



Job satisfaction and organisational commitment in a South African airline

Lucia Govender

UNISA: Industrial and Organisational Psychology Department

Tel: +27 12 429 6431

E-mail: govenlm@unisa.ac.za

and

*Prof Sonja Grobler

D.Com Industrial and Organisational Psychology

UNISA: Industrial and Organisational Psychology Department

Tel: +27 12 429 8272

E-mail: grobbs@unisa.ac.za

*Corresponding author

Abstract

Job satisfaction is a prognosticator of organizational commitment. One can thus presume that if employees feel fulfilled in the job they are doing in an airline company, their organizational commitment is good and they are likely to remain with the company for an extended period of time. The aim of this study was to investigate the relationship between job satisfaction and organisational commitment for different age groups in an airline company. Organisations are constantly seeking to gain advantage over their competitors in order to improve their performance, while maintaining and retaining a healthy workforce. An able, committed and loyal workforce includes employees who are satisfied with their work environment and who are consequently motivated to continue their relationship with the organisation. Although several studies have been conducted to investigate the relationship between job satisfaction and organisational commitment internationally and locally, studies conducted in the specific context of an airline are limited. The empirical and theoretical results indicated that a significant positive relationship does exist between the facets of job satisfaction and the components of organisational commitment. Significant differences were found to exist for specific age groups in relation to job satisfaction and organisational commitment.

Keywords: Job satisfaction, commitment, airline industry, generational differences.

Introduction

Job satisfaction and organisational commitment are considered to be important job-related attitudes and are often researched in various work environments and from different perspectives. Lumley, Coetzee, Tladinyane and Ferreira (2011) found that positive relationships exist between job satisfaction facets and the affective commitment component in the information technology environment. Eslami and Gharakhani (2012) found that three facets of job satisfaction (promotions, personal relationships and favourable conditions of work) have positive and significant relationships with organisational commitment.

The present study focused on investigating the relationship between job satisfaction and organisational commitment in the technical department of a selected airline in South



Africa. Spector's (1997) Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS), consisting of nine facets, and Meyer, Allen and Smith's (1993) Three Component Model (TCM) Employee Commitment Survey, were used in this study. The nine facets of job satisfaction, according to Spector (1997), are pay; promotion; supervision; fringe benefits; contingent rewards; operating conditions; co-workers; nature of work; and communication. The three components of employee commitment according to Meyer, Allen and Smith (1993) are affective, continuance and normative commitment.

Affective commitment (AC) is basically the positive emotion employees voluntarily have towards their employer where they affectively and resolutely commit to organisational the goals. Continuance commitment (CC) represents an awareness by the employee of the costs related with them ever leaving the organization. Normative commitment (NC) designates a sense of responsibility to continue in the employ of the organisation based on a sense of obligation. Meyer and Allen (cited in Dereli, 2006) assert that the three components of commitment are not intricately linked with each other since an employee can, simultaneously be committed to an airline in varying degrees in either an affective, normative and also a continuance sense (Dereli, 2006).

Human capital is an essential part of any organisation, their skills and expertise are indispensable resources, and their capabilities can assist the organisation to achieve a competitive advantage (Amankwah-Amoah & Debrah, 2011). According to Amankwah-Amoah and Debrah, (2011) the loss of a key employee constitutes a loss of competitive assets. Organisations are constantly seeking to gain advantage over their competitors and to improve their performance, while maintaining and retaining a healthy workforce (Castro & Martins, 2010). An able, committed and loyal workforce includes employees who are satisfied with their work environment and who are consequently motivated to continue their relationship with the organisation (Roos & Van Eeden, 2008).

This study aimed to investigate the relationship between job satisfaction and organisational commitment in a South African airline for different age groups. Knowledge gained from the study may be useful in strategic planning decisions such as recruitment, recognition and reward, operating procedures, promotion, supervision, teamwork and retention of employees.

Studies on job satisfaction and organisational commitment in the specific context of an airline are limited. According to the document Airlines in South Africa (2016), airline alliances such as codeshare agreements and partnerships can significantly increase a competitor's size, merely through association, creating fierce competition amongst members of rival alliances. The key resource for competing organisations in global markets is the human capital necessary to respond to the changing realities in the global economy (The Economist, 2006).

Research question

The study investigated the relationship between job satisfaction and organisational commitment within a South African airline for different age groups.

The research questions for this study were as follows:



- How are the facets of job satisfaction related to organisational commitment?
- How do different age groups experience job satisfaction and organisational commitment?

Literature review

Job satisfaction

Locke (1976) provided one of the earliest definitions of job satisfaction, which stated that it is a pleasurable state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experiences. Job satisfaction was further conceptualised in theories of work motivation by Maslow (1943), Vroom (1964) and Herzberg, Mausner and Snyderman (1959). Perspectives of job satisfaction include the affective perspective (Locke 1969), referring to the positive emotional state which is experienced by individuals when evaluating their job or job experiences; the person-environment perspective (Dawis & Lofquist, 1993), which refers to job satisfaction as an attitude resulting from the correspondence between the individual's abilities and the requirements of the job; and the dispositional perspective (Staw & Cohen-Charash, 2005), which views job satisfaction as the reflection of a biologically based trait predisposing individuals to focus on positive or negative life aspects. The current study is based on the facet approach to job satisfaction, which states that job facets are those individual components that comprise and contribute to one's experiences in the workplace, such as autonomy, co-workers, pay and promotions (Locke 1969, 1976).

Mafini, Surujlal and Dhurup (2013) found significant correlations between job loyalty and five job satisfaction facets, namely ability utilisation, autonomy, creativity, teamwork and working conditions. Their findings imply that in order to improve job loyalty, the emphasis should be placed on positively adjusting the five job satisfaction facets. Positive relationships were established between job satisfaction and remuneration, quality of work life, supervision and teamwork (Braun, Peus, Weisweiler & Frey, 2013; Mafini & Dlodlo, 2014). Employees' perceptions of inter-organisational and intra-organisational career mobility opportunities were found to be significantly related to job satisfaction (Joao & Coetzee, 2011), while opportunities for promotion were found to have a significant influence on job satisfaction (Kosteas 2011; Stumpf & Tymon Jr., 2012).

Fringe benefits as well as extrinsic and intrinsic rewards were found to be positively related to job satisfaction (Artz, 2010; Hofmans, De Gieter & Pepermans, 2013). Job satisfaction was found to be positively related to co-worker relationships (Lin & Lin 2011), autonomy, challenging work and independence (Aletaris, 2010; Bontis *et al.*, 2011; Millán, Hessels, Thurik & Aguado, 2013). Abugre (2011), Giri and Kumar (2010) and Tourani and Rast (2012) found direct and significant positive relationships between communication and job satisfaction.

Organisational commitment

Porter, Steers, Mowday and Boulian (1974) provided one of the earliest definitions of organisational commitment as the strength of an individual's involvement in a particular organisation. This type of commitment has three basic characteristics, which are the individual's strong belief in and acceptance of the organisation's goals and values, a



willingness to exercise effort on behalf of the organisation, and an absolute desire to maintain organisational goals (Porter *et al.*, 1974). Meyer and Allen's (1997) view of organisational commitment was one of a psychological connection that employees have with their organisation, characterised by a strong identification with the organisation and a desire to contribute to the accomplishment of organisational goals. Organisational commitment is conceptualised as consisting of three core components, namely affective, continuance and normative commitment (Meyer & Allen, 1991).

Joáo and Coetzee (2012) found that younger employees regarded their career advancement as important for their career mobility, as well as organisational commitment. According to Joáo and Coetzee (2012), talent retention strategies should incorporate the need for intra-organisational career mobility, work-life balance, knowledge and skills utilisation, and competitive compensation. Van Dyk and Coetzee (2012) revealed that staff satisfaction with retention factors had a significant relationship with their organisational commitment. Participants' intention to leave or stay with their current company was a highly significant predictor of their affective commitment, continuance commitment and normative commitment (Van Dyk & Coetzee, 2012).

A study conducted by Iqbal (2010) to investigate the relationship between demographic factors (age, tenure and level of education) and organisational commitment indicated that length of service is significantly related to organisational commitment, with managers and supervisors being more committed than workers. Positive relationships have been found between affective commitment and employee well-being (Meyer & Maltin, 2010). According to Gilbert, De Winne and Sels (2011) found that the enactment of human resource practices and effective relationship-oriented leadership behaviour can enhance employees' affective commitment.

Job satisfaction and organisational commitment

Lumley *et al.* (2011) found significant relationships between job satisfaction and affective and normative commitment. These positive associations suggest that employees who are satisfied with the facets of job satisfaction seem to feel more emotionally attached to and involved in their respective organisations. Positive relationships were found between job satisfaction and affective, continuance and normative commitment (Aydogdu & Asikgil, 2011; Yücel, 2012).

According to Zeinabadi (2010) job satisfaction is an antecedent of organisational commitment, with commitment being a more global response to an organisation, whereas job satisfaction was considered to be more of a response to a specific job or facet of the job. Markovitz, Davis, Fay and Van Dick (2010) found that when extrinsic and intrinsic satisfaction increase, public sector (organisational environments that are typically bureaucratic, with standardised procedures) employees tend to develop a stronger affective and normative commitment towards their organisations, compared to private sector (environments where employees are more rational in their employment attitudes, beliefs and choices, and know what is offered in return for their work and what to expect from management) employees (Markovitz *et al.*, 2010).



Research approach

The research approach was quantitative in nature and used primary numerical data. A cross-sectional survey design was used and primary data was collected at a specific point in time in order to achieve the objectives of the research.

Research participants

The sample consisted of 245 participants from the technical section of a South African airline. The total population from which the sample was extracted consisted of approximately 2500 employees. The sample represented about 10% of the population, and the sampling method used for this study was non-probability convenience sampling (Terre Blanche, Durrheim & Painter, 2006).

Organisational operational requirements and logistics posed challenges in terms of targeting and obtaining the sample, which resulted in 245 respondents completing the questionnaire. Gender was not considered due to the workforce being predominantly male. The questionnaire contained a biographical section, in order to obtain information concerning the characteristics of the participants, which would be used in the comparison of data. Descriptive statistics for the participants are presented in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Characteristics of participants in the sample (N=245)

Item	Category	Frequency	Percentage
Age Group (Years)	Under 20	1	0.41%
	20-30	124	50.61%
	30-40	51	20.82%
	40-50	36	14.69%
	50-60	25	10.20%
	Over 60	8	3.27%
Job Tenure (Years)	0-5	127	51.84%
	5-10	17	6.94%
	10-15	32	13.06%
	15-20	23	9.39%
	20-25	18	7.35%
	25-30	3	1.22%
	Over 30	25	10.20%
Job Level	Senior Management	2	0.82%
	Middle Management	32	13.06%
	Skilled Technical	122	49.80%
	General Worker	89	36.33%

Table 1 indicates that most of the participants were between 20-30 years old (50.61%), 51.84% had 0 to 5 years working experience within this company and 49.80% of participants are in the skilled technical occupational level.



Measuring instruments

Job Satisfaction

The Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) (Spector, 1997) was used in the study to assess the nine facets of job satisfaction, namely: pay; promotion; supervision; fringe benefits; contingent rewards; operating conditions, co-workers; nature of work; and communication. The JSS scale consists of four items for each of the nine sub-scales mentioned, with a total of 36 items. The JSS response format is a six-point Likert scale. Based on a sample of 2870 participants, the internal consistency reliabilities (Cronbach coefficient alpha) were established as follows: pay ($\alpha=0.75$); promotion ($\alpha=0.73$); supervision ($\alpha=0.82$); fringe benefits ($\alpha=0.73$); contingent rewards ($\alpha=0.76$); operating procedures ($\alpha=0.62$); co-workers ($\alpha=0.60$); nature of work ($\alpha=0.78$) and communication ($\alpha=0.71$) (Spector 1985).

The JSS is freely available for non-commercial, educational and research purposes, on condition that results are shared with the developer (Spector 1997).

Organisational Commitment

The revised version of the Three Component Model (TCM) Employee Commitment Survey (Meyer, Allen & Smith, 1993) was used in this study to measure organisational commitment. This survey consists of six items for each of the three dimensions of organisational commitment, namely: affective commitment, continuance commitment and normative commitment, with a total of 24 items. The TCM Employee Commitment Survey response format is a seven-point Likert scale. The scale can be reduced to a five-point scale, which works equally well (Meyer, Allen & Smith, 1993).

The seven-point Likert scale was reduced to a five-point scale for this study. With regard to the internal consistency reliability of the TCM Employee Commitment Survey, the following Cronbach's alphas were reported: affective commitment ($\alpha=0.82$); continuance commitment ($\alpha=0.74$) and normative commitment ($\alpha=0.83$) (Meyer, Allen & Smith, 1993).

A free academic version of the TCM Employee Commitment Survey is available for research purposes only.

This study focused on the relationship between job satisfaction and organisational commitment, and due to the correlational nature of the study, the JSS and Organisational Commitment scale were reduced to a five-point Likert-type scale, with 1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree.

Statistical analysis

The raw data was captured onto an Excel spreadsheet and imported into SAS (2012) for data analysis. The data was cleaned (missing values casewise deleted) and verified to ensure that it was correct and useful. Descriptive statistics which included the mean, standard deviation, range of scores, skewness and kurtosis were used to describe the variables and to determine the distribution of the data.

Internal consistency reliability was measured using the Cronbach's co-efficient alpha. Internal consistency refers to the degree to which the items that make up the scale are all



measuring the same underlying attribute (Tredoux & Durrheim, 2013). A Cronbach alpha value between 0.6 and 0.8 is considered acceptable, and a value above 0.8 is considered good in terms of reliability (Tredoux & Durrheim, 2013).

This particular study was based on the relationship between variables. Therefore, inferential statistical analysis involved determining correlations using the Pearson correlation co-efficient (r). Correlation analysis is used to describe the strength and direction of the linear relationship between two variables (Tredoux & Durrheim, 2013). The Pearson correlation co-efficient (r) can only take on values from -1 to 1. The sign in front of the number (negative or positive) indicates whether there is a positive correlation (as one variable increases, so does the other) or a negative correlation (when one variable increases, the other decreases) (Tredoux & Durrheim, 2013). Therefore, $r=1$ denotes a perfect positive correlation, where $r=0$, there is no correlation, and where $r=-1$, there is a perfect negative correlation. In order to test the hypotheses, the probability value (p) is calculated. If the p -value is less than or equal to 0.05, this represents significance at the 95% level, whereas a p -value less than or equal to 0.01 represents significance at the 99% level.

Participants in the study were divided into four groups according to their age (<30, 30-40, 40-50 and >50). As more than two groups were used, the analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used instead of a t -test, which is used to test the difference between two groups. Thereafter, a post hoc test was used to determine where the significant differences are between and within the different age groups for the facets of job satisfaction and the components of organisational commitment. Tukey's Honestly Significant Difference test (HSD), as a post hoc test, was administered to indicate where the exact differences are found. This value is a number that acts as an indicator of distance between groups. The post hoc test of Tukey was selected because it is the best for all-possible pairwise comparisons when sample sizes are unequal or confidence intervals are needed, and it is considered to be a very good method, even with equal samples sizes without a confidence interval (Tredoux & Durrheim, 2013).

Statistical tests that require assumptions about parameters or their estimation are referred to as parametric tests, whereas tests statistical tests that do not rely on parameter estimation or distributional assumption are referred to as non-parametric tests (Tredoux & Durrheim, 2013). In general, parametric tests and procedures have been developed more than distribution-free tests and there is a much smaller range of procedures and much less flexibility when using distribution-free procedures (Tredoux & Durrheim, 2013).

Parametric tests have shown to be fairly robust to violations of their assumptions, whereas non-parametric tests are most useful with small datasets and when parametric assumptions are severely violated (Tredoux & Durrheim, 2013). This study utilised parametric methods based on the Central Limit Theorem which specifies the shape, mean, and variance of the sampling distribution of the mean. The Central Limit Theorem states that regardless of the shape of the population distribution, the sampling distribution of the mean will be more or less normally distributed as long as the sample size is not too small (Tredoux & Durrheim, 2013).

Results

Table 2 presents the descriptive statistics for the study based on the mean (M) and standard deviation (SD) scores.



Table 2: Descriptive statistics (N = 245)

Survey	Variable	Mean	SD	α
JSS	Pay	2.81	0.86	0.69
	Promotion	2.73	0.88	0.72
	Supervision	3.94	0.67	0.77
	Fringe benefits	2.50	0.78	0.70
	Contingent rewards	2.98	0.80	0.67
	Operating conditions	3.22	0.70	0.48
	Co-workers	3.64	0.73	0.67
	Nature of work	4.13	0.59	0.65
	Communication	3.23	0.95	0.80
TCM	Affective commitment	3.59	0.74	0.80
	Continuance commitment	3.34	0.69	0.64
	Normative commitment	3.31	0.89	0.85

From Table 2 it can be seen that participants had relatively high scores (strongly agree) on the JSS variables of Nature of work ($M=4.13$; $SD=0.59$), Supervisor ($M=3.94$; $SD=0.67$), Co-worker ($M=3.64$; $SD=0.73$), Communication ($M=3.23$; $SD=0.95$) and Operating conditions ($M=3.22$; $SD=0.70$).

The participants scored lowest on the JSS variables of Contingent reward ($M=2.98$; $SD=0.80$), Pay ($M=2.81$; $SD=0.86$), Promotion ($M=2.73$; $SD=0.88$) and Fringe benefits ($M=2.50$; $SD=0.78$). As indicated in Table 2, participants also had relatively high scores (strongly agree) on all the variables for the TCM Organisational Commitment Survey, the highest being Affective commitment ($M=3.59$; $SD=0.74$), followed by Continuance commitment ($M=3.34$; $SD=0.69$) and Normative commitment ($M=3.31$; $SD=0.89$).

Table 3 presents the inferential statistics based on the Pearson correlation co-efficient and the practical effect size.

Table 3: Inferential statistics (N = 245)

Survey	Variable	Affective Commitment	Effect size	Continuance Commitment	Normative Commitment	Effect size
JSS	Pay	0.42***	++	-0.04	0.48***	++
	Promotion	0.56***	+++	-0.18	0.54***	+++
	Supervision	0.29***	+	-0.03	0.28***	+
	Fringe benefits	0.31***	++	0.05	0.35***	++
	Contingent rewards	0.53***	+++	-0.14	0.54***	+++
	Operating conditions	0.37***	++	-0.21	0.31***	++
	Co-workers	0.45***	++	-0.12	0.46***	++
	Nature of work	0.56***	+++	-0.08	0.45***	++
	Communication	0.61***	+++	-0.19	0.58***	+++

*** $p \leq 0.001$ ** $p \leq 0.01$ * $p \leq 0.05$ (two-tailed)
 +++ $r \geq 0.50$ (large practical effect size)
 ++ $r \geq 0.30 \leq 0.49$ (medium practical effect size)
 + $r \leq 0.29$ (small practical effect size)

The Pearson correlation co-efficient was used to allow the researcher to identify the direction and strength of the relationship between each of the variables. Cohen's d presents the mean difference between groups in terms of standard deviation units. Cohen



(1988) provided the following guidelines to interpret the value of d when comparing different groups:

- ✓ < 0.1 = trivial effect
- ✓ $0.1 - 0.3$ = small effect
- ✓ $0.3 - 0.5$ = moderate effect
- ✓ > 0.5 = large difference effect

From Table 3 it can be reported that a significant positive relationship ($p \leq 0.001$; medium to large practical effect sizes) was observed between all the variables of the JSS and the affective commitment variable of the TCM Organisational Commitment Survey. The supervision variable of the JSS had a small practical effect size ($p \leq 0.001$; $r \leq 0.29$) with the affective commitment variable of organisational commitment.

Similarly, significant positive relationships were observed between all the JSS variables and the normative commitment variable of the TCM Organisational Commitment Survey, with the exception of the supervision variable ($p \leq 0.001$; $r \leq 0.28$). A negative relationship exists between the JSS variables and the continuance commitment variable of the TCM Organisational Commitment Survey (pay -0.04; promotion -0.18; supervision -0.03; fringe benefits 0.05; contingent rewards -0.14; operating conditions -0.21; co-workers -0.12; nature of work -0.08; communication -0.19).

The mean differences between the age groups for job satisfaction and organisational commitment were analysed by means of analysis of variance (ANOVA). According to Lyons and Kuron (2013), Baby Boomers are those born between the end of World War II (1945) and the early- to mid-1960s. Generation X are those born between the early- to mid-1960s and the mid- to late 1980s. Generation Y are those born between the early 1980s and the late 1990s.

Traditionalists are those born prior to the end of World War II (prior to 1945). Researchers have typically adopted a four-generation categorisation (Lyons & Kuron, 2013). Pilcher (1994) advised that 'external units' of time, such as decades, years and months are replaced by 'generation' as a temporal unit in history.

As most individuals start a career at the age of 20 years and retire at the age of 60 years, the participants were grouped as follows according to their age:

- <30 years (born after 1985), ($n=125$)
- 30-40 years (1975-1986), ($n=51$)
- 40-50 years (1965-1976), ($n=36$)
- >50 years (born prior to 1966), ($n=33$)

In linking the age groups to Lyons and Kuron's (2013) generational classification, the Under 30 years are the Generation Y, the 30-40 and 40-50 years are the Generation X, and the over 50 year group are the Baby Boomers. Table 4 presents the mean differences amongst the different age groups.



Table 4 Mean differences amongst different age groups

Survey		t	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig
JSS	Pay	Between Groups Within Groups Total	1.55 179.31 180.86	3 241 244	0.52 0.74	0.70	0.56
	Promotion	Between Groups Within Groups Total	37.97 151.79 189.75	3 241 244	12.66 0.63	20.09	0.00
	Supervision	Between Groups Within Groups Total	4.57 106.41 110.98	3 241 244	1.52 0.44	3.45	0.03
	Fringe benefits	Between Groups Within Groups Total	2.46 147.67 150.13	3 241 244	0.82 0.61	1.34	0.26
	Contingent Rewards	Between Groups Within Groups Total	22.88 134.59 157.47	3 241 244	7.63 0.56	13.66	0.00
	Operating Conditions	Between Groups Within Groups Total	17.19 101.99 119.18	3 241 244	5.73 0.42	13.54	0.00
	Co-workers	Between Groups Within Groups Total	16.61 114.64 131.24	3 241 244	5.54 0.48	11.64	0.00
	Nature of Work	Between Groups Within Groups Total	9.59 76.11 85.70	3 241 244	3.20 0.32	10.12	0.00
	Communication	Between Groups Within Groups Total	66.48 153.79 220.27	3 241 244	22.16 0.64	34.73	0.00
TCM	Affective Commitment	Between Groups Within Groups Total	11.76 122.58 134.34	3 241 244	3.92 0.51	7.71	0.00
	Continuance Commitment	Between Groups Within Groups Total	4.60 111.12 115.72	3 241 244	1.53 0.46	3.32	0.02
	Normative Commitment	Between Groups Within Groups Total	19.32 172.66 191.98	3 241 244	6.44 0.72	8.99	0.00

Comparisons significant at the 95% confidence level ($p < 0.05$)

Even though statistically significant differences at the $p < 0.05$ level were reported in Table 5, the actual differences in terms of effect sizes were also calculated. Only statistically significant differences with large effect sizes were reported and discussed. The Tukey's post hoc test indicated the exact age groups where the job satisfaction facets and organisational commitment components differed significantly.



From Table 4, a one-way between groups analysis of variance (ANOVA) indicated that significant differences exist between job satisfaction facets and organisational commitment components for different age groups. Significant differences were found between the age groups on all the job satisfaction facets, except for the pay and fringe benefits facets, where a non-significant difference was reported. The highest significant differences were reported for communication $F(3,241)=34.73$, $p<.05$; promotion $F(3,241)=20.09$, $p<.05$ and contingent rewards $F(3,241)=13.66$, $p<.05$. Significant differences were also found for affective commitment $F(3,241)=7.71$, $p<.05$, continuance commitment $F(3,241)=3.32$, $p<.05$ and normative commitment $F(3,241)=8.99$, $p<.05$.

In order to determine the specific differences between the age groups, Tukey's Honestly Significant Difference test (HSD) test was performed. The results as well as the effect size in terms of Cohen's d (practical significance) are reported in Table 5 for the facets of job satisfaction and the components of organisational commitment.

Table 5: Tukey's Honestly Significant Difference (HSD) test with Cohen's d effect size

Survey	Facets	Age group	Comparison Age group	Mean difference	Std Error	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Cohen's d
JSS	Promotion	<30; $n=125$ $M=3.09$; $SD=0.78$	30-40; $n=51$; $M=2.57$; $SD=0.88$	0.53*	0.13	0.19	0.85	$d=0.65$ Large
		<30; $n=125$; $M=3.09$; $SD=0.78$	40-50; $n=36$; $M=2.26$; $SD=0.77$	0.83*	0.15	0.44	1.21	$d=1.07$ Large
		<30; $n=125$; $M=3.09$; $SD=0.78$	>50; $n=33$; $M=2.11$; $SD=0.70$	0.98*	0.16	0.57	1.38	$d=1.29$ Large
	Contingent rewards	<30; $n=125$; $M=3.28$; $SD=0.73$	30-40; $n=51$; $M=2.67$; $SD=0.73$	0.61*	0.12	0.29	0.93	$d=0.84$ Large
		<30; $n=125$; $M=3.28$; $SD=0.73$	40-50; $n=36$; $M=2.66$; $SD=0.92$	0.62*	0.14	0.25	0.99	$d=0.80$ Large
		<30; $n=125$; $M=3.28$; $SD=0.73$	>50; $n=33$; $M=2.67$; $SD=0.61$	0.61*	0.15	0.22	0.98	$d=0.88$ Large
	Operating conditions	<30; $n=125$; $M=3.48$; $SD=0.61$	30-40; $n=51$; $M=2.96$; $SD=0.70$	0.52*	0.11	0.24	0.80	$d=0.82$ Large
		<30; $n=125$; $M=3.48$; $SD=0.61$	40-50; $n=36$; $M=3.02$; $SD=0.71$	0.46*	0.12	0.14	0.78	$d=0.73$ Large
		<30; $n=125$; $M=3.48$; $SD=0.61$	>50; $n=33$; $M=2.87$; $SD=0.65$	0.61**	0.13	0.28	0.94	$d=0.99$ Large
	Co-workers	<30; $n=125$; $M=3.90$; $SD=0.71$	30-40; $n=51$; $M=3.41$; $SD=0.66$	0.49*	0.11	0.19	0.78	$d=0.71$ Large
		<30; $n=125$; $M=3.90$; $SD=0.71$	40-50; $n=36$; $M=3.36$; $SD=0.80$	0.52*	0.13	0.19	0.86	$d=0.74$ Large
		<30; $n=125$; $M=3.90$; $SD=0.71$	>50; $n=33$; $M=3.33$; $SD=0.51$	0.56*	0.13	0.22	0.91	$d=0.85$ Large



Survey	Facets	Age group	Comparison Age group	Mean difference	Std Error	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Cohen's d	
	Nature of work	<30;n=125 ; M=4.30; SD=0.53	>50;n=33; M=3.72; SD=0.65	0.58*	0.11	0.29	0.86	d=1.05 Large	
		30-40;n=51; M=4.06; SD=0.58	>50;n=33; M=3.72; SD=0.65	0.34*	0.13	0.01	0.66	d=0.57 Large	
	Communication	<30;n=125 ; M=3.71; SD=0.82	30-40;n=51; M=3.01; SD=0.80	0.70*	0.13	0.36	1.05	d=0.87 Large	
		<30;n=125 ; M=3.71; SD=0.82	40-50;n=36; M=2.52; SD=0.88	1.19*	0.15	0.80	1.58	d=1.44 Large	
		<30;n=125 ; M=3.71; SD=0.82	>50;n=33; M=2.52; SD=0.61	1.20*	0.16	0.79	1.60	d=1.53 Large	
		30-40;n=51; M=3.01; SD=0.80	40-50;n=36; M=2.52; SD=0.88	0.49*	0.17	0.04	0.94	d=0.59 Large	
		30-40;n=51; M=3.01; SD=0.80	>50;n=33; M=2.52; SD=0.61	0.49*	0.18	0.03	0.10	d=0.68 Large	
		TCM	Affective commitment	<30;n=125 ; M=3.80; SD=0.70	30-40;n=51; M=3.49; SD=0.67	0.31*	0.11	0.00	0.66
	<30;n=125 ; M=3.80; SD=0.70			40-50;n=36; M=3.39; SD=0.78	0.41*	0.13	0.06	0.76	d=0.57 Large
	<30;n=125 ; M=3.80; SD=0.70			>50;n=33; M=3.22; SD=0.74	0.57*	0.14	0.21	0.93	d=0.82 Large
Continuance Commitment	>50;n=33; M=3.70; SD=0.80		<30;n=125; M=3.30; SD=0.65	0.40*	0.13	0.06	0.75	d=0.59 Large	
	Normative commitment		<30;n=125 ; M=3.57; SD=0.81	30-40;n=51; M=3.08; SD=0.93	0.48*	0.14	0.12	0.85	d=0.58 Large
<30;n=125 ; M=3.57; SD=0.81			>50;n=33; M=2.82; SD=0.88	0.75*	0.17	0.32	1.18	d=0.92 Large	

*Significant at 95% confidence level (p<0.05)

The results in Table 5 indicated that the age group <30 years ($M=3.09$, $SD=0.78$) differed significantly and with a large effect size from the group 30-40 years ($M=2.57$, $SD=0.88$), with a mean score of $M=0.53$ ($d=0.646$) on the job satisfaction facet of promotion. Furthermore, the age group <30 years ($M=3.09$, $SD=0.78$) differed significantly and with a large effect size from the age group 40-50 years ($M=2.26$, $SD=0.77$), with a mean score difference of $M=0.83$ ($d=1.074$), as well as from the age group >50 years ($M=2.11$, $SD=0.70$), with a mean score difference of $M=0.98$ ($d=1.290$) on the promotion facet of job satisfaction.



The age group <30 years ($M=3.28$, $SD=0.73$) differed significantly and with a large effect size from the group 30-40 years ($M=2.67$, $SD=0.73$), with a mean score difference of 0.61 ($d=0.840$) for the contingent reward facet of job satisfaction. The age group <30 years ($M=3.28$, $SD=0.73$) also differed significantly and with a large effect size from the group 40-50 years ($M=2.66$, $SD=0.92$), with a mean score difference of 0.62 ($d=0.804$), as well as from the age group >50 years ($M=2.67$, $SD=0.61$), with a mean score difference of 0.61 ($d=0.868$) on the contingent rewards facet of job satisfaction.

For the operating conditions facet of job satisfaction, the age group <30 years ($M=3.48$, $SD=0.61$) differed significantly and with a large effect size from the following age groups: 30-40 years ($M=2.96$, $SD=0.70$), with a mean score difference of 0.52 ($d=0.821$), 40-50 years ($M=3.02$, $SD=0.71$), with a mean score difference of 0.46 ($d=0.731$), and >50 years ($M=2.87$, $SD=0.65$), with a mean score difference of 0.61 ($d=0.993$).

The age group <30 years ($M=3.90$, $SD=0.71$) differed significantly and with a large effect size from the age group 30-40 years ($M=3.41$, $SD=0.66$), with a mean score difference of 0.49 ($d=0.708$) for the job satisfaction facet of co-workers.

The age group <30 years ($M=3.90$, $SD=0.71$) also differed significantly and with a large effect size from the age group 40-50 years ($M=3.36$, $SD=0.80$), with a mean score difference of 0.52 ($d=0.744$), as well as from the age group >50 years ($M=3.33$, $SD=0.51$), with a mean score difference of 0.56 ($d=0.851$) for the job satisfaction facet of co-workers.

For the nature of work facet of job satisfaction, the age group <30 years ($M=4.30$, $SD=0.53$) differed significantly and with a large effect size from the age group >50 years ($M=3.72$, $SD=0.65$), with a mean score difference of 0.58 ($d=1.048$). The age group 30-40 years ($M=4.06$, $SD=0.58$) differed significantly and with a large effect size from the age group >50 years ($M=3.72$, $SD=0.65$), with a mean score difference of 0.34 ($d=0.566$) for the nature of work facet of job satisfaction.

The age group <30 years ($M=3.71$, $SD=0.82$) differed significantly and with a large effect size from the following age groups for the communication facet of job satisfaction: 30-40 years ($M=3.01$, $SD=0.80$), with a mean score difference of 0.70 ($d=0.865$); 40-50 years ($M=2.52$, $SD=0.88$), with a mean score difference of 1.19 ($d=1.437$); and >50 years ($M=2.52$, $SD=0.61$), with a mean score difference of 1.20 ($d=1.532$). The age group 30-40 years ($M=3.01$, $SD=0.80$) differed significantly and with a large effect size from the age group 40-50 years ($M=2.52$, $SD=0.88$), with a mean score difference of 0.49 ($d=0.594$). Furthermore, the age group 30-40 years ($M=3.01$, $SD=0.80$) differed significantly and with a large effect size from the age group >50 years ($M=2.52$, $SD=0.61$), with a mean score difference of 0.49 ($d=0.678$) for the communication facet of job satisfaction.

For the affective commitment component of organisational commitment, the age group <30 years ($M=3.80$, $SD=0.70$) differed significantly and with a moderate effect size from the age group 30-40 years ($M=3.49$, $SD=0.67$), with a mean score difference of 0.31 ($d=0.451$). Significant differences with a large effect size were reported for the age group <30 years ($M=3.80$, $SD=0.70$), compared to the age group 30-40 ($M=3.39$, $SD=0.78$), with a mean score difference of 0.41 ($d=0.574$), as well as for the age group >50 years ($M=3.22$, $SD=0.74$), with a mean score difference of 0.57 ($d=0.824$).

The age group >50 years ($M=3.70$, $SD=0.80$) differed significantly and with a large effect size from the age group <30 years ($M=3.30$, $SD=0.65$), with a mean score difference of 0.40 ($d=0.589$) for the continuance commitment component of organisational commitment.

For the normative commitment component of organisational commitment, the age group <30 years ($M=3.57$, $SD=0.81$) differed significantly and with a large effect size from the age group 30-40 years ($M=3.57$, $SD=0.93$), with a mean score difference of 0.48 ($d=0.582$). Furthermore, the age group



<30 years ($M=3.57$, $SD=0.81$) differed significantly and with a large effect size from the age group >50 years ($M=2.82$, $SD=0.88$), with a mean score difference of 0.75 ($d=0.915$).

To summarise the above results, statistically significant differences with large effect size were found between specific age groups for the job satisfaction facets of promotion, contingent rewards, operating conditions, co-workers, nature of work and communication. Statistically significant differences with large effect size were found between specific age groups for the affective, continuance and normative components of organisational commitment.

Discussion and Conclusions

The objective of this study was to determine how each of the facets of job satisfaction relates to the affective, continuance and normative components of organisational commitment, as well as to determine whether significant differences exist between age groups in terms of the job satisfaction facets and organisational commitment components within the context of a South African airline.

From the correlational analysis, this study found that significant positive relationships exist between the job satisfaction and affective and normative commitment variables, and that a negative relationship exists between the job satisfaction and continuance commitment variable.

The positive associations observed between the job satisfaction variables and the affective commitment variable, as shown in Table 3, suggest that employees who are satisfied with pay, promotion, fringe benefits, contingent rewards, operating conditions, co-workers, nature of work and communication seem to feel more emotionally attached to the organisation. These results are in line with the findings reported by Lumley et al. (2011). Statistically significant positive relationships with a large practical effect size were reported for communication, promotion, nature of work, contingent rewards and the affective commitment variable. A statistically significant positive relationship with a medium effect size was reported for co-workers, pay, operating conditions and fringe benefits and the affective commitment variable.

A statistically significant positive relationship with a small practical effect size was reported for supervision and the affective commitment variable. Therefore, in line with the findings of Tourani and Rast (2012), managers should encourage open communication in the organisation, in order to promote a working environment that encourages employees to raise their concerns, as well as to share information with other employees, in order to promote an interconnected workforce and to inspire job satisfaction among employees. Joao and Coetzee (2011) found a significantly strong positive relationship between intra-organisational career mobility (promotion), extrinsic job satisfaction and organisational commitment. This strong positive relationship highlighted the importance of work situation factors such as pay, working conditions and advancement opportunities for employees' overall commitment.

Pay is considered to be an important factor in satisfying an employee's needs (Singh & Loncar, 2010), and pay satisfaction is important to both employers and employees, as satisfaction with their overall pay may have an impact on employees' attitudes and behaviours. Nujjoo and Meyer (2012) found that monetary rewards (which include fringe benefits) predict employees' affective commitment. Job satisfaction has been associated with various job characteristics, such as task identity, skill variety, task significance, autonomy and task feedback (Morris & Venkatesh, 2010). High levels of job satisfaction have been linked to a preference for autonomy, independence and challenging work (Bontis, Richards & Serenko, 2011; Millán, Hessels, Thurik & Aguado, 2013).



Affective commitment refers to the employee's psychological or emotional connection to, identification with and participation in the organisation (Meyer & Allen, 1991). Affectively committed employees will retain their relationship with the organisation because they want to, and not because they have to (Meyer & Allen, 1991). The proposed antecedents of affective commitment include job challenge, role clarity, goal clarity, goal difficulty, management receptiveness, peer cohesion, organisational dependability, equity in employment treatment, personal importance to the organisation, feedback concerning work performance and participation in decisions regarding employees own work (Allen & Meyer, 1990). The antecedents of affective commitment and the facets of job satisfaction seem to be closely linked in terms of their theoretical definition.

The positive relationship observed between the job satisfaction and normative commitment variables suggest that participants who are satisfied with pay, promotion, fringe benefits, contingent rewards, operating conditions, co-workers, nature of work and communication seem to feel more obliged to remain with the organisation due to social norms. These results are in line with the findings reported by Lumley et al. (2011). Statistically significant positive relationships with a large practical effect size were reported for communication, promotion, contingent rewards and the normative commitment variable. A statistically significant positive relationship with a medium effect size was reported for pay, co-workers, nature of work, fringe benefits, operating conditions and the normative commitment variable.

Normative commitment can be explained as a sense of responsibility to continue employment with a specific organisation (Meyer & Allen, 1997) because it is morally right to do so, regardless of how much status enhancement or satisfaction the organisation has given the employee over the years. The antecedents to normative commitment include cultural socialisation (normative pressure exerted on an individual prior to entering the organisation), organisational socialisation (normative pressure following entry into the organisation) and organisations providing rewards in advance or incurring significant costs in providing employment (Wiener, 1982). Normative commitment has been found to correlate strongly with affective commitment (Meyer & Parfyonova, 2010), as well as having a co-varying relationship with affective commitment (Yucel, McMillan & Richard, 2014). Similar to the affective commitment variable, the findings of this study indicate that all nine facets of job satisfaction have a significant positive relationship with the normative commitment variable.

From the ANOVA analysis, the overall findings indicate that significant differences do exist for specific age groups in relation to job satisfaction and organisational commitment.

The <30 year age group differed significantly and with a large effect size from the 30-40, 40-50 and >50 year age groups for the following job satisfaction facets: promotion, contingent rewards, co-workers and communication. The 30-40 year age group differed significantly and with large effect size from the 40-50 and >50 year age groups for the communication facet of job satisfaction. Significant differences were found between the 30-40 year and >50 year age groups for the nature of work facet of job satisfaction. These findings in respect of generational differences for job satisfaction are supported by those of Twenge (2010) and Kowske, Rasch and Wiley (2010).

The <30 year age group differed significantly and with a moderate effect size from the 30-40 year age group for affective commitment, and significant differences with a large effect size were found between the <30 year age group, 30-40 year age group and >50 year age group for affective commitment and normative commitment. For continuance commitment, the only significant difference was found between the <30 year age group and the >50 year age group. These findings were supported by those of Ng and Feldman (2010), who conducted a meta-analysis and found that, in general, older workers have more favourable job attitudes (and/or less unfavourable job attitudes) compared to younger workers, and that age is significantly related to task-based, people-based and organisation-based (which includes affective, continuance and normative commitment)



attitudes. Keepnews, Brewer, Kovner and Shin (2010) also found that generational differences do exist for organisational commitment.

The findings of the present study can be used to advise and guide the airline company in its strategy development and planning, so as to enhance its employee commitment which impacts organizational performance, service quality, overall effectiveness, and ultimately productivity and profits.

References

- Abugre, J.B. (2011). Appraising the impact of organizational communication on worker satisfaction in organizational workplace. *Problems of Management in the 21st Century*, 1, 7-15.
- Aletraris, L. (2010). How satisfied are they and why? A study of job satisfaction, job rewards, gender and temporary agency workers in Australia. *Human Relations*, 63(8), 1129-1155.
- Allen, N.J. & Meyer, J.P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63, 1-18.
- Amankwah-Amoah, J. & Debrah, Y.A. (2011). Competing for scarce talent in liberalized environment: evidence from the aviation industry in Africa. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 22:17, 3565-3581.
- Artz, B. (2010). Fringe benefits and job satisfaction. *International Journal of Manpower*, 31(6), 626-644.
- Aydogdu, S. & Asikgil, B. (2011). An empirical study of the relationship among job satisfaction, organizational commitment and turnover intention. *International Review of Management and Marketing*, 1(3), 43-53.
- Banks, G.C., Batchelor, J.H., Seers, A., O'Boyle, E.H., Pollock, J.M. & Gower, K. (2014). What does team-member exchange bring to the party? A meta-analytic review of team and leader social exchange. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 35, 273-295.
- Barrick, M.R., Mount, M.K. & Li, N. (2013). The theory of purposeful work behavior: the role of personality, higher-order goals, and job characteristics. *The Academy of Management Review*, 38(1), 132-153.
- Bedwell, W.L., Wildman, J.L., DizaGranados, D., Salazar, M., Kramer, W.S. & Salas, E. (2012). Collaboration at work: an integrative multilevel conceptualization. *Human Resource Management Review*, 22, 128-145.
- Bernadin, H. (2007). Human resource management: an exponential approach, 4, 253-277.
- Bontis, N., Richards, D. & Serenko, A. (2011). Improving service delivery: investigating the role of information sharing, job characteristics, and employee satisfaction. *The Learning Organization*, 18(3), 239-250.



Boselie, P., Dietz, G. & Boon, C. (2005). Commonalities and contradictions in HRM and performance research. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 15(3), 67-94.

Braun, S., Peus, C., Weisweiler, S. & Frey, D. (2013). Transformational leadership, job satisfaction, and team performance: a multilevel mediation model of trust. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 24, 270-283.

Brown, M.E. & Mitchell, M.S. (2010). Ethical and unethical leadership: exploring new avenues for future research. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 20, 583-616.

Buchanan, B. (1974). Building organizational commitment: the socialization of managers in work organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 19, 533-546.

Cascio, W.F. (2003). Changes in workers, work and organizations. *Handbook of Psychology*, 3(16), 399-422.

Castilla, E.J. & Benard, S. (2010). The paradox of meritocracy in organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 55, 543-567.

Castro, M. & Martins, N. (2010). The relationship between organisational climate and employee satisfaction in a South African information and technology organization. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 36(1), Art #800, 9 pages.

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analyses for the behavioural sciences* (2nd ed). New York: Academic Press.

Dawis, R.V. & Lofquist, L.H. (1993). From TWA to PEC. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 43, 113-121.

De Vries, R.E., Bakker-Pieper, A. & Oostenveld, W. (2010). Leadership=communication? The relations of leaders' communication styles with leadership styles, knowledge sharing and leadership outcomes. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 25(3), 367-380.

DeConinck, J.B. (2011). The effects of ethical climate on organizational identification, supervisory trust, and turnover among salespeople. *Journal of Business Research*, 64, 617-624.

Den Hartog, D.N., Boselie, P. & Paauwe, J. (2004). Performance management: a research agenda. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 53(4), 556-569.

Dereli, B. (2006). The effect of human resource development on the organizational commitment. *The Second International Conference on Business, Management & Economics*, Turkey, 15-18.

Dierdorff, E.C., Bell, S.T. & Belohlav, J.A. (2011). The power of "we": effects of psychological collectivism on team performance over time. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96, 247-262.

Eslami, J. & Gharakhani, D. (2012). Organizational commitment and job satisfaction. *ARPN Journal of Science and Technology*, 2(2), 85-91.

Erez, M. (2010). Culture and job design. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 31, 389-400.



- Gajendran, R.S. & Joshi, A. (2012). Innovation in globally distributed teams: the role of LMX, communication frequency and member influence on team decisions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. Advance online publication, doi:10.1037/a0028958.
- Gibson, C.B. & Gibbs, J.L. (2006). Unpacking the concept of virtuality: the effects of geographic dispersion, electronic dependence, dynamic structure or national diversity on team innovation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 51, 451-495.
- Gilbert, C., De Winne, S. & Sels, L. (2011). The influence of line managers and HR department on employees' affective commitment. *The Journal of Human Resource Management*, 22(8), 1618-1637.
- Giri, V.N. & Kumar, P.B. (2010). Assessing the impact of organizational communication on job satisfaction and job performance. *Psychological Studies*, 55(2), 137-143.
- Goldhaber, G.M. (1993). *Organizational communication (6th ed.)*. Madison, WI: WCB Brown & Benchmark.
- Graen, G.B. & Uhl-Bien, M. (1995). Relationship-based approach to leadership: development of leader-member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years: applying a multi-level multi-domain perspective. *Leadership Quarterly*, 6(2), 219-247.
- Grant, A.M. (2007). Relational job design and the motivation to make a prosocial difference. *The Academy of Management Review*, 32(2), 393-417.
- Grant, A.M. & Parker, S.K. (2009). Redesigning work design theories: the rise of relational and proactive perspectives. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 3:1, 317-375.
- Hackman, J.R. & Oldham, G.R. (1976). Motivation through the design of work: test of a theory. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 16, 250-279.
- Hale, A. & Borys, D. (2013a). Working to rule or working safely? Part 1: a state of the art review. *Safety Science*, 55, 207-221.
- Han, J.H., Bartol, K.M. & Kim, S. (2015). Tightening up the performance-pay linkage: roles of contingent reward leadership and profit-sharing in the cross-level of individual pay-for-performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 100(2), 417-430.
- Harney, B. & Jordan, C. (2008). Unlocking the black box: line managers and HRM-performance in a call centre context. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 57(4), 275-296.
- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B. & Snyderman, B.B. (1959). *The motivation to work*. New York: Wiley.
- Hofmans, J., De Gieter, S. & Pepermans, R. (2013). Individual differences in the relationship between satisfaction with job rewards and job satisfaction. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 82, 1-9.



Huselid, M.A., Jackson, S.E. & Schuler, R.S. (1997). Technical and strategic human resource management effectiveness as determinants of firm performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 40(1), 171-188.

Iqbal, A. (2010). An empirical assessment of demographic factors, organizational ranks and organizational commitment. *International Journal of Business Management*, 5(3), 16-27.

Jackson, C.L., Colquitt, J.A., Wesson, M.J. & Zapata-Phelan, C.P. (2006). Psychological collectivism: a measurement validation and linkage to group member performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(4), 884-899.

Jans, N.A. (1989). Organizational commitment, career factors and career/life stage. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 10, 247-266.

João, T.F. & Coetzee, M. (2011). Perceived career mobility and preference, job satisfaction and organisational commitment in the financial sector: an exploratory study. *South African Journal of Labour Relations*, 35(1), 38-60.

João, T.F. & Coetzee, M. (2012). Job retention factors, perceived career mobility and organisational commitment in the South African financial sector. *Journal of Psychology in Africa*, 22:1, 69-76.

Johnson, J.D., Donohue, W.A., Atkin, C.K. & Johnson, S. (1994). Differences between formal and informal communication channels. *The Journal of Business Communication*, 31:2, 111-122.

Joo, B.K.B. (2010). Organizational commitment for knowledge workers: the roles of perceived organizational learning culture, leader-member exchange quality, and turnover intention. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 21(1), 69-85.

Judge, T.A., Higgins, C.A., Thoreson, C.J. & Barrick, M.R. (1999a). The big five personality traits, general mental ability and career success across the life span. *Personnel Psychology*, 52(3), 621-652.

Kanter, R.M. (1968). Commitment and social organization: a study of commitment mechanisms in utopian communities. *American Sociological Review*, 33, 499-517.

Katou, A.A. & Budhwar, P.S. (2010). Causal relationship between HRM policies and organisational performance: evidence from the Greed manufacturing sector. *European Management Journal*, 28, 25-39.

Keepnews, D.M., Brewer, C.S., Kovner, C.T. & Shin, J.H. (2010). Generational differences among newly licensed registered nurses. *Nursing Outlook*, 58, 155-163.

Kosteas, V.D. (2011). Job satisfaction and promotions. *Industrial Relations*, 50(1), 174-194.

Kowske, B.J., Rasch, R. & Wiley, J. (2010). Millenials'(lack of) attitude problem: an empirical examination of generation effects on work attitudes. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 25(2), 265-279.



Lin, S.C. & Lin, J.S.J. (2011). Impacts of coworkers' relationships on organizational commitment and intervening effects of job satisfaction. *African Journal of Business Management*, 5(8), 3396-3409.

Locke, E.A. (1969). What is job satisfaction? *Organizational Behavior and Human Resource Performance*, 4, 309-336.

Locke, E.A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction, in: M.D.Dunnette, ed., *Handbook of Industrial Psychology*. Rand-McNally: Chicago.

Lumley, E.J., Coetzee, M., Tladinyane, R. & Ferreira, N. (2011). Exploring the job satisfaction and organisational commitment of employees in the information technology environment. *Southern African Business Review*, 15(1), 100-118.

Lyons, S. & Kuron, L. (2013). Generational differences in the workplace: a review of the evidence and directions for future research. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 35, S139-S157.

Mafini, C. & Dlodlo, N. (2014). The linkage between work-related factors, employee satisfaction and organisational commitment: insights from public health professionals. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management*, 12(1), Art. #616, 12 pages.

Mafini, C., Surujlal, J. & Dhurup, M. (2013). The relationship between job satisfaction and job loyalty among municipal sports officers. *African Journal for Physical, Health Education, Recreation and Dance*, 19(1), 12-29.

MarketLine Industry Profiles. (2016). Airlines in South Africa Jul 28 2016. New York, NY: Alacra Store. Retrieved 15 August, 2016 from <http://www.alacrastore.com/storecontent/MarketLine-Industry-Profiles/Airlines-in-South-Africa-2124-7764>.

Markovits, Y., Davis, A.J., Fay, D. & Van Dick, R. (2010). The link between job satisfaction and organizational commitment: differences between public and private sector employees. *International Public Management Journal*, 13(2), 177-196.

Marsh, R.M. & Mannari, H. (1977). Organizational commitment and turnover: a prediction study. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 22(1), 57-75.

Maslow, A.H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, 50, 370-396.

Matos Marques Simoes, P. & Espisito, M. (2014). Improving change management: how communication nature influences resistance to change. *Journal of Management Development*, 33(4), 324-341.

Meyer, J.P. & Allen, J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1, 61.

Meyer, J.P. & Allen, J. (1997). *Commitment in the workplace*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Meyer, J.P. & Maltin, E.R. (2010). Employee commitment and well-being: a critical review, theoretical framework and research agenda. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 77, 323-337.



Meyer, J.P. & Parfyonova, N.M. (2010). Normative commitment in the workplace: a theoretical analysis and re-conceptualization. *Human Resource Management Review*, 20, 283-294.

Meyer, J.P., Allen, N.J. & Smith, C.A. (1993). Commitment to organisations and occupation: extension and test of a three-component conceptualization. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78(4), 538-551.

Meyer, M. & Kirsten, M. (2012). *Introduction to human resource management*. Pretoria: Van Schaik.

Milkovich, G., Newman, J. & Gerhardt, B. (2011). *Compensation*. Chicago, IL: Irwin Professional.

Millán, J.M., Hessels, J., Thurik, R. & Aguado, R. (2013). Determinants of job satisfaction: a European comparison of self-employed and paid employees. *Small Business Economics*, 40(3), 651-670.

Morgeson, F.P. & Humphrey, S.E. (2006). The work design questionnaire (WDQ): developing and validating a comprehensive measure for assessing job design and the nature of work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(6), 1321-1339.

Morris, M.G. & Venkatesh, V. (2010). Job characteristics and job satisfaction: understanding the role of enterprise resource planning system implementation. *MIS Quarterly*, 34 (1), 143-161.

Mottaz, C.J. (1985). The relative importance of intrinsic and extrinsic rewards as determinants of work satisfaction. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 26(3), 365-385.

Mowday, R.T., Steers, R.M. & Porter, L.W. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 14, 224-247.

Ng, T.W.H. & Feldman, D.C. (2010). The relationships of age with job attitudes: a meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 63, 677-718.

Nguyen, H.N. & Mohamed, S. (2011). Leadership behaviors, organizational culture and knowledge management practices. *Journal of Management Development*, 30(2), 206-221.

Nujjoo, A., & Meyer, I. (2012). The relative importance of different types of rewards for employee motivation and commitment in South Africa. *SA Journal of Human Resources Management*, Art. #442, 10 pages.

Nyberg, A. (2010). Retaining your high performers: moderators of the performance-job satisfaction-voluntary turnover relationship. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95(3), 440-453.

Odunlade, R.O. (2012). Managing employee compensation and benefits for job satisfaction in libraries and information centres in Nigeria. *Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)*. Paper 714.

Oldham, G.R. & Hackman, J.R. (2010). Not what it was and not what it will be: the future of job design research. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 31, 463-479.

Parker, S.K. & Ohly, S. (2008). Designing motivating work. In R. Kanfer, G. Chen, & R.D. Pritchard (Eds.). *Work motivation, past, present, and future*, 233-384. New York: Routledge.



Pilcher, J. (1994). Mannheim's sociology of generations: an undervalued legacy. *British Journal of Sociological Review*, 481-495.

Porter, L.W., Steers, R.M., Mowday, R.T. & Boulian, P.V. (1974). Organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover among psychiatric technicians. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 59, 603-609.

Roos, W. & Van Eeden, R. (2008). The relationship between employee motivation, job satisfaction and corporate culture. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 34(1), 54-63.

Ryan, R.M. (1995). Psychological needs and the facilitation of integrative processes. *Journal of Personality*, 63, 297-427.

SAS Institute Incorporated (2002-2012). Cary, NC, USA.

Schlechter, A., Hung, A. & Bussin, M. (2014). Understanding talent attraction: the influence of financial rewards elements on perceived job attractiveness. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management*, 12(1), Art. Number 647, 13 pages.

Schyns, B. & Day, D.V. (2010). Critique and review of leader-member exchange theory: issues of agreement, consensus and excellence. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 19, 1-29.

Scott, S.G. & Bruce, R.A. (1994). Determinants of innovative behavior: a path model of individual innovation in the workplace. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 37(3), 580-607.

Seers, A. (1989). Team-member exchange quality: a new construct for role-making research. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 43, 118-135.

Sicherman, N. & Galore, O. (1990). A theory of career mobility. *Journal of Political Economy*, 98(1), 169-192.

Singh, P. & Loncar, N. (2010). Pay satisfaction, job satisfaction and turnover intent. *Industrial Relations*, 65(3), 470-490.

Spector, P.E. (1985). Measurement of human service staff satisfaction: development of the job satisfaction survey. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 13, 693-713.

Spector, P.E. (1997). *Job satisfaction: application, assessment, causes, and consequences*. Sage Publications, Inc: Thousand Oaks.

Staw, B.M. & Cohen-Charash, Y. (2005). The dispositional approach to job satisfaction: more than a mirage but not yet an oasis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26, 59-78.

Stebbins, R.A. (1970). On misunderstanding the concept of commitment: a theoretical clarification. *Social Forces*, 48, 526-529.

Stumpf, S.A. & Tymon Jr, W.G. (2012). The effects of objective career success on subsequent subjective career success. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 81, 345-353.



- Super, D.E. (1990). *A life-span, life-space approach to career choice and development: applying contemporary theories to practice (2nd ed.)*, 197-261). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Terre Blanche, M., Durrheim, K., & Painter, D. (2006). *Research in practice: applied methods for the social sciences*. Cape Town: UCT Press.
- The Economist (2006). A survey of talent: the battle for brainpower, October 7, 1-15.
- Tims, M. & Bakker, A.B. (2010). Job crafting: towards a new model of individual job redesign. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 36(2), 1-9.
- Tourani, A. & Rast, S. (2012). Effect of employees' communication and participation on employees' job satisfaction: an empirical study on airline companies in Iran. *IPEDR*, 36, 52-56.
- Tredoux, C. & Durrheim, K. (2013). *Numbers, hypotheses & conclusions*. Cape Town: University Press.
- Twenge, J.M. (2010). A review of empirical evidence on generational differences in work attitudes. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 25(2), 201-210.
- Van Dyk, J. & Coetzee, M. (2012). Retention factors in relation to organisational commitment in medical and information technology services. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management*, 10(2), 1-11.
- Vroom, V.H. (1964). *Work and motivation*. New York: Wiley.
- Wagner III, J.A. (1995). Studies of individualism-collectivism: effects on cooperation in groups. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 38(1), 152-172.
- Weng, X.Q. & Hu, B. (2009). The structure of career growth and its impact on employees' turnover intention. *Industrial Engineering and Management*, 14(1), 14-21.
- Wiener, Y. (1982). Commitment in organizations: a normative review. *The Academy of Management Review*, 7(3), 418-428.
- Wrzesniewski, A. & Dutton, J.E. (2001). Crafting a job: revisioning employees as active crafters of their work. *The Academy of Management Review*, 26(2), 179-201.
- Yücel, I. (2012). Examining the relationships among job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intention: an empirical study. *International Journal of Business Management*, 7(20), 45-58.
- Yücel, I., McMillan, A. & Richard, O.C. (2014). Does CEO transformational leadership influence top executive normative commitment? *Journal of Business Research*, 67, 1170-1177.
- Yukl, G. (1999). An evaluation of conceptual weaknesses in transformational and charismatic leadership theories. *Leadership Quarterly*, 10(2), 285-305.
- Yukl, G. (2006). *Leadership in organizations (6th ed.)*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc.



Zeinabadi, H. (2010). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as antecedents of organizational citizenship behaviour (OCB) of teachers. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 5, 998-1003.

Zhu, W., Riggio, R.E., Avolio, B.J. & Sosik, J.J. (2011). The effect of leadership on follower moral identity: does transformational/transactional style make a difference? *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 18(2), 150-163.