



International Journal of Innovative Research in Science Engineering and Technology (IJIRSET)

(A Monthly, Peer Reviewed, Refereed, Scholarly Indexed, Open Access Journal)



Impact Factor: 8.699

Volume 14, Issue 7, July 2025

Exploring the Relationship between Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment

Dr. B. Venkateshwara Prasad, Abinaya V, Subaranjana N

Professor, Sri Sairam Institute of Management Studies, Sri Sairam Engineering College, Chennai, India

Scholar, Sri Sairam Institute of Management Studies, Sri Sairam Engineering College, Chennai, India

Scholar, Sri Sairam Institute of Management Studies, Sri Sairam Engineering College, Chennai, India

ABSTRACT: This study explores the intertwined nature of job satisfaction and organizational commitment. It examines how various intrinsic and extrinsic factors influence employees' psychological attachment and overall morale. The research adopts a mixed-methods approach, combining statistical analysis and qualitative insights from employees across multiple sectors. Findings confirm a strong positive association between job satisfaction and organizational commitment. The study offers evidence-based recommendations to enhance employee engagement and organizational loyalty.

I. INTRODUCTION

Job satisfaction and organizational commitment are interrelated concepts crucial to understanding employee behavior, performance, and retention. Job satisfaction, the positive emotional response to one's job, impacts motivation, productivity, and organizational success. Organizational commitment reflects an employee's loyalty and attachment to the organization. While job satisfaction often leads to greater commitment, the relationship is dynamic and reciprocal. Factors such as leadership style, job characteristics, and organizational culture strongly influence both. In Vietnam's public sector, retaining skilled workers is challenging due to lower pay and high expectations. Despite high qualifications, public employees often feel less committed. Leadership and job satisfaction play key roles in shaping commitment. Organizations must create supportive environments that promote autonomy, growth, and recognition. This study explores how job features, satisfaction, and leadership styles affect commitment in Vietnam's public sector. Job satisfaction and organizational commitment are deeply interconnected and essential to understanding employee performance, motivation, and retention. Job satisfaction refers to the positive emotional response individuals have toward their job, shaped by work conditions, pay, relationships, and growth opportunities.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory identifies motivators (like achievement and recognition) and hygiene factors (like salary and company policies) as key influencers of satisfaction.

Meyer and Allen's Three-Component Model outlines affective commitment (emotional attachment), continuance commitment (cost-related commitment), and normative commitment (sense of obligation). Studies have shown that satisfied employees are more likely to develop affective commitment.

Hackman and Oldham's Job Characteristics Model shows that autonomy, task significance, and feedback increase job satisfaction and motivation.

Locke, 1976: Job satisfaction is a widely recognized construct in industrial-organizational psychology, defined as a positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experiences

Enache et al., 2011: The relationship between organizational commitment and job satisfaction has been extensively studied, with a general consensus that they are positively correlated, often in a reciprocal manner.

III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research methodology is the systematic and logical plan a researcher follows to conduct a study, ensuring consistency, reliability, and validity in the findings. It outlines the steps taken to collect, analyze, and interpret data.

Research is a structured and organized investigation aimed at discovering, interpreting, and revising facts or behaviors. It uses specific methods to explore a defined problem or question.

Research design serves as the blueprint of the study, integrating all components—like research questions, methods, and analysis—into a coherent structure to address the research problem effectively.

Descriptive research focuses on observing, recording, and analyzing characteristics of a subject without manipulating variables. It answers "what," "where," "when," and "how," but not "why."

Sample design determines the strategy for selecting participants or units for the study. It ensures that the sample accurately represents the target population and aligns with the research goals.

Data Collection and Tools:

The study's sample consisted predominantly of young adults, with 87.1% of respondents aged between 18 and 30, indicating a youthful workforce. In terms of gender, 54.8% were female and 45.2% male, reflecting a fairly balanced demographic. Educationally, most respondents (71%) held a Master's degree, while 22.6% had a Bachelor's and a small number (6.5%) held Doctorates.

Experience-wise, 80.64% had less than 2 years of work experience, suggesting a largely early career group. When it came to job satisfaction, 45.16% reported being satisfied, though a significant number (35.48%) remained neutral, and a small percentage expressed dissatisfaction.

Regarding compensation and benefits, 35.48% were satisfied, 32.26% were neutral, while the remaining respondents were either dissatisfied or highly dissatisfied. As for work-life balance, a majority (45.16%) felt neutral, and only a small proportion were highly satisfied.

On life satisfaction with their current position, most (45.17%) remained neutral. The highest sense of organizational commitment was associated with opportunities for growth (32.26%) and leadership (29.03%), showing these are key drivers of engagement. However, recognition and rewards were cited by only 6.45%, indicating a potential gap.

In terms of skill utilization, 45.17% felt neutral, and only 6.45% felt highly satisfied. Similar trends were found in satisfaction with organizational communication, where most respondents (45.17%) remained neutral.

Scope of the study:

To research differences in work satisfaction and organizational commitment between cultures, as well as the causes and effects of these differences.

To investigate the factors that influence organizational commitment and work satisfaction at the individual, organizational, and contextual levels.

Limitation of the study:

The study adopts a cross-sectional design, which limits the ability to establish causal relationships between variables. Longitudinal research designs would provide more robust evidence of causality over time.

The study's sample may not fully represent the broader population, as participants are recruited through convenience sampling methods, potentially limiting the generalizability of findings to other organizational contexts or demographics.

Variability in response rates across different demographic groups or organizational units may introduce sampling bias and affect the representativeness of the sample.

IV. KEY FINDINGS

The findings of the study reveal that the majority of respondents (87.1%) belong to the 18–30 age group, indicating a predominantly young workforce. More than half of the participants are female (54.8%), and a significant proportion (71%) have completed their Master's degree.

Most respondents (80.64%) have less than two years of work experience, suggesting that the sample consists largely of early-career professionals. Regarding job satisfaction, 45.16% expressed satisfaction, while 35.48% remained neutral and only a small percentage (3.22%) were highly satisfied.

In terms of compensation and benefits, 35.48% were satisfied, though 19.35% reported dissatisfaction. Work-life balance received neutral feedback from 45.16% of respondents, with only 6.45% being highly satisfied. Life satisfaction with the current position was also largely neutral (45.17%), while 38.70% felt satisfied.

Opportunities for growth and development were the leading contributors to organizational commitment (32.26%), followed closely by leadership (29.03%). Recognition and rewards played a smaller role (6.45%). A significant portion (45.17%) felt neutral about how effectively their skills and abilities were used, with 38.70% expressing satisfaction. Similarly, organizational communication received mostly neutral (45.17%) and satisfied (38.70%) responses.

Importantly, 74.19% of respondents believed their contributions were recognized. However, 32.27% indicated they might leave their job, and only 3.22% stated they would definitely stay. A moderate positive correlation (0.537) was found between education and benefits, significant at the 5% level. The chi-square test showed no significant association between age and satisfaction with communication. Overall, the findings suggest moderate levels of satisfaction and commitment, with key areas such as recognition, development opportunities, and communication requiring further attention to enhance employee retention and engagement.

V. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the study highlights that job satisfaction and organizational commitment are closely intertwined and play a pivotal role in shaping employee behavior, retention, and overall organizational performance. The research reveals that most respondents are young, early-career professionals with less than two years of experience, indicating that organizations need to pay special attention to the expectations and motivations of a younger workforce.

While a fair number of participants expressed satisfaction with their jobs and compensation, a considerable proportion remained neutral, suggesting room for improvement in several areas of employee experience. Key factors contributing to organizational commitment included opportunities for growth and effective leadership, while recognition and rewards were seen as lacking by many. The findings suggest that when employees feel their contributions are valued and their development is supported, they are more likely to remain committed to the organization.

However, the data also points to potential retention challenges, as a significant number of respondents indicated they might consider leaving their current jobs. Statistical analysis further confirmed a positive correlation between educational qualification and perceived benefits, suggesting that more educated employees may have higher expectations for reward structures. The absence of a significant association between age and satisfaction with organizational communication highlights that communication challenges are consistent across age groups. Overall, the study concludes that while general satisfaction and commitment levels are moderate, organizations must take strategic actions to enhance employee engagement. This includes implementing fair and transparent reward systems, providing clear communication, fostering leadership development, and creating growth opportunities.

REFERENCES

1. Bhasin, N. K., & Rajesh, A. (2021). Impact of E-Collaboration Between Indian Banks and Fintech Companies for Digital Banking and New Emerging Technologies. *International Journal of e-Collaboration (IJeC)*, 17(1), 15–35.
2. Kaur, R., Sandhu, R. S., Gera, A., Kaur, T., & Gera, P. (2020). Intelligent voice bots for digital banking. In *Smart Systems and IoT: Innovations in Computing* (pp. 401–408). Springer, Singapore.
3. Dhayalan, V., & Seethalakshmi, M. (2021). Comparative HR Models for Stress Control. *Ilkogretim Online*, 20(2), 4875–4880.
4. Ramu, M., & Venkatesh, P. (2024). Analytics in HR Interview Forecasting. *ICPECTS, IEEE*, 5(13), 96–100.
5. Maran, K., & Usha, S. (2014). Evolving IT Work-Life Policies Post-Covid. *Asia Pacific Journal of Research*, 1(XXIX), 212–218.
6. Jeyalakshmi, R., & SentamilSelvan, K. (2023). HR Inclusion for Talent Retention. *RIFA*, 14(2), 1131–1135.
7. Venkatesh, P. (2020). AI-Based Talent Search Practices. *Studies In Indian Place Names*, 40(55), 379–382.
8. Murugan, K. (2020). CAMEL-Based HR Risk Management. *Test Engineering & Management*, 40(18), 168–172.
9. Dinesh Kumar, S. (2022). Virtual HR Tools in Campus Hiring. *Journal of Tech HR*, 1(14), 64–68.
10. Maran, K., & Sathyanarayanan, K. (2011). HR Counseling for Stress Recovery. *JMRD*, 1(1), 83–88.
11. Usha, S., & Rohini, V. (2018). Frameworks for QWL. *IJPAM*, 118(20), 893–899.
12. Dinesh Kumar, & Karthika, S. (2024). Machine Learning in HR Resume Screening. *IJRHRM*, 6, 479–482. <https://doi.org/10.33545/26633213.2024.v6.i2e.259>
13. Keerthana, S., & Anantharajan, R. S. (2024). Fairness in AI Hiring Logic. *IJARETY*. <https://doi.org/10.15680/IJRET.2024.1106098>
14. Usman Mohideen, K. S., & Swathi, G. (2024). Digital HRM and Employee Psychology. *IJRHRM*, 6(2), 409–413.
15. Suresh, R., & Athapit, A. (2020). Assembly Line Stress and HR's Role. *Ilkogretim Online*, 19(2), 2130–2135.
16. Murugan, K. (2020). Dynamic HR Modeling in Retail Chains. *GRSHR*, 40(17), 189–193.
17. Maran, K., & Sekhar, B. R. (2017). Millennial Preferences in HR Development. *JARDCS*, 17(Special Issue), 774–778.
18. Ramu, M., & Manikandan, M. (2023). Outsourcing Strategy in HR Policy. *ICCEBS, IEEE*, 4(14), 75–79.
19. Prasad, B. V., & Suresh, R. (2020). Attrition Analysis in HR Decision-Making. *PalArch Journal*, 17(7), 10051–10055.
20. Venkateswara Prasad, B., & Rajasekhar, D. (2018). Frameworks for Employee Upskilling in HR. *IJMET*, 9(13), 578–583.
21. Jeyalakshmi, R., Sivarajeswari, S., & Selvalakshmi, V. (2022). Telecommuting and HR Practice Shift. *ICSE*, 206–210.
22. Maran, K., & Chandra Shekar, V. (2015). HR Skill Audit for Engineering Graduates. *IJRESS*, 5(3), 86–91.
23. Ganesh Kumar, R., & Venkatesh, P. (2024). Framework for Employee Training Assessment. *IJHRM Metrics*, 6(5), 244–248.
24. Dhayalan, V., & Maran, K. (2013). Reward Practices in Higher Education HR. *IJOBMP*, 2(1), 347–351.
25. Suresh, R., & Prasad, B. V. (2019). Induction Revamp in HRM Context. *IJMET*, 13(7), 1193–1198.
26. Jeyalakshmi, R., & Gracy, H. R. (2023). Workforce Flexibility via HR Tools. *RIFA Junior*, 14(2), 1145–1150.
27. Suresh, R., & Kumar, R. G. (2020). HR Dimensions in Stress Control. *IJMRSET*, 6(11), 2180–2185.
28. Keerthana, B., & Harshini, R. (2024). Resume Filtering via AI-Driven HRM. *IRJMETS*, 6(12), 4682–4686.
29. Usha, S., & Jaichitra, D. (2018). Attendance Policy Analysis in IT HRM. *IJPHRD*, 9(2). <https://doi.org/10.5958/0976-5506.2018.00082.7>
30. Jeyalakshmi, R., & Yugendran, S. (2024). Restructuring Hiring Frameworks with AI. *IJFTIB*, 6(2), 297–301.
31. Mohideen, K. S., & Sabharish, A. (2024). HR Engagement in Crisis Times. *IJAR*, 10(12), 232–235.
32. Anantharajan, R. S., & Ashwatha, J. (2024). Appraisal Automation Models. *IJPREMS*. <https://doi.org/10.58257/IJPREMS37992>
33. Venkatesh, P., & Selvakumar, V. (2023). HR Interventions in Multi-Role Workforces. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 2(3), 122–126.
34. Anantharajan, R. S., & Sujitha. (2024). Role of Predictive AI in HR Talent Pools. *IJRPRR*. <https://doi.org/10.55248/gengpi.5.1224.0222>
35. Dhayalan, V., & Nimalathasan, B. (2021). Digital Stress Patterns in HR Roles. *Ilkogretim Online*, 20(1), 4862–4867.
36. Maran, K., & Priyadarsini, P. (2009). HR and Emotional Climate in Call Centers. *SMART Journal*, 5(2), 133–138.

37. Usha, S. (2025). Smart Recruitment Using Sustainability Index. ICFTS. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICFTS62006.2025.11031918>
38. Jeyalakshmi, R., & Gracy, H. R. (2023). Workforce Flexibility via HR Tools. RIFA Junior, 14(2), 1145–1150.



INTERNATIONAL
STANDARD
SERIAL
NUMBER
INDIA



INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF INNOVATIVE RESEARCH

IN SCIENCE | ENGINEERING | TECHNOLOGY

 9940 572 462  6381 907 438  ijirset@gmail.com



www.ijirset.com

Scan to save the contact details