

## Relationship between the Individual Facets of Job, Job Satisfaction and Organisational Commitment

MOSES M.R. LAHAI, RAHIM MD. SAIL, MAZANAH MUHAMAD  
& TURIMAN SUANDI

*Fakulti Pengajian Pendidikan  
Universiti Putra Malaysia, 43400 UPM, Serdang,  
Selangor, Malaysia*

**Keywords:** Job satisfaction, organisational commitment, job performance, facets of job satisfaction

### ABSTRAK

Banyak kajian telah mendokumenkan hubungan positif antara kepuasan kerja dan komitmen organisasi. Beberapa kajian, walau bagaimanapun, menfokuskan faset kerja individu yang membentuk kepuasan kerja secara keseluruhan. Corak kajian melibatkan tinjauan ke atas pekerja di pelbagai industri elektrik dan elektronik di Lembah Klang, Malaysia. Respons kesemua sampel 426 operator telah dihantar kepada satu siri Pearson Product Moment Correlation dan analisis regresi berganda untuk menguji hipotesis tersebut. Selepas dihipotesis, hasil keputusan menunjukkan bukti yang menyokong kepuasan faset individu atau dimensi kepuasan kerja (model kepuasan kerja Herzberg) yang semuanya secara positif berkaitan dengan komitmen organisasi. Analisis regresi berganda menyokong hubungan yang dihipotesis antara lima variabel dalam model Herzberg dan komitmen organisasi. Secara keseluruhannya, kedua-dua faktor dalaman (motivasi) dan luaran (ilmu kesihatan) model Herzberg didapati mempunyai perkaitan dan implikasi praktikal untuk menjangka komitmen organisasi.

### ABSTRACT

Numerous studies have documented positive relationships between overall job satisfaction and organisational commitment. Some research has, however, focused on the individual facets of job that constitute the overall job satisfaction. The study's design involved a survey of workers in a variety of electrical and electronic industries in the Klang Valley in Malaysia. The responses of a total sample of 426 operators were submitted to a series of Pearson Product Moment Correlation and multiple regression analysis in order to test the hypotheses. As hypothesized the results provided evidence to support that satisfaction with the individual facets or dimensions of job satisfaction (Herzberg's Job satisfaction model) were all positively related to organisational commitment. Multiple regression analysis supported the hypothesised relationships between five variables in Herzberg's model and organisational commitment. Overall, both the intrinsic (motivational) factors and the extrinsic (hygiene) factors of Herzberg's model were found to have relevance and practical implications for predicting organisational commitment.

### INTRODUCTION

During the last two decades a great deal of time and energy by way of research have been devoted to the analysis of organisational commitment and other work-related behaviours (turnover, absenteeism and employees willingness to help one another). The reason being that developing personnel commitment to an organisation is not only important to achieving the goal of human resources development policy and practice but

also the findings of researchers have shown that developing personnel commitment in organisations have positive effects on performance (Bishop and Scott; Matthieu and Zajac 1990; Randell 1990; Crampton and Smith 1976). Organisational commitment is also important because past researchers have suggested that it might have an impact on several other work-related attributes such as productivity (Larson and Fukami 1984; Steers 1977; Crampton

and Smith 1976), absenteeism (Larson and Fukami 1984; Koch and Steers 1978), turnover (Price and Mveller 1981) and employees' willingness to help one another (Bishop and Scott 1977). Although past emphases have actually been on turnover and absenteeism, researchers have lately realized that employees' job satisfaction is arguably just as or more important than for example, turnover (Meyer *et al.* 1989). Other studies that have also explored the relationship between organisational commitment and job satisfaction have found that satisfied employees have a tendency to be committed to their organisations. This in turn will lead to loyalty to the organisation and a willingness to work hard to achieve organisational goals such as high productivity (Porter *et al.* 1974). Furthermore, according to Bishop and Scott (1997) low commitment in an organisation leads to absenteeism, turnover and intention to quit.

It is important for organisations to create an environment in which workers are reasonably motivated to perform their tasks effectively and in which they have a reasonable opportunity to fulfill some of their own objectives and goals. This is a prerequisite to what motivation is all about and the related reaction of the workers towards their work situations including their attitude and sense of job satisfaction. It should be noted that when workers join a particular organisation they bring with them their own built-in sets of values and motivations including the desire for security, income, achievement and the like. If the work situation fulfills the desires of the workers it can be expected that the desires and reactions of the workers will be favourable. On the other hand, frustration of such desires will tend to propel workers to exhibit unfavourable attitudes and possibly through a chain reaction of hostility, poor job satisfaction, attendance problems and other undesirable effects.

Workers cannot become committed to their jobs if their basic necessities are not met. In other words, they should first be satisfied with their present situations. The Herzberg's Two-Factor Motivation Theory establishes the difference between two kinds of motivational influences which seem to relate differently to human behaviour and motivation. These factors are categorized as hygiene and motivational factors. The theory is hinged on the fact that

employees' satisfaction depends on factors that are intrinsic to the nature of their job. Among these factors are recognition, achievement and personal growth in competence mainly because employees are assumed to be highly motivated to acquire more of them. The theory further states that gratification of the motivational factors increases job satisfaction, but when not gratified, they will lead to some dissatisfaction (Herzberg 1970). On the other hand, dissatisfaction is largely accounted for by factors extrinsic to the nature of the work. These factors are related to the nature of the work environment (pay, good supervision, sound policies and working conditions). When extrinsic rewards categorized under 'hygiene' factors are gratified, only minimum job satisfaction is created and when not gratified, negative attitudes may be created. The absence of rewards, especially pay, results in dissatisfaction, and leads to demotivation.

#### *Focus of the Study*

The present study postulates that employees who experience great satisfaction in their jobs would become committed to their organisations. Most past studies seem to have focused only on the direct relationship between organisational commitment and job satisfaction and have side-stepped the effects of different facets of job satisfaction in the relationship. Little was done to sharpen the hypothesis. In reality, overall job satisfaction in all aspects of organisational behaviour cannot equally influence attitudinal outcomes and behaviours such as organisational commitment. In assessing organisational commitment therefore, we believe that it is important to determine employees' satisfaction as being the focus. Different individuals may have different facets of job satisfaction which may motivate them to become committed to their organisation. For example, while some employees may be highly interested in such hygiene factors as pay, friendly co-workers and a good supervisor, others may be interested in the motivational factors that are intrinsic to them, for example, recognition on the job and achievement.

A number of studies on the relationship between the facets of job satisfaction and organisational commitment were encountered in the literature. For example, some studies have shown that satisfaction with supervisor, good supervision and pay may translate into the

willingness on the part of the employees to go beyond normal compliance level, become loyal and stay with the organisation and internalise its goals. These strong feelings are clearly linked with high job performance and increase in productivity (Greenberg and Baron 1993; Whyte 1957).

According to Near (1989) and Mowday *et al.* (1979), several work characteristics should be important correlates of organisational commitment. Salancik (1977) argues that one theoretical rationale for the relationship between several job characteristics and organisational commitment is the extent to which they create a sense of 'felt responsibility' in job incumbents, a feeling that gives individuals the power to act. The stronger the feeling of felt responsibility, the stronger the commitment to the organisation in which that responsibility has been developed. Given this context, one would assume that the more satisfaction individuals have in performing their jobs, the stronger would be their commitment to the organisation. The study therefore posits that there is a positive relationship between the operators' level of satisfaction with the individual facets of job satisfaction variables\* and their level of organisational commitment.

In connection with the lack of a deeper focus between job satisfaction and organisational commitment and the need to identify the facets of job satisfaction that would influence organisational commitment, this research was designed to explain: a) why the relationship between job satisfaction and organisational commitment is generally weak b) what is the nature of relationship between facets of job satisfaction and organisational commitment? c) which hygiene and motivational variable(s) in the Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory are better predictors of organisational commitment? and d) which factor (hygiene or motivational) is a stronger predictor of organisational commitment?

#### *Objectives of the Study*

The overall purpose of the research was to study which individual facets of job satisfaction in the Herzberg's Two-Factor Motivational Theory are

better predictors of organisational commitment. The specific objectives of the study were: a) to determine the operators' level of organisational commitment and job satisfaction b) to determine the nature of the relationship between the individual facets of hygiene and motivational variables and organisational commitment and c) to determine which variables (hygiene or motivation) can better predict organisational commitment. The study was also aimed at determining whether the Herzberg's Two-Factor Motivational Theory is a useful framework for the study of the relationship between job satisfaction and organisational commitment.

## METHODS

### *Measures*

The measurement of organisational commitment (dependent variable) and the individual facets of job satisfaction (independent variables) was based on instruments that have been used in past studies and have been proven to have high reliability and validity. The measurement of each concept in this study is discussed below.

### *Organisational Commitment*

The criterion variable, organisational commitment, was measured by adapting several instruments used in previous commitment studies by Turiman Suandi (1991) and Rahim Sail (1983). In both studies, the instruments were adapted from Porter *et al.* (1979), Steers (1977) and Porter and Lawler (1975). These instruments included diverse definitions and measures of employee commitment. Specifically for this study, the workers' level of commitment was a measure of the operators' perception of their level of a) strong belief in the acceptance of the goals and values of the industry/ factory they work for, b) willingness and readiness to exert considerable effort to achieve the industry's goals and objectives and c) loyalty and strong desire to stay with the industry or factory.

The Likert scale or the summated rating scale, which has been used in previous studies to measure employees' commitment to their organisations, was used in this study. The decision to use the Likert scale was based on the

\* This study used the Herzberg's Two-Factor Motivational Theory variables (Hygiene and motivational) to measure job satisfaction.

effectiveness of the instrument in past commitment studies (Porter *et al.* 1974; Mowday, *et al.* 1979; Bateman and Strasser 1984). Its reliability has been as high or higher than the more complex techniques (Forest 1970). Most studies that have shown organisational commitment to be related to behavioural outcomes have used Porter's measure of commitment (Porter *et al.* 1974) which was based on the psychological approach described in Porter and Smith (1970). The scale also allowed for both attitudinal and cognitive type of statements to be included. In addition, Porter's index has a substantial body of reliability and validity documentation as testified by Mowday *et al.* (1979). The 19 items used in the questionnaire to measure the operators' level of commitment was adopted and modified from the instruments used by Turiman Suandi's (1991) study on commitment of youth leaders and Rahim Sail's (1983) study of clients' commitment to the Federal Land Development Authority's schemes in Malaysia.

In line with the definition of operators' level of commitment to the industries as described above, the scale (see Appendix A) used contained items concerning the three content areas of the definition of commitment mentioned earlier. Some of the questions were stated in a positive form while others were posed in the negative form to reduce response biases.

#### *Job Satisfaction*

The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ), a rating scale for measuring job satisfaction was used in this study. Individuals completing this scale indicate the extent to which they were satisfied with various aspects of their jobs. There are two forms of the MSQs. The long form has 100 items where each item deals with reinforcer in the work environment. The short form has 20 items measuring intrinsic satisfaction, extrinsic satisfaction, and general satisfaction (Weiss *et al.* 1967). In this study, parts of the MSQ that are applicable to the Malaysian environment, Seegmiller's (1977) instrument and a modified content of the variables as defined by Herzberg, Mausner and Synderman (1959) were adapted for use. In total, the job satisfaction instrument contained 101 items regarding specific satisfaction facets of the job and also a single item question to measure overall satisfaction. The nomenclature for one

of the variables, "company policy and administration" was changed to read "industry policy and administration" in order to make it more relevant and understandable to the respondents.

#### *Procedure*

The study was conducted in six industries in the Nilai, Ulu Klang and Bangi Industrial zones in Malaysia. The total operator population in the six industries was 8,850. A total of 426 respondents were randomly selected for this study based on Krejcie and Morgan's (1970) table for determining sample size. A quantitative research design was adopted for this study and a structured questionnaire was chosen as the research instrument. Before the actual instrument was used, a reliability test was carried out to determine the reliability of the research instrument used. The results of the pre-test provided an acceptable level of reliable statistics ranging from 0.67 to 0.91 for all the variables. Data were collected using questionnaires in the selected industries by the researcher himself with the aid of three research assistants, the personnel of the human resources departments in the selected industries and the line supervisors. Data were collected from the respondents on demographic characteristics, job attitudes and organisational commitment. The data were summarized and analysed using the Pearson Product Moment Correlation analysis. Multiple regressions were used to determine the predictor variables.

## RESULTS

#### *Respondents' Profile*

More than three fourths of the respondents (78%) were young and below the age of 30. Their mean age was 26.5 years and 73% of them were females. The ratio of male and female operators was 1 to 2.7. Almost all of them (94%) had upper secondary school level of education while three percent had university education. The average number of years of formal education was 10.3 years (see Table 1).

It is also evident from Table 1 that only 28% of the respondents had worked for more than 5 years. Slightly more than two-thirds (72%) of them had tenure ranging from one to five years with the industries.

The data in Table 2 show that all the eight variables under the hygiene factor and the six

TABLE 1  
Descriptive statistics on respondents' background profile

Characteristic	Freq.	%
<i>Age (Years)</i>		
Less than 20	60	4.1
21 - 30	272	63.8
31 - 40	81	19.0
Above 40	13	3.1
TOTAL	426	100.0
Mean = 26.5	S.D. = 5.9	Min. = 17.0
		Max. = 47
<i>Gender</i>		
Female	311	73.0
Male	115	27.0
TOTAL	426	100.0
<i>Education (No. of Years)</i>		
0 - 6	11	2.0
7 - 9	129	30.3
10 - 11	240	56.3
12 - 14	33	7.7
Above 14	13	3.1
TOTAL	426	100.0
Mean = 10.28	S.D. = 2.83	Min. = 6.0
		Max. = 17.0
<i>Tenure (No. of Years)</i>		
1 - 5	307	72.1
5.1 - 10	53	12.4
10.1 - 15	41	9.6
15.1 - 20	25	5.9
TOTAL	426	100.0
Mean = 5.1	S.D. = 4.7	Min. = 1.0
		Max. = 20.0

variables under the motivation factor were positively related to organisational commitment. The overall hygiene and motivation factors had a moderate  $r$ -value of 0.46 and 0.48 respectively while job satisfaction (combination of hygiene and motivation factors) had an  $r$  value of 0.5.

The hypothesised relationships involving each facet of both the hygiene and motivation factors were positive and significant (ranging from a low of  $r = .23$  to  $r = .47$ ) at the 0.05 level, indicating that job satisfaction (hygiene and motivation factors) would tend to lead to organisational commitment. It can also be discerned from Table 2 that the strength and direction of the job satisfaction variables (the hygiene and motivational factors) among industry operators and their level of commitment to the industries were almost similar ( $r$ -values of 0.46 and 0.48 respectively) thus implying that both factors are equally important in influencing organisational commitment.

The findings of this study supported the hypothesis that the relationship between job satisfaction and organisational commitment was significantly related ( $r = 0.50$ ,  $p = 0.00$ ). This finding is important because it reinforces the results of similar studies on job satisfaction and organisational commitment as reported by Turiman (1991), Shore and Martin (1989) and Welsh and La Van (1981).

#### *Job Satisfaction Facets as Predictors of Organisational Commitment*

In order to determine which of the variables in the Herzberg's Model were better predictors of organisational commitment, a stepwise multiple regression analysis was computed. Out of a total of 14 independent variables in the Herzberg Two-Factor Model, five were significant in the regression equation at SIG-F level of 0.05. These variables were "advancement", "achievement", "interpersonal relationship with supervisor",

TABLE 2  
Correlation coefficient between job satisfaction variables and  
operators organisational commitment (n=426)

Variables	r-value
<i>Hygiene Factors</i>	
Status	0.32
Inter-personal relationship with supervisor	0.35
Inter-personal relationship with peer group	0.23
Quality of supervision	0.36
Industry policy and administration	0.39
Job security	0.32
Working conditions	0.32
Pay/salary	0.27
<i>Overall Hygiene Factors</i>	.46
<i>Motivation Factors</i>	
Work itself	0.29
Achievement	0.47
Possibility for growth	0.26
Responsibility	0.33
Advancement	0.47
Recognition for achievement	0.35
<i>Overall Motivator Factor</i>	0.48
<i>Job Satisfaction</i>	0.50

\* Significant at  $p < .05$  (One tail test)

industry policy and administration" and "work itself". These five variables in the Herzberg's model were found to be sufficiently good predictors of organisational commitment. Table 3 indicates the strength of the relationship between the five independent variables and organisational commitment ( $R$ -value = 0.52) and together they accounted for 27% of the variance explained in the degrees of organisational commitment.

It is interesting to note that two of the variables "Industry Policy and Administration" and "Relationship with Supervisor" that were significant in the regression equation were from the hygiene factor while the other three, "Advancement", "Achievement" and "Work Itself", were from the motivational factor. The finding is contrary to popular belief that hygiene factors are only important at the extrinsic level in the motivational process. These findings show that they are important at the extrinsic as well as the intrinsic levels in developing organisational commitment.

## CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The findings presented in Tables 2 and 3 supported the hypothesis that job satisfaction would have positive effects on operators' organisational commitment. From the findings, it can be concluded that two hygiene factors (relationship with supervisor and industry policy and administration) and three motivator factors (advancement, achievement and work itself) are good predictors of organisational commitment. The implication arising out of this is that some hygiene factors may act as motivators besides providing the necessary condition to motivate employees at work. They serve as hygiene as well as motivator factors. Given the present situation in the industries, it is strongly recommended that managers should concentrate on increasing the commitment of the workers as well as their job satisfaction to higher levels because fostering high levels of commitment among the workers can lead to low levels of absenteeism, less grievance and alienation, low turnover and high levels of willingness to share and make sacrifices on behalf of the industries. Some of the strategies

TABLE 3

Regression analysis of the effect of job satisfaction variables and operators organisational commitment

Job Satisfaction Variables	Multiple			R <sup>2</sup>
	Beta	R	R <sup>2</sup>	Incremental
Advancement	0.15	0.42	0.17	-
Achievement	0.20	0.47	0.22	0.05
Industry Policy & Administration	0.18	0.50	0.25	0.03
Relationship with Supervisor	0.11	0.51	0.26	0.01
Work Itself	0.09	0.52	0.27	0.01

R = 0.52

F = 31.1

R squared adjusted = 0.27

F - Sig. = 0.00

to be adopted by managers should include understanding the dynamics of employees' apathy and disillusionment in the industries through policy pulse-testing surveys and good relationships. In addition, managers of industries should provide conducive work environments for workers, especially having cordial relationships with supervisors and to institute industry policy and administration that is worker friendly which emphasizes workers' welfare as its top priority. Open dialogues and discussions on a regular basis, should be carried out to build up team spirit and organisational commitment.

Employees need to be given adequate responsibility, trust and autonomy to carry out their tasks. This would create a sense of achievement and more importantly, a sense of belonging to the organisation. To achieve this, employees must be trained regularly so as to improve their knowledge and skills and hence their productivity. In line with this and a close monitoring procedure, capable employees should be given the opportunity to shoulder more responsibility to advance in their career. Advancement opportunities have been proven to motivate employees and be good predictors of organisation commitment.

Job rotation as well as varying the tasks should be implemented wherever possible so as to minimize boredom among employees. Boredom can lead to a number of job-related attitude problems such as absenteeism and turnover. Job rotation allows the development of new experience and new approach of doing things while varying the tasks would allow, whenever possible, an employee to complete a whole task and be able to see a complete product of his/her effort.

## REFERENCES

- BATEMAN, T. S. and S. STRASSER. 1984. A longitudinal analysis of the antecedents of organisational commitment. *Academy of Management Journal* 27(1): 95-112.
- BISHOP, J. W. and K. D. SCOTT. 1977. How commitment affects team performance. *Human Resource Magazine* February: 107-111.
- PORTER, L. W., W. J. CRAMPTON and F. T. SMITH. 1979. Organisational commitment and managerial turnover. *Organisational Behaviour and Human Performance* 15: 87-98.
- FOREST, L. B. 1970. Commitment of leaders as predictors of attitudes towards social issues in a rural community social system. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Wisconsin, Madison.
- FERRATT, T. W. 1981. Overall job satisfaction: Is it a linear function of facet satisfaction? *Human Relations* 34: 463-473.
- GREENBERG, J. and R. A. BARON. 1993. *Behaviour in Organisations*. 4th ed. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- GRUNBERG, M. M. 1979. *Understanding Job Satisfaction*. Great Britain: The MacMillan Press Ltd.
- HERZBERG, F. B., MAUSNER and B. B. SNYDERMAN. 1959. *Motivation to Work*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- HERZBERG, F. 1965. The motivation to work among Finnish supervisors. *Personnel Psychology* 18: 393-402.
- HERZBERG, F. 1966. *Work and the Nature of Man*. Cleveland, Ohio: World Publishing Company.
- HERZBERG, F. 1970. The motivation-hygiene theory. In *Management and Motivation*, ed. V.H. Vroom and E.L. Deci. Harmondsworth, England: Penguin Books Ltd.

- HERZBERG, F. 1987. How do you motivate employees? *Harvard Business Review* September/October: 109-120.
- HERZBERG, F. 1990. One more time: how do you motivate employees? In *Manage people, not personnel: motivation and performance appraisal. Harvard Business Review*: 49-75.
- KREJCI, R. C. and D. V. MORGAN. 1970. Determining sample size for research activities. *Education and Psychological Measurements* 30: 607-610.
- LAWSON, E. W. and C. V. FUKAMI. 1984. Relationship between workers behaviour and commitment to the organisation and union. Best paper presented at the 44th Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management, New Orleans, Louisiana.
- LUTHANS, F., D. BACK and L. TAYLOR. 1987. Organisational commitment: analysis of antecedents. *Human Relations* 40(4): 219-236.
- MATHIEU, J. E. and D. M. ZAJAC. 1990. A review and meta-analysis of the antecedents, correlates and consequences of commitment. *Psychology Bulletin* 108: 171-194.
- MEYER, J. P., S. V. PAMNONEN, I. R. GELLATLY, R. D. GOFFIN and D. M. JACKSON. 1989. Organizational commitment and job performance: its the nature of the commitment that counts. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 74: 152-156.
- MOWDAY, R. T., R. M. STEERS and L. W. PORTER. 1979. The measurement organisational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour* 14: 224-247.
- PORTER, L. W., R. M. STEERS, R. T. MOWDAY and P. J. BOULLIAN. 1974. Organisational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover among psychiatric technicians. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 59: 603-629.
- PORTER, L. W., W. J. CRAMPTON and F. T. SMITH. 1976. Organisational commitment and managerial turnover. *Organisational Behaviour and Human Performance* 15: 87-98.
- PORTER, L. W. and E. E. LAWLER. 1968. *Managerial Attitudes and Performance*. Homewood, Illinois: Irwin.
- PORTER, L. W. and F. J. SMITH. 1970. The etiology of organizational commitment: a longitudinal study of initial stages of employee-organisational relationship. Unpublished manuscript.
- PRICE, I. L. and C. W. MUELLER. 1981. A causal model turnover for nurses. *Academy of Management Journal* 24: 543-565.
- RAHIM MOHD. SAIL. 1983. Client's commitment to a project in a group farming organisation: a study of FELDA schemes in Malaysia. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Wisconsin, U.S.A.
- RANDALL, D. M. 1990. The consequences of organizational commitment: methodological investigations. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour* IV: p. 361-378.
- RICE, R. W., D. B. MCFARLIN, R. G. HUNT and J. P. NEW. 1985. Organisational work and perceived quality of life: towards a conceptual model. *Academy of Management Review* 26: 177-188.
- SALANCIK, G. R. 1977. Commitment and the control of organisational behaviour. In *New Directions for Organisational Behaviour*, ed. B.M. Shaw and G.R. Salancik. Chicago: St. Clair Press.
- SCARPELLO, V. and J. P. CAMPBELL. 1983. Job satisfaction: are all the parts there? *Personnel Psychology* 26: 503-520.
- SEGMILLER, J. P. 1977. Job satisfaction of faculty and staff at the College of Eastern Utah. Ph.D. dissertation, College of Eastern Utah.
- STEERS, R. M. 1977. Antecedents and outcomes of organizational commitment. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 22: 46-56.
- STEERS, R. M. and L. W. PORTER. 1979. *Motivation and Work Behaviour*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- TURIMAN B. SUANDI. 1991. Commitment of 4-B (Malaysia) youth leaders towards volunteerism. Ph.D. Dissertation, Ohio State University.
- WEISS, D. J., R. V. DAVID, G. W. ENGLAND and L. H. LOFQUIST. 1967. Manual for the Minnesota satisfaction questionnaire. Work Adjustment, Industrial Relations Center. University of Minnesota.
- WHYTE, W. F. 1957. *Money and Motivation*. New York: Harper and Row Publishers Inc.

(Received: 13 July 2000)

## APPENDIX A

### Section D - Commitment

Listed below are a series of statements that represent the possible feelings that individuals might have about their involvement or working with an organisation. With respect to your own feelings about working with this industry/factory, please indicate your reaction to the following statements by circling the number most closely associated with your feelings according to one of the following alternatives.

scale: 1 strongly disagree  
2 disagree  
3 neutral  
4 agree  
5 strongly agree

1. I would accept any kind of job assignment in order to keep myself involved in the industry/factory activities.  
1 2 3 4 5
2. There is not much to be gained by involving myself in this industry/factory activities. (R)  
5 4 3 2 1
3. I am willing to put in extra effort, more than my usual share, to ensure the success of this industry/factory.  
1 2 3 4 5
4. I would definitely like to see this industry/factory improve far more than it is at the moment.  
1 2 3 4 5
5. This industry/factory's goal to improve workers' quality of life will not be achieved. (R)  
5 4 3 2 1
6. No matter what happens I will remain a member of this industry/factory.  
1 2 3 4 5
7. I am happy I chose to become a member of this industry/factory.  
1 2 3 4 5
8. Deciding to be a member of this industry/factory was a definite mistake on my part. (R)  
5 4 3 2 1
9. I am happy to tell others that I work for this industry/factory.  
1 2 3 4 5

10. Life in industry/factory has taught me the values of sharing responsibility with my fellow workers.  
1 2 3 4 5
11. I feel that my values and the values of this industry/factory are very similar.  
1 2 3 4 5
12. This industry/factory gives workers more responsibility in carrying out the daily duties.  
1 2 3 4 5
13. My commitment to the industry/factory has increased greatly in the last six months to one year.  
1 2 3 4 5
14. This industry work really inspires the best of me in the way of achieving high performance.  
1 2 3 4 5
15. Even when I am sick, I always manage to come to work everyday.  
1 2 3 4 5
16. I always do my best not to come to work late.  
1 2 3 4 5
17. I am willing to be in the industry/factory's management team to manage the organisation in the future.  
1 2 3 4 5
18. Often, I disagree with all the policies of the industry/factory on important matters relating to the work. (R)  
5 4 3 2 1
19. I am committed to this industry/factory because it is an indigenous industry/factory and I would like to stay and work for it.  
1 2 3 4 5

Please Indicate Your Employment No(h). \_\_\_\_\_

**THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR COOPERATION AND PATIENCE IN FILLING IN THIS QUESTIONNAIRE.**