</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>36.270</td>
<td>1.072</td>
<td>.360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Normative commitment</td>
<td>2965.622</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>60.523</td>
<td>.921</td>
<td>.624</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. R Squared = .287 (Adjusted R Squared = .120)  
b. Computed using alpha = .05  
c. R Squared = .200 (Adjusted R Squared = .013)  
d. R Squared = .177 (Adjusted R Squared = -.015)

As it is indicated in the above table, the individual dependent variables were subject to ANOVAs in order to assess whether the three dependent variables showed the same trend. For the measure of the difference in the effect of job satisfaction on combined scores of the components of commitment, job satisfaction were superior in the contribution of the general effect (M=25.355, F(3,49)=1.721, p < .05). To assess the effect of gender and turnover intention on combined components of commitment MANOVA were computed but no significant difference on effect was founded.
Chapter 5

5. Discussion

Under this section the researcher is going to discuss the major results of the study in contrast with other similar supportive or antagonistic studies. General contextual explanation will be given as logical to the research question.

5.1. Gender Difference with in the Study Variables

The independent t-test computed as to test whether there is gender difference between males and females. Hence, across the tested variables the researcher found out that there is statistical difference between males and females on measures of general commitment and normative commitment dimension. But, no statistical difference existed between male and female regarding job satisfaction and turnover intention, affective and continuance commitment. To add up one point, As many organizations in the world, this study, though, it may not the major concern for the study, females are underrepresented, this might happen in ethio-telecom because of the available number of female students graduated from computer science is lesser than males. But internationally, there are many explanations for the women in which women are undermined in profession tasks and the major one is for the matter that women are being prohibited from schooling, cultural biases that supports women to left in home, etc can be mentioned (Kaiser, 2002).

5.1.1. Job satisfaction

Job satisfaction is an organizational construct that has been described as a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experiences (Locke 1976 cited in Jonathan, Darroux and Thibeli, 2013). With this point in mind, the finding of this study showed that there is no difference between male and female employees. However, many studies will support this finding while many others refute it by saying the reverse. Thus, we can’t find consistent finding across the world. This will put as a paradox of sex vs. job satisfaction. According to Cabrita and Heloisa(2007) in their national survey, the paradox will be summarized into twoworldwide perspective, the first group of researchers, the information provided by the national correspondents does not indicate a straightforward correlation. There are no significant differences between
the job satisfaction of women and men. In other words, gender does not play a key role in job satisfaction in many countries. On the hand, in many researches, women are more satisfied than men with their jobs despite the fact that there exist a clear disadvantaged position in the labor market in terms of earnings, recruitment/dismissals, promotions and career prospects (Kaiser, 2002; Litton, 2012). Despite the above mentioned paradoxes, men and women use qualitatively different criteria in their assessment of work. From this point of view, a woman focuses on the social aspect of a job than men, and men value the opportunity for self-expression in their work more than women (Billy, Norazah, Suki, 2010).

5.1.2. Turnover Intention

According to the finding there exist no significant variation between males and females with regard to turnover intention. This finding is parallel with other studies that showed that there was no significant relationship between gender and turnover intention. But there are many others researchers that support women are more tend to have intention to leave than men and also others have supported men are inclined to leave (Heydarian and Abhar, 2011). But in actual behavior of leaving women are the first. Women tend to have higher turnover rates than men and lower organizational commitment levels. This link can be demonstrated through the consistent positive relationship between absenteeism and attrition (Thompson, 2008). As to the underline reasoning why men and women have the intention to leave? The answer remains different for both groups. This is because females and males differ in the value they give for their work. According to one study, females will have the intention to leave when women begin to recognize a failing of in the social aspect of their job. When this happen they begin to consider leaving the organization, thus, this asserts that females more consider the social value of their work. Unlike females, men understand their work interims of support they get. When the feel they lack the support from the organization, they will consider leaving (Susan, Mark, Melissa.Michael, 2007).
5.1.3. Gender differences in general and aspects of organizational commitment

Coming to our main point of discussion, when examining, gender differences in three components of organizational commitment (OC) as well as OC as a whole construct, there is significant difference between males and females in general commitment and also on normative component of organizational commitments.

According to the general commitment finding men are more committed to their organization than females but this is not consistent with some studies. According to studies women are more committed to an organization than men (Marsden, Kallberg, and Cook, 1992; Fink, 1992). But this happen due to Research targeting various industries does not show consistent results because of the different characteristics of the industries and their work forces (Cho and Son, 2012.). These studies arrived to their conclusions by statistically adjusting job family and career factors. When this not done by research finding is also consistent with the finding of (Marsden, Kallberg, and Cook, 1992). When we see dimensional findings regarding on which dimension of commitment the major difference between females and males lie in organizational commitment. Sex differences in organizational commitment particularly its dimensions have gained significant attention but no conclusive evidence has been settled with regard to levels of affective, normative and continuance commitment. In this study males have got higher level of normative commitment, based on perceived obligation, which is by implication men trying to be committed to their work because of the perception that they owe to the company. Clearly, highly obligated employees will attach with goals of the enterprise, have stronger tendency to belong to the organization, and are willing to exhibit greater behavior and attitudes. In contrary, to this finding, according to Khalili and Asmawi, (2012) women have a greater level of normative commitment than men. For instance, it has been reported that women score higher on normative commitment than men.

Meanwhile men score higher on affective and continuance commitment, with only the latter being significant. But the researcher’s finding is in line (Demir, 2013 cited in Jonathan, Darroux and Thibeli, 2013) i.e. Male employees had more normative commitment than female employees. Finally in other dimensions of commitment namely affective and continuance commitment, there were no significant difference between
males and females. With this finding, the researcher is similar one study except the overall organizational commitment, which concludes that men and Women have the same level of affective commitment, continuance commitment, and an overall organizational commitment (Khalili and ASmawi, 2012).

In conclusion, men tend to have slightly higher overall levels of organizational commitment than women, this primarily attributed to gender differences in commitment related jobs and attitudes. In fact this study finding is consistent with Marsden et.al, (1992), that didn’t deny the men outsmart females in general levels of commitment.

5.2. Differences in educational status

In this section the ANOVA summery result indicate that there are no significant differences across educational status in job satisfaction, turnover intention and over all commitment. This is highly inconsistent with the study of Jonathan, et.al, (2013) that found statistically significant differences in the mean scores for affective, continuance, and normative commitment based on Degree holders and non-degree holders at work.) . The higher the education level is associated with lower affective and continuance commitment among employees.

Nonetheless, statistically significant differences in the mean scores for affective, continuance, and normative commitment based on university graduates and non-university graduates employees proposing higher commitment to latter group because the earlier group faces little obstacles in finding alternative jobs.

5.3. The Relationship among Variables in the Study

Under this section the relationship among demographic, the independent variables (job satisfaction and turnover intention) and organizational commitment will be discussed as follows.
5.3.1 The Relationship between Selected Socio-demographic variables and study variables

Gender

As it is asserted in independent t-test analysis there exist no significant difference between males and females. But, in terms of relation with their job, there exist significant correlation between job satisfaction and gender. In both cases their satisfaction increase/or decrease in the same direction depending on their satisfaction level on the organization or the tasks they do. Gender as a correlate of turnover has been inconclusive as a factor in understanding the development of turnover decision. Hence, with regard to gender relation with turnover intention there exist no correlations depending on gender. This also in contrary to the above explanation of gender difference analysis result in other studies which disconfirms Gender doesn’t have relational effect with regard to the intent to leave or stay in an organization. As Susan, et.al (2007), describe it what matter is what the organization has to offer in accordance with females and males need. If females provided the social elements of the job, they will have lower level intention to leave and whereas males if provided the chance to prove themselves and get support they needed, they will also have lower level of intention to leave. With regard to commitment, this study is consistent with many studies (Marsden et.al, 1992; Jonathan, Darroux and Thibeli, 2013; Khalili and Asmawi, 2012; and Marsden, Kallberg, and Cook, 1992) that asserts there exist gender correlation with organizational commitment. The above mentioned studies and this study have confirmed the existence of relationship between the two constructs. But, the difference in argument lies in what kind of commitment between males and females observed still remains point of argument and further debate. In the researcher opinion, this variation may be due the reality in underground than in conceptual differences. This to mean that the females are fewer in such kind professional area in our country than western organizations that have high level educated female employees. Thus, this has to be in control before making any kind of generalization as to whether there exist difference among males and females in their level of organizational commitment.
With regard to relation of gender with component wise analysis of commitment, as it if found out earlier investigation, there exist positive significant relationship between normative commitment and gender which is by large the character of males in this study. These studies have identified already that males are more of normatively committed than females and also it is this finding contradicted and also supported with many other researches (Darroux and Thibeli, 2013).

**Marital status**

This study analysis result revealed that there is no significant relation between marital status and job satisfaction. This finding is also consistent with that of Samuel and Uchenna, 2013). But, many studies relate married women or men have got greater job satisfaction than those who didn’t get married or divorced. This assertion that there exist difference and relation between marital status and job satisfaction may require contextual view of organization. Of course, according to one study by Ebrahimi, Nafar and Keramati,(2013), have found that there exist significant relation between marital status and job satisfaction. According to the researcher point of argument, this may be true when excluding other form of life satisfaction factors. Their point of argument lies seeing the marital status issue with narrow binocular and argued that there are two major life areas namely job and family. This will lead us to the conclusion that employees who are formed a family are happier than to who didn’t have marriage. What about those who are not happy about their family? In the researcher opinion, the researchers put this fact out of the equation of discussion. In conclusion, several variables might have intervened in this finding of the researcher. One reason might be it because Ethio-telecom employees those are by large young and non-married ones. Again this study doesn’t get significant relation between marital status and intention to leave the organization. Consequently, in trying to find evidences for this non-significant result, the researcher get one study which is contrary the finding at hand. According, the reasons for the variation, plentiful studies are conducted on the relationship between the demographic variables like marital status and Intention to leave. Regarding the marital status, singles (unmarried) particularly men are more vulnerable to switchovers than the married persons. The study revealed that female, those who are married, with higher academic qualification, occupying permanent
position and having advanced increments with high salary packages are eventually more likely to stay in the institution. In terms of marital status, singles especially men are more exposed to switchovers than married. It seems that singles are more tilted towards the change than others. Divorcees in this regard are more committed as their social status demands financial and professional stability (Khan, Nawaz, Khan, Yar, 2013).

As for the relation between commitment and marital status, the study analysis result indicate that there is no significant correlation between marital status and overall commitment but this marital status indication is not that much worrying because there is significant connection across dimensional aspects of commitment. the study revealed that there is significant relational effects among marital status with continuance commitment and affective commitment, this finding as a correlate of marital status vs continuance and affective commitment is supported by many empirical evidences (Jonathan, Darroux and Thibeli, 2013). In this case and other supportive evidences indicate that married individuals have got affective type of commitment than single ones. This is may be because of the fact that, they tend to be nurturing kind for human relation because of the emotional state of mind they develop as a family. This is more of the characteristics of female employees. And, in terms of continuance commitment which is by large gain the characteristics of (as the literature indicate) females, will be portrayed by single employees. As Mayer and Allen (1997) described it, the source of these individuals with high level of continuance commitment, will emerge their perception of commitment in relation with the costs the associate with when they leave the company.

**Age**

As the analysis of this study portrayed, there is significant relationship between age and job satisfaction. As to the question regarding who is more satisfied employee? In terms of age, there exist contradicting evidences. According to one finding Litton (2012) there was a positive relationship between commitment behavior, age and gender; women and younger employees showed higher commitment than men and older employees. Regarding the correlation between age and the intention to leave a job, the finding indicated that there is no significant relation between the two constructs. In fact, age is a span of life and within this span a lot of complex changes occur. This will make age
difficult and very complex demographic variables to predict in with this construct (Khan, Nawaz, Khan, and Yar, 2013). Similarly age as a correlate of overall commitment and dimension wise relation with commitment is not significant. The implication of this finding will lead us to the conclusion that age doesn’t play a vital role for an employee to be committed. The age factor implies that younger and less experienced would have lower of organizational commitment. This means that they have relatively young age and work experience is a pointer to their tendency to exhibit lower of organizational commitment (Anthony, Akinykes, and Jelil, 2014). Though, other researchers find a significant correlation under the context of Ethio-Telecom, it is difficult to find differences and correlation between the two constructs (Salam, 2008 as cited in Anthony, et.al, 2014). In connection with this study output displayed no significant difference between age and specific components of commitment. Anthony, et.al (2014) has found consistent evidence with this study but only with Affective commitment. Accordingly researchers have found out that younger employees displayed significantly lower continuance commitment compared with the older employees. Organizational commitment increases as age increases.

5.3.2. Relationship between job satisfaction and turnover intention

Job satisfaction and Turnover intention

When expanding the relationship between the two constructs, analysis result indicate that there is negative or inverse relationship between the two variables. As job satisfaction boosted in one company, the level of Turnover intention will depreciate (Medina, 2012). Consequently, the voluntary switchover will take place when employees’ job satisfaction is lowered. The higher the intent to leave, the lower the job satisfaction will be displayed is prominent. But this relationship has no causal effect in dealing with organizational issues (Salleh, Sivadahasas and Harun, 2012). But one thing should be put in mind that satisfied employees are not free from intention to leave. Therefore, job satisfaction cant grantee or prohibit employees from leaving (Henry, Casuis and Motera, 2013; Marsden, et.al, 1992; Toby and Catly, 2007). In general, this finding is consistent with Studies involving professional and nonprofessional employees indicate a negative relationship between overall satisfaction and turnover although the variance
accounted for is less than 14 per cent (Studies involving professional and nonprofessional employees indicate a negative relationship between overall satisfaction and turnover although the variance accounted for is less than 14 per cent. (Lum, Kervin, Reid and Sirol, 1998).

5.3.3. Relationship between job satisfaction and commitment

In this study there exist strong relationship between job satisfaction and overall commitment. When down to earth analysis is made regarding this finding implication, the positive relation in overall commitment resides on largely due to the summative effect of affective and normative commitment (Cho and Son, 2012; Henerey et al, 2013). Furthermore, this study found significant correlation between job satisfaction and continuance commitment. And this finding is consistent with the finding of Gunulu et al, (2009) that asserts no connection between the two constructs. When analyzing the general and the two significant relationships, as opposed to many researchers that found negative correlation between job satisfaction and continuance commitment. If so, it will be very difficult to find strong positive correlation between job satisfaction and overall commitment as this research did. When we come to analyzing the implication, the specific aspects of relation, by the researcher level of understanding from review literature, job satisfaction and affective commitments correlated due to the intrinsic connection between the two constructs. Like job satisfaction depends on both external (like payment) and internal (task purpose) factors, affective commitment is something internal value driven towards the organization. Thus, when we talk about the connection between job satisfaction and affective commitment, the connection between the two is by large internal to internal attraction. Similarly, as to the significant relationship between job satisfaction and continuance commitment, again these there correlation is highly dependent on external factors. The external factors of job satisfaction will pull or correlate with to the external cost dependent commitment that forms continuance commitment (Darroux and Thibeli, 2013).
5.3.4. Relationship between turnover intention and commitment

As a final correlation observation, the study analyses indicate that there is very much weak negative correlation between the two variables. Lum, et.al (1998) have reported a significant association between organizational commitment and turnover intentions. As an implication to this finding, though, it is weak in this study, we can infer that the relationship between variables such organizational commitment and turnover is nonlinear, that is, termination represents a discontinuous change in withdrawal behavior, occurring only after certain levels of tension and commitment are exceeded. Hence, the path of relation between turnover intention and overall commitment, in fact with job satisfaction also very complex and shall be expounded very careful. As much as we like to understand the variables in combination, we have to expand the horizon of understanding them and we shall develop holistic too that exactly scrutinize the path of each variable in terms of causal, relational, and impact wise understanding.

As a concluding remark about the relationship about the three variables (job satisfaction, turnover intention), as Cho and Son (2012) explained about the interaction, when employees level of job satisfaction and commitment reduced, than they will have the intention to leave. As to this study, the path of analysis indicated that when employees level of job satisfaction and the level of turnover intention increases, than this will lead to deteriorating employees’ commitment to their organization. Whatever the path of relationship among these variables, it is good to understand the relationship in inclusive manner. As summarized point, Lum, et.al (1998), concluded that although both satisfaction and commitment are related to turnover, organizational commitment is more strongly related to turnover intentions. Which is somewhat inconsistent with this finding in the manner that turnover intention is strongly correlated with job satisfaction rather than commitment as opposed the above mentioned research. This makes it unique as an additional path of looking at the big picture about the interactive effect across each other.
5.4 Selected Socio-Demographic variables, job satisfaction and turnover intention as predictors of organizational commitment

5.4.1 The Joint Contribution of Predictor variables to the variability of organizational commitment

The study revealed that the model consisted of selected socio-demographic variables (Age, educational level, marital status, gender, department and work experience), job satisfaction, and turnover intention have statistically significant power to predict over organizational commitment. 24.3% of the variability in overall organizational commitment of employees in the study setting was determined by the variables included in the model.

This finding is consistent with many studies that infer organizational commitment is predicted by demographic, job satisfaction and turnover intention (Marsden et.al, 1992; Jonathan, Darroux and Thibeli, 2013). Studying commitment has continued since it has been shown to be consistently related to employee behaviors such as turnover, absenteeism, and performance; attitudinal, affective, and cognitive constructs such as job satisfaction, job involvement, and job tension; characteristics of the employee's job and role, and task identity; and personal characteristics of the employee such as age, gender, need for achievement, and job tenure (Lum et.al, 1998). Thus, in this research it is expected that the demographic and the major variables should be able to predict overall commitment approximately equal to each other. But, the strongest predictor of overall commitment remains job satisfaction than others.

5.4.2 The Independent Contribution of Predictor variables to the variability of overall commitment

When the separate contribution of selected socio demographic variables (Age, educational level, marital status, gender, department and work experience), job satisfaction and turnover intention is examined the findings of the study portrayed that all of these variables did not contribute at the same rate to the variability of overall organizational commitment. Out of the 24.3% variability, job satisfaction on its weight contributed to the variance in overall commitment by 22.1%. The remaining variables
contributed 2.1% to the variability of job performance. Thus, the expectation that selected socio-demographic variables and turnover intention will contribute relatively the same to the prediction of job performance of employees was not held true in the current study. This might happen due the condition of Ethio-telecom employees’ status as compared to previous studies stated (Marsden et.al, 1992; Jonathan, Darroux and Thibeli, 2013).

Having this form analysis will not suffice to make a concluding remark in generic manner without taking the findings stated above in deep perspective and also without connecting it to the reality of the organization under this research scrutiny. As MANOVA, analysis indicate to assess the relative effect of job satisfaction on components of job satisfaction, it found that there is significant relationship among job satisfaction, affective, normative and continuance commitment. As to other variables the MANOVA analysis indicates no significant effect of each IV’s on components of organizational commitment. This finding contradicts with Lum et.al, (1998) which indicate that overall satisfaction is not a cause of commitment but rather a result of it. They have suggested that commitment may be a construct that is neither simultaneous with nor a consequence of job satisfaction.

Under this notion, the current study will come to conclusion that the model of association is very complex than as previously thought and opens up many loops to scrutinize and visualize the case in-depth.
Chapter Six

6. Summary, Conclusion and Recommendation

6.1 Summary

The crucial career path that employee organizational commitment plays in organizational efficiency and effectiveness directed the present study to assess the source of variation in this wide construct across targeted variables. Job satisfaction, turnover intention and selected socio demographic variables, which are the key individual difference variables, were used to predict employee’s organizational commitment. Thus, the main aim of the study was to predict, and explain organizational commitment from job satisfaction, turnover and selected socio-demographic variables. To achieve this objective the following four research questions was raised and answered in the study:

1. Is there a significant Gender difference in job satisfaction, turnover intention and organizational commitment?

2. Is there a significant relationship among job satisfaction, selected socio-demographic variables, turnover intention and organizational commitment (affective, continuance and normative)?

3. What are the joint and separate/independent contributions of job satisfaction, socio-demographic variables and turnover intention to the variability of organizational commitment?

4. What are the effects of independent variables, job satisfaction, and turnover intention on the components of organizational commitment (Affective, continuance, and Normative)?

By employing a cross-sectional research design data was collected from 260 samples by using GJBQ instrument to measure job satisfaction, TIQ to measure turnover intention,
OCQ instrument to measure commitment questionnaire and self-prepared questionnaire was prepared and administered together with the above instruments to collect selected socio-demographic data.

To answer the first research question raised in the study, t-test was computed and it was found that gender difference happen between males and females. Hence, across the tested variables the researcher found out that there is statistical difference between males and females on measures of general commitment and normative commitment dimension. But, no statistical difference existed between male and female regarding job satisfaction and turnover intention, affective and continuance commitment.

Pearson product-moment correlation technique was used to answer the second research question and the study found that job satisfaction is positively correlated with Affective commitment, organizational commitment, age, educational status, gender and normative commitment. Similarly there is a positive relation between continuance commitment; Age and Marital status, department and educational status, age with department and educational status and Affective commitment and Department. Gender is negatively correlated with normative commitment, and department. Similarly and most importantly, job satisfaction is negatively correlated with turnover intention and same is also organizational commitment with turnover intention.

To answer the third research question multiple regression and stepwise regression analysis was computed and it was found that the joint contribution of the predictor variables in predicting the joint contribution of predictor selected socio-demographic, job satisfaction and turnover intention variables in explaining the criterion variable (organizational commitment) was significant($R^2=.243$), which means 24.3% of the variability is explained by the regression model. However, when the independent contribution of each variable is considered out of the 24.3% variability, job satisfaction on its weight contributed to the variance in overall commitment by 22.1%. when component wise effect is weighted job satisfaction is highly significant.
6.2. Conclusion

From the above findings of the study the following concluding remark can be summarized as follows:

The existence of significant difference in males and female on measures of general commitment and normative commitment dimension, but, no statistical difference existed between male and female regarding job satisfaction and turnover intention, affective and continuance commitment. This result attributed to the current status of the organization under stated in that it mainly men dominated and also the needs to be inculcating other variables to extract the actual difference between males and females. As to the non-significant resulted displayed, the contextual characteristics of the organizations shall be taken since there are no universally asserted evidences as to where the real difference lies. As to the component wise differences concerned, the normative commitment displayed by males resulted due the reason for the feeling of obligation that existed in the mind of male workers.

With regard to relational differences, as a concluding remark about the relationship about the three variables (job satisfaction, turnover intention), when employees level of job satisfaction and commitment reduced, than they will have the intention to leave. As to this study, the path of analysis indicated that when employees level of job satisfaction and the level of turnover intention increases, than this will lead to falling employees’ commitment to their organization.

As it was found that the joint contribution of the predictor variables in predicting the joint contribution of predictor selected socio-demographic, job satisfaction and turnover intention variables in explaining the criterion variable (organizational commitment), there was significant variation($R^2=0.243$), which means 24.3% of the variability is explained by the regression model. But the larger position of the variability is taken by job satisfaction when the independent contribution of each selected variables being weighted. Again the researcher went far to see how the IV is affecting to the variability of components of commitment. it was again founded that there exist significant difference across all DV’s(Affective , continuance and normative commitment).this prediction, relation and
effect, will lead us to conclusion that job satisfaction is very vital for the company’s
development of committed employees. Again, this will lead to a new way of looking at
the variables in a different manner than the linear model assessment conducted in this
research.

6.3 Recommendation

6.3.1. Theoretical and Research Recommendations

Static correlation analyses of the relationship between commitment and its presumed
antecedent still did not help to catch up the full picture. Further study yet important
discrepancies exist concerning the relative contribution of job satisfaction and
organizational commitment to the withdrawal process, suggesting the need for further
study. The results reveal a model of association which is more complex than assumed by
previous researchers. As many researchers indicate a contradicting as well as supportive
evidences across each other, regarding their stand about commitment, job satisfaction and
turnover intention, some points shall be understood before dealing with those variables
using universal way of dealing with them, as research and theory strives to propose
arguable evidences to the world of science, for one thing the nature of the three variables
might differ across industries nature operating in world, and in other way they might be
culturally bounded and the underlying reason may vary across the behavioral
characteristic of employees. Therefore, if needed to study it again with different context,
one has to fully grasp the path of relation across each other, in a cultural and contextual
manner of the organization under scrutiny. Obviously further researchers shall focus the
study of these variables in terms of path analysis and deal them in a non-linear way by
including other important factors in the study.

6.3.2. Practical recommendations

Organizations need to recognize the uniqueness of generation employees' work attitudes,
and develop appropriate talent strategies to retain, to make their job satisfied, meaningful
and motivate this new generation employees. Originality/value – The paper highlights the
new generation employees and forwards plausible suggesting the need for the turnover
reduction and job satisfaction models by integrating the perspectives of job satisfaction, career satisfaction and work commitment to make the overall commitment to be realized. As it is clearly indicated in this study there is an urge to develop affective commencement through various mechanisms. Though the normative commitment is essential for the organization, more than this commitment type, a given organization should have to inculcate affective commitment in order to maintain and spread the values and mission of its existence. Without affective qualities it is impossible to the organization to maintain its structural and organizational flavor as employees’ loss the internal driven forces that coupled with the organization prior needs. The normative qualities are the best gate ways to transform into the affective values through group formation and synergy by that the organization can change the feeling of obligation to the feeling of responsibility and service orientation to the public. As a concluding remark, managers of this organization need to foster job satisfaction and affective commitment within their organization to reduce turnover intentions.
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