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Abstract
While job satisfaction is a major concern in today’s organizations, there is little empirical research concerning Quantity Surveyors in public sector in Nigeria. Primary data were sourced through survey of Quantity Surveyors in various ministries and parastatals by adopting Job Satisfaction Questionnaire used by previous researchers to elicit information under the two headings for general satisfaction scale to indicate their satisfaction or dissatisfaction with research variables along a five-point scale. The data were subjected to descriptive statistics, this paper examined the the major variables affecting job satisfaction amongst Quantity surveyors working in Nigerian public sectors at federal level. The research revealed that Quantity Surveyors in public service are more satisfied with their when adequate recognition is given and opportunities for advancement are encouraged. The result of the correlation also showed that strong positive relationship existed between adequate recognition opportunities and feeling of accomplishment derived from the job with the r-value of 85%. The research recommended that advancement opportunity in career progression and professional development such as in-house training should be encouraged to improve quality service delivery and also practice of job development and job enrichment in the workplace which is vital tool to satisfy employees and make them happy should be given adequate attention.
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1. Introduction
Since 1959 when Herzberg, Mauser and Snyderman carried out a study on the “motivation to work”; they came up with the development of the “Two-Factor Theory of job satisfaction”. The developed theory was based on interview of over two hundred professionals specifically, accountants and engineers in Pittsburgh and Pennsylvania to determine the factors responsible for job satisfaction and dissatisfaction (Herzberg et al., 1959). This was later researched further to explore factors responsible for job dissatisfaction Herzberg (1987) and Herzberg (2003). Since after the study was conducted, organizational behaviorists and human resources researchers in both private and public sectors viewed the subject of job satisfaction to be one of the most studied work related attitudes (Bedeian, Ferris, & Kacmar, 1992; Clark 1997; Durst & DeSantis, 1997; Ellickson & Logsdon, 2001; Jung & Moon, 2007; Lewis, 1991; Ting, 1997; Wright & Kim, 2004). Kinicki, McKee-Ryan, Schriesheim, Carson, (2002) and Kreitner & Kinicki, (2007) argued that it is little wonder that over 12,000-job satisfaction studies were published by the early 1990s, the concept has been increasingly sophisticated and challenged. The concept of job satisfaction is very abstract and complex, even opined to be indescribable and mythical (Malik, 2011).

The principles underlying job satisfaction and motivation are closely related to each other, and to foster an effective and productive workplace the two concepts should not be divorced (Mowday et al., 1982; Mathieu and Zajac, 1990; Bon et al., 2001; Koy, 2001; Chen and Francesco, 2003, Greguras et al., 2004; Tziner et al., 2008). The importance of these two concepts was stressed in Loosemore, Dainty and Lingard (2003) as germane to the wellbeing of the construction industry in which the study population operates. Koy (2001), Chen and Francesco (2003) and Tziner et al. (2008) asserted that the relative success of organizations has been tied to the two motivational constructs of work satisfaction and organizational commitment. Garcia-Bernal et al. (2005) in their study of job satisfaction with respect to gender differences argued that with job satisfaction perceived to be
a pre-condition for competitive levels of quality to be recorded and for organization to be successful then employee satisfaction should be cardinal to organizational objective.

The main aim of this paper is to identify the major variables affecting job satisfaction amongst Quantity surveyors working in Nigerian public sectors at federal level and the specific objectives include; to investigate the impact of job satisfaction on Quantity Surveyors performance; the motivating factors that enhances organisational commitment, the relationship that exists between job satisfaction and organisational commitment on the satisfaction derived from work. Many research have evolved or been carried out on job satisfaction or performance of professionals operating within the construction industry and various industries (Chileshe and Haupt, 2007; Bowen et al., 2008; 2009) very few of them are within the African context as the majority of the researches focuses on the developed countries. This research becomes necessary because many Quantity surveyors in Nigerian Federal ministries and Parastatals are getting disenchanted with lack of recognition or professional encroachments being experienced within their organisation. A typical instance to buttress this submission was statements credited to a sitting minister of works and transport Ogunlewe (2005) in a public hearing on due process and procurement bill submitted that “We are talking of Due Process, shouting Due Process. What is Due Process? In the Federal Ministry of Works where I preside as the Minister, I don’t believe there is anything that is Due Process. How can there be Due Process when the Engineer designs the roads, estimates the costs of the roads, selects the contractor, constructs the roads, supervises the construction, recommends payment for works done, approves the payment, certifies the quality and quality of work! All these by one person! Haba! This cannot be Due Process. Not until roles are assigned to relevant professionals like the Quantity Surveyors to be in charge of cost and cost management of roads and highways, can there be any Due Process in Federal Ministry of Works.”

Also Adebola (2006) posited that “I also know from experience, especially in the public service, that most Quantity Surveyors are becoming despair about the manner in which Quantity Surveying is being excluded from the highway sector”. Infrastructure Concession Regulatory Commission (Establishment etc) Act 2005 and the Public Procurement Act 2007 have Quantity Surveying profession totally excluded as a player within the acts, all of these make quantity surveyors get disillusioned and when workers are not happy it may be difficult to offer their best. Patterson et al. (2004) reported that research in European countries and the U.S. suggests that individual job satisfaction can be a strong predictor of job performance and productivity.

Thus, it becomes highly imperative to have an understanding of what variables lead to key increases in work satisfaction and organizational commitment (Westover et al., 2010) and to empowers employers to make workplace adjustments that will raise the motivation levels and ultimately the performance of their workers (westover et al., 2010).

2. Concept of Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction is viewed as an attitude that relates to overall attitudes towards life, or life satisfaction (e.g., Tait et al., 1989; Ilies et al., 2009) as well as to service quality (Schneider and Bowen, 1985; Hartline and Ferrell, 1996). Duffy and Richard (2006) while carrying out their research across six major specialties among physicians opined that exploring the prediction of job satisfaction is extensive and stressed further that recently, theorists have proposed that job satisfaction may be equally affected by issues related to work and by personality characteristics.

Tovey and Adams (1999) reported that relevant dimensions of job satisfaction appear to be situational and depending on the particular characteristics of the work environment and on the period in which the studies took place. Job satisfaction has been included in more than 50 studies of job insecurity (Sverke et al., 2006). Jobs provide many sources of satisfaction. They ensure economic stability, provide social interaction, and offer reinforcement contingencies that enhance self efficacy (De Witte, 1999).

3. Previous Research on Job Satisfaction

Chileshe and Haupt (2007) and Bowen et al., (2008; 2009) classified previous researches conducted on job satisfaction and on workers in general fall into the following categories:

- Prediction of psychological wellbeing in terms of workers health and job satisfaction (Clark, 1997; Loosemore et al., 2003; Love and Edwards; 2005; Wright et al., 2007).)
- Impact of corporate wellness on stress, satisfaction and absenteeism (Ho, 1997)
- Linkages between organizational networking and cultural organizing (Fletcher, 2002)
Impact of age on job satisfaction (Rhodes, 1983; Luthans and Thomas, 1989; Holden and Black, 1996; Hickson and Oshagbemi, 1999; Oshagbemi, 2000; Eskildsen et al., 2003 Okpara, 2004; Moyes et al., 2006)
- Linkages between customer satisfaction and service workers perceived control (Yagil, 2002)
- Barriers to empowerment (Greasley et al. 2005; Holt et al., 2005)
- Assessment of universal forms of work commitment (Freund and Carmeli, 2003)
- Testing the applicability of Herzberg's two-factor theory (Bassett-Jones and Lloyd, 2005; Ruthankoon and Ogunlana; 2003).
- Relevance of job satisfaction and how it impacts the physical and mental well being of employees (Oshagbemi 2000a)
- The linkages between the length of service in employment and satisfaction have also been examined in the academia related organizations (Oshagbemi, 2000b)
- Leadership style (Rad and Yarmohammadian, 2006);
- Work characteristics and characteristics of the work environment (Irvine and Evans, 1995);
- Job security or insecurity (Yousef, 1998; Reisel et al., 2007)
- Disability and workplace characteristics (Uppal, 2005);
- Adverse working conditions (Bockerman and Ilmakunnas, 2006);
- Size of business (Davis, 2004); and
- Socio- and racio-ethnic differences in perceptions (Sloane and Williams, 2000; Friday and Friday, 2003; Friday et al., 2004).
- Public service motivation (Leonard, 2008)
- Job satisfaction among construction professionals (Bowen et al., 2007; Bowen, 2008; 2009; Chileshe and Haupt, 2007)

Not all findings are conclusive, with contradictory findings being reported (Koustelios, 2001) and therefore, more research are required to unfold events in every areas of human endeavors.

Moynihan and Pandey (2007) submitted that in the area of work motivation it is expected that organizations will have greatest influence over job satisfaction, less influence over employee commitment, and the least influence over employee involvement.

4. Factors Influencing Job Satisfaction

According to Rue and Byars (2005) it was viewed that job satisfaction leads to an increased commitment to one’s organization and Jernigan and Beggs (2010) concluded that more substantial attention has to be given to the relationship that exists between organizational commitment and job satisfaction, which may generate findings that may be useful in developing the understanding of the links between satisfaction and management substitutes. Gautam; Mandal and Dalal (2006) argued that job satisfaction of an employee either in public or private organization is a topic that has received considerable attention by researchers and managers alike and Roznowski & Hulin (1992) reported that the most essential information to have regarding an employee in an organization is a validated measure of his/her level of job satisfaction

Therefore, work conditions was found to be the most influential on the job satisfaction and that public employees turnover intentions were more of intrinsic nonmonetary characteristics of their work, such as good social relationships with coworkers and supervisors, promotion opportunities, professional development opportunities, and participatory management strategies (Emmert & Taher, 1992; DeLeon & Taher, 1996; Kim, 2002, Ellickson, 2002; Wright & Davis, 2003; Kim, 2004; Borzaga & Tortia, 2006). Also, there is a string in some literature that corroborated the assertion of the earlier authors that job satisfaction scores can explain employees’ intentions to quit or actual quits (Ward and Sloane, 2000; Clark, 2001; Shields and Price, 2002; García-Serrano, 2004; Kristensen and Westergård- Nielsen, 2004; Sousa-Poza and Henneberger, 2004; Delfgaauw, 2007; Lévy-Garboua et al., 2007.

Although some scholars reported that public employees do have acceptable levels of job satisfaction, burnout among other things was found to be a major threat in public organizations. This is rooted in the submission of (Naff & Crum, 1999; Kamdron, 2005) that there is evidence that Permanent status with respect to nature of appointment of employees is negatively related to the job satisfaction of public employees.
Ting (1997) assertion that interpersonal relations are imperative to job satisfaction reiterated the report of Khojasteh (1993), Kim (2002) in his research carried out to examining the relationship between participative management and job satisfaction reported that more inclusive and participatory styles of management also foster increased job satisfaction. These earlier arguments was also buttressed by Ellickson (2002) who also found that the sense of esprit de corps as used my military people was the most influential predictor of job satisfaction in his sample of municipal employees, whereas Steijn (2004) opined in his research on Human resource management and job satisfaction in the Dutch public sector that organizational climate was important in predicting job satisfaction. In another research carried by Cummings (2007) among IT workers indicated that working conditions/ work environment, the corporate culture, job peers, and the challenge derived from the job itself are the top rated factors capable of influencing job satisfaction.

5. Effects of Job Satisfaction or Dissatisfaction

With respect to previous research findings reported in (George, 1992; George & Jones, 2008; Ghazzawi, 2008-b; Ghazzawi & Smith, 2009; Judge & Locke, 1993; Robbins and Judge, 2009; Rue & Byars, 2005) the consequences of job satisfaction includes: organizational commitment; organizational citizenship behavior (OCB), and employee well-being. However; the consequences of job dissatisfaction was also highlighted which are: absenteeism; turnover intentions, and turnover (George, 1992; George & Jones, 2008; Ghazzawi, 2008-b; Ghazzawi & Smith, 2009; Judge & Locke, 1993; Robbins and Judge, 2009). Mathieu and Zajac (1990) suggested that the higher performance, the greater satisfaction derived and the lower the turnover intention of workers, therefore, low levels of organizational commitment may be dysfunctional not only to the organization but also to the individual, while high levels of organizational commitment may have positive effects on both the organization and the employee.

6. Organizational Commitment

Allen and Meyer (1990) classified organizational commitment into three basic elements. The three component of organizational commitment includes affective, continuance and normative as the three dimensions of organizational commitment. He viewed affective commitment as the employee’s emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the organization. The continuance component refers to commitment based on the costs that the employee associates with leaving the organization. The normative component refers to the employee’s feeling of obligation to remain with the organization.

Schwepker (2001) reported previous researches in his study of ethical climate’s relationship to job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intention in the salesforce and it was viewed that organizational commitment acts as a “psychological bond” to the organization that inspires individuals to act in ways that are harmonious with the concerns of the organization. Zeinabadi (2010) reported that “Organizational commitment is the strength of an individual’s identification and involvement in a particular organization as characterized by a strong belief in and acceptance of the organization’s goals and values (value commitment) along with a readiness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization and to remain a member (commitment to stay ) (p. 999)”

7. Role Clarity, Job Characteristics and Self Efficacy

Ting (1997) found that clarity of tasks leads to greater job satisfaction among workers. Role clarity provides a sense of purpose and increases the individual’s belief that the goal is achievable individually and collectively. Greater role clarity will create employees who are more satisfied with, committed to, and involved in their work. Job characteristics are aspects of the individual employee’s job and tasks that shape how the individual perceives his or her particular role in the organization. Goal theory suggests that goals that are both specific and difficult to achieve lead to higher performance than goals that tend to be easy or ambiguous (Locke & Latham, 1990).

Bandura (1986) viewed self-efficacy as the judgments of individuals regarding their ability to organize and perform daily works required to obtain successful performance. O’Neill and Mone (1998), Krishnan et al. (2002), Zellars (2001) and Karatepe et al (2006) submitted that that there is a positive correlation and direct relationship between self-efficacy and effort. Bradley and Roberts (2004) reported that self-efficacy is capable of increasing the job satisfaction of self-employed individuals. McFarland and Buehler, (1995) also opined that self-efficacy is an individual construct and that it can also be affected by group-level effects such as group-efficacy. Therefore, project team members who believe that they can contribute project success by sharing knowledge will develop greater positive willingness to contribute to share knowledge (Lin, 2007) and this is line with the assertion of Wasko and Faraji (2005) that self-efficacy can help motivate individuals to share knowledge with colleagues. Knowledge self-efficacy reveals in people confidence that their knowledge can help to solve problem of organization and increase work efficacy (Luthans, 2003).
8. Research Methods
The research adopted survey method its approach using questionnaire as the main tools for exploring the opinions of the sample of Quantity Surveyors in Nigerian Federal Civil Service with respect to job satisfaction and job commitment. Well structured questionnaire previously used by Bright (2008) and Moynihan and Pandey (2007) which identified job satisfaction and job/organisational commitment was used for the data collection and the survey involved a random selection of potential participants from the available Quantity Surveyors in the study area. The target population for this research is the registered Quantity surveyors (QS) working in the Nigerian Public service. This is on the premise that registered QSs have the opportunity of crystallizing their ambition elsewhere or go into private practice. The questionnaires were self administered during the annual meeting of Quantity surveyors working in Government ministries and parastatals. Due to a large number of the population size of all Registered Quantity Surveyors in the Nigerian Public Service, the sampling frame was delimited to all Federal Ministries, Parastatals and Agencies within the Federal Capital Territory, Abuja.

The study employed Non-probabilistic sample of Seventy five (75) Registered Quantity Surveyors in the employment of Nigeria’s public service were administered with the questionnaires, Sixty (61) numbers of the questionnaires were returned by the respondents. This was adopted because of non availability of comprehensive list of registered Quantity surveyors in the public service within the Federal Capital Territory, Abuja.

The respondents were given statements and were asked to assess the importance of these factors on a 5 – point Likert scale. The respondents were asked to score on a scale of 1 to 5, the level of agreement with the statements as it relates to working in the Nigerian Public Service using 1 for strongly disagree, 2 disagree, 3 neutral, 4 for agree and 5 for strongly agree. The data sourced were analyze using basic descriptive statistics (Pearson Correlations, standard Deviations, means) to explore the relationship between Job satisfaction and organizational commitment.

9. Reliability Test
Reliability has to do with the accuracy and precision of measurement procedure (Cooper and Emory, 1995). Sekaran (2003) opined that Cronbach’s alpha is a reliability coefficient that reflects how well the items in a set are positively correlated to one another. Sekaran (2003) argue further that a study is only reliable only if another researcher, using the same procedure and studying the same phenomenon, arrives at similar or compatible findings. Therefore, Cooper and Emory (1995) submitted that the scientific requirements of a research call for measurement process to be reliable and valid. Sekaran (2005) argued that if the cronbach’s alpha reliability test result is less than 0.6, it thus mean that the instrument used has low reliability and therefore gives room for some errors but if the alpha value is within 0.7, the instrument is reliable.

Hence, the internal consistency reliability coefficients for the scaled employed by this is 0.85 for job satisfaction and 0.9 for job commitment, which is above the level of 0.7 posited by sekaran (2005) as acceptable for the purpose of analysis.

10. Results and Analysis
The tables showed the mean value, standard deviation as well as skewness and kurtosis results. Curran, West, and Finch (1995) as cited in Bright (2008) suggested that data could be said to be in excellent condition if skewness ranges is fewer than 2 and kurtosis ranges fewer than 7.

Table1 showed the descriptive analysis result of Job Satisfaction and the results of the analysis affirmed the assertion of the authors, thus the result is good enough for the research. Recognition of opportunities was ranked first with mean value (Mean=3.803, SD=0.128), advancement opportunities was ranked second with mean value (Mean=3.314, SD=0.787), level of responsibility on the job was ranked third with mean value (Mean=3.294, SD=1.026) and Opportunities for achievement was ranked fourth with mean value (Mean=3.255, SD=0.796). The views of respondents were based on the impact of these variables on Job satisfaction, the respondents were asked if they were satisfied with the work at all in all, this showed mean value of (Mean=3.75, SD=0.896). High mean values showed that quantity surveyors are satisfied with their work and high standard deviation denoted dissatisfaction; therefore, quantity surveyors would be more satisfied with their job if their work and efforts are more recognized.

Table 2 showed the descriptive analysis result of Organizational Commitment within the organization and the results from the table was in tune with the results shown in table1. From the table, Feeling of accomplishment from the Job exhibited the highest ranking with mean value (Mean=3.784, SD=0.966), the organization deserving Loyalty was ranked second with a mean value (Mean=3.549, SD=1.045, getting praised for doing a good job was ranked third with of (Mean=3.412, SD=0.92) mean value and having sense of obligation to people...
within an organisation was ranked last with (mean= 3.294, SD=0.901). The respondents view was based on the impact of the variables on Organisation commitment.

From table 3 and the result of analysis carried out to test whether there was significant relationship among the variables tested; Pearson’s (r) correlation was calculated. The correlation coefficient for the data revealed that variables tested were significantly related. The result of the correlation between job satisfaction and job commitment variables are significant at 1 and 5% respectively. The significance of the relationship was demonstrated by correlation between opportunities for achievement and owing a great deal to the organisation with the values of $r=+0.499$, $p<0.01$. Also, correlation between recognition opportunities and feeling of accomplishment derived from the job show the values of $r=+0.855$, $p<0.01$. Hikkel, Wiersma and Jurs (1998) as cited in Oyewobi et al (2011) recommended that correlation in the range of 70% (0.70) to 90 % (0.90) is high and 50%(.50) to 70% (.70) is moderate. This rule is pertinent in this respect since r- value is used in determining the strength of the relationship, which indicates that an increase in one variable give rise to a corresponding increase in the other (Love, 2002). Thus, the correlation between opportunities for achievement and owing a great deal to the organization is high because 50% approximately means that there is a positive moderate correlation between the variables. Therefore, as the opportunities for achievement slopes from left to the right, owing a great deal to the organization variation also increases.

The correlation analysis also revealed that the level of responsibilities and the praise gotten for doing a good job are significantly related, $r=+0.590$, $p<0.01$. However, the r (59.0) value is moderate considering the rule stated above, which means the more occurrence of the level of responsibilities, there is going to be increase in praise of doing a good job.

11. Discussion of Results

The result of the analysis revealed that Quantity Surveyors are more likely to be satisfied and motivated with their job if they are given adequate recognition and more opportunities to advance in their career. This is supported by Kreitner and Kinicki (2007) who argued that value is positively associated with Job Satisfaction. Thus Quantity surveyors in Public service motivator for job satisfaction are intrinsic since it involves the expectation that work should be satisfying irrespective of the pay or compensation (George and Jenes, 2008). Draflke and Kossen (2002) was of the opinion that many workers experience satisfaction when they believe that their future prospects are bright and good and this may according to Bull (2005) “translate into opportunities for advancement and growth in their current workplace, or enhance the chance of finding alternative employment”. It was stressed further that if people feel they have limited opportunities or chance for career advancement in any organization, their job satisfaction may decrease which consequently may lead to job turnover.

The result of the correlation analysis showed that positive relationships exist amongst the variables of job satisfaction and job commitment tested. The researcher choose to correlate the two factors in line with the submission of Udo et al. (1997) that job satisfaction and organisational commitment are both reflecting a positive evaluation of the job. Strong relationship existed between recognition opportunities and feeling of accomplishment among the Quantity surveyors in the federal civil service. Other variables tested exhibited moderate positive relationship.

This indicated that Quantity surveyors are more committed to their jobs when adequate opportunities for advancement and achievement with due recognition. Guleryuz, Guney, Aydin and Asan (2008) in their research carried out among nurses which focused on investigate the relation among emotional intelligence, job satisfaction, organisational commitment and the mediating effect of job satisfaction between emotional intelligence and organisational commitment submitted significant relationship existed between job satisfaction and organisational commitment. Lum et al., (1998); Cohen and Hudacek,(1998) and Becker et al, (1996) asserted that lack of organisational commitment has detrimental effects such as increase in turnover rate and turnover intention; higher absenteeism and tardiness; poorer performance which are affecting organisational efficiency and effectiveness negatively.

12. Conclusions

After examining the effects on Job Satisfaction and job commitment among Quantity Surveyors in the Nigerian Public Service, the research work concludes thus; Quantity surveyors in Nigerian public service enjoy their job when adequate recognitions are given. Enhancement of job satisfaction with advancement opportunities and professional development has significant effect on Quantity Surveyors in Nigerian public service.

Quantity surveyors in Nigerian public service are more satisfied with their job when there is clarity of job as planned goals, objectives and having the chance to work alone. Role clarity plays an important role to commit
employees to their jobs. The findings revealed that strong positive correlation do exist between variables of job satisfaction and job commitment. This implies that Quantity surveyors in the Nigerian public service are more committed to their job when they derive more satisfaction in their job.

13. Recommendations

From the conclusions, the following recommendations were made; adequate recognition of the work Quantity surveyors in the public service should be fully appreciated and encroachment by other professionals should be highly discouraged. Advancement opportunity in career progression and professional development such as in-house training should be encouraged to improve quality service delivery and also practice of job development and job enrichment in the workplace which is vital tool to satisfy employees and make them happy should be given adequate attention. The work to be done by Quantity surveyors should have clear goals, objectives and interference by other professionals should be checked. It is important that Government involve quantity surveyors in their goals’ formulation process as these goals directly affect their performance within the organization. In the same vein, an apt performance feedback on employees’ progress is highly necessary to achieve the required performance expected from them and rewards. If quantity surveyors in the Nigerian public service are to be committed to their job, all aspects of job satisfaction should be taken care of that is the affective, continuance and normative.

It is important to note that this research only considered registered Quantity surveyors in the Federal Ministries and parastatals, so the result should be cautiously considered and probably replicated since it was only relationship between job satisfaction and organizational/job commitment that was focused and not the fundamental connections among the variables considered.
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Table 1. Job satisfaction variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>standard Error</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>skewness</th>
<th>kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Satisfaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All in all, I am satisfied with my job.</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td>0.868</td>
<td>-1.806</td>
<td>1.109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACH How satisfied are you with your opportunities for</td>
<td>3.255</td>
<td>0.112</td>
<td>0.796</td>
<td>-0.251</td>
<td>-0.908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>achievement?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC How satisfied are you with your recognition</td>
<td>3.803</td>
<td>0.128</td>
<td>0.917</td>
<td>-1.374</td>
<td>2.372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opportunities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RES How satisfied are you with your level of responsibility on your job?</td>
<td>3.294</td>
<td>0.144</td>
<td>1.026</td>
<td>-0.399</td>
<td>-1.116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEN How satisfied are you with the meaningfulness of your job?</td>
<td>3.275</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>1.002</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>-1.651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADV How satisfied are you with your advancement</td>
<td>3.314</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.787</td>
<td>-0.629</td>
<td>-1.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opportunities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Organisational commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>standard Error</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>skewness</th>
<th>kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Commitment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This organization deserves my loyalty.</td>
<td>3.549</td>
<td>0.146</td>
<td>1.045</td>
<td>-2.049</td>
<td>2.431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would not leave my organization right now because</td>
<td>3.294</td>
<td>0.126</td>
<td>0.901</td>
<td>-1.142</td>
<td>0.464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a sense of obligation to the people in it.</td>
<td>3.392</td>
<td>0.119</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>-0.461</td>
<td>-0.826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I owe a great deal to my organization.</td>
<td>3.784</td>
<td>0.135</td>
<td>0.966</td>
<td>-1.209</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The feeling of accomplishment I get from the job</td>
<td>3.412</td>
<td>0.129</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>-0.611</td>
<td>-1.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The praise I get for doing a good job</td>
<td>3.255</td>
<td>0.142</td>
<td>1.017</td>
<td>-0.052</td>
<td>-0.742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The way my co-workers get along with each other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Correlation between Job satisfaction and Job Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ACH</th>
<th>REC</th>
<th>RES</th>
<th>MEN</th>
<th>ADV</th>
<th>LOY</th>
<th>OBL</th>
<th>OWE</th>
<th>ACO</th>
<th>PRS</th>
<th>REL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACH</strong></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REC</strong></td>
<td>0.398**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RES</strong></td>
<td>0.191</td>
<td>-0.235</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEN</strong></td>
<td>0.136</td>
<td>0.147</td>
<td>0.407**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADV</strong></td>
<td>0.253</td>
<td>0.336*</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.244</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOY</strong></td>
<td>0.357*</td>
<td>0.407**</td>
<td>-0.247</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>-0.092</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OBL</strong></td>
<td>0.451**</td>
<td>0.604**</td>
<td>-0.052</td>
<td>0.263</td>
<td>0.347*</td>
<td>0.505**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OWE</strong></td>
<td>0.499**</td>
<td>0.28*</td>
<td>-0.043</td>
<td>-0.050</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.405**</td>
<td>0.342*</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACO</strong></td>
<td>0.307*</td>
<td>0.855**</td>
<td>-0.339</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>0.222</td>
<td>0.377**</td>
<td>0.534**</td>
<td>0.324*</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRS</strong></td>
<td>0.146</td>
<td>-0.021</td>
<td>0.59**</td>
<td>0.417**</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0.155</td>
<td>0.116</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>-0.146</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REL</strong></td>
<td>0.231</td>
<td>0.502**</td>
<td>0.331*</td>
<td>0.570</td>
<td>0.372**</td>
<td>0.264</td>
<td>0.559**</td>
<td>0.201</td>
<td>0.396**</td>
<td>0.404**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).