

**UNIVERSITY OF GHANA**  
**DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY**

**ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT, JOB SATISFACTION AND TURNOVER  
INTENTIONS OF INFORMAL WORK GROUPS: A STUDY AMONG  
ORGANIZATIONS IN ACCRA**

**BY**  
**MERCY ADORKOR ALLOTEY**  
**(10636296)**

**THIS THESIS IS SUBMITTED TO THE UNIVERSITY OF GHANA, LEGON IN  
PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENT FOR THE AWARD OF MPhil.  
INDUSTRIAL AND ORGANIATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY DEGREE.**

**JULY, 2019**

**DECLARATION**

I confirm that this thesis has not been presented in whole or in part for any other degree or professional qualification. That, this thesis is an original work carried out at the Department of Psychology, University of Ghana for the award of an MPhil Degree in Industrial and Organizational Psychology. I have duly acknowledged other people's work used in this study.

.....

.....

Mercy Adorkor Allotey (Student)

Date

*This thesis has been submitted for examination with the approval of:*

.....

.....

Dr. Benjamin Amponsah  
(Principal Supervisor)

Date

.....

.....

Dr. Kingsley Nyarko  
(Co Supervisor)

Date

## **DEDICATION**

This work is dedicated to my family.

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

I am thankful to God for giving me the grace to be able to finish this dissertation. I express my gratitude to my supervisors, Dr. Benjamin Amponsah and Dr. Kingsley Nyarko for their direction and guidance in shaping this work.

I am also extremely thankful and appreciative of the encouragement from my family and friends.

Thank you all for your varied support in putting me through school.

Lastly, I would like to thank my MPhil colleagues for their help in varied ways towards completion of my work and all participants who took time to respond to the questionnaires.

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

DECLARATION .....i

DEDICATION..... ii

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT..... iii

TABLE OF CONTENT .....iv

LIST OF TABLES .....vi

ABSTRACT .....vii

CHAPTER ONE..... 1

INTRODUCTION ..... 1

    1.1 Background of the study ..... 1

    1.2 Problem Statement..... 10

    1.3 Aims and Objectives of the Study ..... 12

    1.4 Significance of the Study ..... 13

CHAPTER TWO ..... 14

LITERATURE REVIEW ..... 14

    2.0 Introduction ..... 14

    2.1 Theoretical Framework..... 14

        2.1.1 Groupthink Theory ..... 14

        2.1.2 Social Identity Theory..... 17

        2.1.3 Job Satisfaction ..... 18

        2.1.4 Intermediate Linkage Model ..... 20

        2.1.5 Organizational Commitment ..... 22

        2.1.6 Informal Group ..... 24

        2.1.7 Aloneness Group ..... 26

    2.2 Review of Related Studies ..... 27

        2.2.1 Informal Groups and Job Satisfaction..... 27

        2.2.2 Informal Groups and Turnover Intentions ..... 28

        2.2.3 Informal Groups and Organizational Commitment ..... 30

        2.2.4 Job Satisfaction and Turnover Intentions..... 32

        2.2.5 Organizational Commitment and Turnover Intentions ..... 34

    2.3 Rationale ..... 35

    2.4 Statements of Hypotheses ..... 36

    2.5 Operational Definitions ..... 36

CHAPTER THREE.....	38
METHODOLOGY.....	38
3.0 Introduction .....	38
3.1 Research Setting/Population .....	38
3.2 Research Design .....	38
3.3 Sample and Sampling Procedure .....	39
3.4 Instruments .....	40
3.4.1 Demographic Characteristics.....	40
3.4.2 Organizational Commitment .....	40
3.4.3 Job Satisfaction Survey .....	41
3.4.4 Employee Turnover Intentions Questionnaire.....	42
3.4.5 Workplace Friendship Scale.....	42
3.5 Data Collection Procedure .....	43
3.6 Pilot Study .....	44
3.7 Participants .....	45
3.8 Ethical Considerations .....	45
3.9 Data Analyses .....	45
2.4 Statements of Hypotheses .....	45
CHAPTER FOUR.....	47
RESULTS.....	47
4.0 Introduction .....	47
4.1 Preliminary Results.....	48
4.2 Hypotheses Testing.....	51
4.2.1 Hypothesis 1 .....	51
4.2.2 Hypothesis 2 .....	52
4.2.3 Hypothesis 3 .....	52
4.2.4 Hypothesis 4 .....	53
4.3 Summary of Results .....	54
CHAPTER FIVE .....	55
DISCUSSION.....	55
5.0 Introduction .....	55
5.1 Job Satisfaction and Informal Groups .....	55

5.2 Organizational Commitment and Informal Groups .....	57
5.3 Turnover Intentions and Informal Groups .....	59
5.4 Groups, Job Satisfaction, Org. Commitment and Turnover Intentions .....	60
5.5 Limitations .....	62
5.6 Recommendations.....	63
5.7 Implications .....	63
5.8 Conclusion .....	65
REFERENCES .....	67
APPENDICES .....	82

### **LIST OF TABLES**

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics and Reliability.....	48
Table 2: Demographic Characteristics of Respondents.....	49
Table 3: Inter-correlation Matrix between Study Variables.....	50
Table 4: T-test on Turnover.....	51
Table 5: T-test on Job Satisfaction.....	52
Table 6: T-test on Organizational Commitment.....	52
Table 7: Multiple Regression Analysis.....	53

## ABSTRACT

Studies on job satisfaction, organizational commitment and turnover intentions in Ghana have not investigated the possible influence of informal groups on these organizational outcomes. The study compared organizational commitment, job satisfaction and turnover intentions among employees in informal groups and those who were not in any informal group. Job satisfaction, organizational commitment and groups (employees in informal groups and those who were not in any informal group) were hypothesized to predict turnover intentions. Two hundred full time employees were sampled from 6 organizations. A survey research design using four standardized instruments was used to collect data for this study. Findings from the study indicated that employees in informal groups reported higher job satisfaction and lower organizational commitment than employees who were not in any informal group. There was no statistical significant difference between the two groups of employees on turnover intentions. It is in the best interest of organizations to identify informal groups in the organization and their possible influence on work attitudes.

**Keywords:** *organizational commitment, job satisfaction, turnover intentions, informal groups*

## CHAPTER ONE

### INTRODUCTION

#### 1.1 Background to the study

Most organizations have the tendency to make the best usage of employed personnel in order to increase organizational performance and sustainability. Managers and human resource managers hope to boost job satisfaction, organizational commitment and reduce turnover intentions. The positive effect of job satisfaction, organizational commitment and reduced turnover intentions on the organization's performance has been recognized worldwide (Xu & Zhao, 2008). Every organization has ambitions to achieve its organizational goals, aims and objectives. In order to accomplish these aims and goals, employees with recognized skills and knowledge may be formally grouped within the organization to provide possible solutions, result-oriented ways and remedies to achieve set goals and aims (Raef, 1990). Raef (1990) further explains that these formal groups are well-defined and structured and all orders and instructions are addressed formally. Morgan (2018) explained that a formal group is formed when the organization puts people together to accomplish specific goals and objectives. This official group has particular structures and roles where responsibilities of members of the group are defined.

On the other hand, groups that are not formed by an organization are termed as informal groups. Owusu-Boateng, Attah and Acheampong (2016) described informal groups as groups formed spontaneously in the organization. The basis of the group is built on common interest and

friendship without a formal structure or management control. Informal groups are characterized by spontaneity, social interaction, friendships, common interests, group norms etc. (Raef, 1990). Examples of informal groups in the organization are employees who always have lunch together, two or more employees who hang out together during and after working hours.

Both formal and informal groups exist in any organization (Xu & Zhao, 2008). Robbins and Judge (2010) described the types of groups in the organization. These dissimilar group types within the organization are formal and informal groups. Robbins and Judge (2010) defined formal groups as two or more individuals created by the organization's structure and have designated work assignments and rooted tasks. The behaviour of such groups is directed toward achieving organizational goals. This group can further be classified into two sub groups. They are the Command/Control group and Task group (Robbins & Judge, 2010).

Command/Control group comprises of managers or supervisors and subordinates, who meet frequently to discuss general and specific ideas to improve product or service. This group is specified by the organization's structure. In business organizations, most employees work in such command groups. This group is composed of individuals who report or give an account directly to a given manager. An example of a command group is an academic department chairman or the head of department and the faculty members in that department.

A Task group is also organizationally determined. The organization appoints group members and assigns the goals and tasks to be accomplished. It is a temporary group representing the employees who are working together to complete a job task or particular project. A typical example is a group assigned to a particular project, the project may include the task of developing a new product or improving an existing product for the organization.

According to Greenberg and Baron (2003), as a result of common interests shared among individual employees, informal groups are likely to be formed in an organization. Robbins and Judge (2011) classified this group into two sub groups. They are the Interest group and Friendship group. An Interest Group is a group formed by people who have interest in the same or similar subjects or have a common interest (Mehmet, Murat, Mustafa, & Deniz, 2015). Interest groups usually continue over time and may last longer than general informal groups (McMillan, 2018). Members of interest groups may not necessarily be in the same department in the organization but they are bound together by some other common interest. The goals and objectives of interest groups are specific to each group and may not be related to organizational goals and objectives. For example, colleagues who are interested in football, they meet up after work hours to watch and discuss football. Robbins and Judge (2011) articulated that members of interest groups also work together to attain a specific objective, such as raising funds for a common cause or organize a clean-up exercise. Mehmet et al. (2015) defined friendship groups as groups which are formed by the individual employees who become close to each other. Members enjoy each other's company and often meet after work to participate in social activities. For example, a group of employees who form a friendship group may have an exercise group, a tennis team, or get together once a month to cook, share a meal and just talk.

The extent to which informal groups matter depends on its development of certain “rules” and “roles” in the group which may exert an influential and motivational impact on work performance, job satisfaction, organizational commitment and turnover intentions in the organization (Xu & Zhao, 2008). These “rules” and “roles” can satisfy certain emotional, social and psychological needs of its members that formal groups may fail to offer; or alternatively, they can moderate undesirable outcomes caused by formal groups (Raef, 1990).

Informal groups are formed for various reasons. Some of the reasons include need satisfaction, proximity, goals and economics (Gibson, Ivancevich & Donnelly, 1985). The desire for need satisfaction can be a strong motivating force which can lead to group formation. Affiliation with a group can satisfy certain security, social, self-esteem and self-actualization needs. Without the group to lean on when various management demands are made, certain employees may assume or feel that they are standing alone facing management. This 'aloneness' leads to a degree of insecurity (Gibson, Ivancevich & Donnelly, 1985).

Informal groups help ease management workload and act as a safety valve and fill the gap of managerial abilities (Owusu-Boateng, Attoh & Acheampong, 2016). For instance, if a manager is weak in succession planning and organizational analysis, a subordinate may informally lend a hand in preparing reports and assist the manager by either suggestions or direct involvement. This eventually will result in effective performance of tasks. This boosts entrustment, delegation, transference and greater worker support of the manager, which suggests a possible progress or enhancement in performance and overall organizational productivity (Sarkwa, 2011). The informal groups also offer a means for relieving emotional and psychological pressures (such as frustration, tension, and emotional problems) with management and other employees by allowing a person to discuss these pressures among friends openly and truthfully (Draper, 2006). Employees who through informal groups get rid of these emotional and psychological pressures have free minds to imagine and generate new ideas, concentrate and approach their duties with clear unambiguous thoughts and therefore perform better (Draper, 2006).

In Ghana, according to Owusu-Boateng, Attoh and Acheampong (2016) informal groups in the banking sector are very supportive and boost employee performance. In addition, informal groups create an avenue for employees to clear their frustrations and dissatisfactions. They also

help employees position themselves tactically to executive given tasks well and lighten workloads. Informal groups in its supportive nature assists employees to free their minds, imagine and generate new ideas to perform better. Finally, they act as checks and balance on management's use of control and authority (Owusu-Boateng, Attah & Acheampong, 2016)

Mullins (2010) emphasizes that informal groups are very influential social networks which are fashioned in response to and through activities of their members. Mullins (2010) further expresses that managers and supervisors frequently encounter problems due to failure to identify that within every organization there are often informal group pressures that influence and regulate individual behaviour. Informal groups convey an unspoken or implied code of ethics or objectionable set of standards forming acceptable behaviours for a group of employees (Mullins, 2010). According to Hellriegel and Slocam (2007), some managers view informal groups as a possible cause of anti-establishment power, and as a result, members of informal groups hold back information when the group does not agree with organizational goals or pressurize employees to slow down production. Anderson et al. (2006) observes that some informal groups within the organization enforce the belief that high productivity will work against the interest of workers. Bennet (1991) also argues that if the aims of the group do not correspond to the objectives of its management, informal groups can cause problems on performance.

Research has shown that people pay attention to several factors of their work environment which influences their work attitudes (Jex & Liu, 2015). Some of these factors include characteristics of the job, relationships with colleagues and managers, organizational justice and level of stress (Yin-Fah, Foon, Chee-Leong & Osman, 2010). Work attitudes as defined by Jex and Lui (2015) are a variety of feelings that employees have toward different aspects of their jobs or work lives. These feelings about one's job has the tendency to influence an employee's

performance, turnover intentions, among others. At work, two work attitudes have the likelihood of influencing an employee's intention to leave the organization: these are job satisfaction and organizational commitment.

Various factors can have an influence on an employee's job satisfaction, organizational commitment and turnover intentions. Identifying and getting understanding of such factors can have important implications for employers in terms of their decisions on organizational incentive and motivational mechanisms. Yin-Fah et al. (2010) stated that job satisfaction has been known as a significant factor in the working lives for all work-related groups and employees who are satisfied with their jobs are more likely to be committed to their organizations and decrease the intention of leaving the job.

Robert, Young and Kelly (2011) postulated that job satisfaction is one of the most frequently studied variables in organizational study because managers want to gain knowledge on how to avoid employee turnover and reward their best workers. Researchers have intensively studied the nature and cause of being satisfied with a job and its positive influence on organizational performance and productivity has been properly recognized (Locke, 1976). Organizations also employ professionals and consulting firms to assess their employees on job satisfaction. There may be a plethora of reasons behind the trend, including the desire to decrease absenteeism and turnover or to increase the well-being of their employees (Vance, 2006). Research has discovered several factors that influence job satisfaction.

Judge and Church (2000) posit that feedback and autonomy affect job satisfaction. Barber, Dunham and Formisano (1992) also discovered a positive relationship between compensation and job satisfaction. Roznowski and Hulin (1992) argue that, even though evaluation of

cognitive and physical skill is the most important data that an enterprise can have about applicants prior to recruitment, assessment of job satisfaction is similarly essential after hiring the applicant. This is because job satisfaction has been recognized to influence variables, such as employee attendance at work, intention to leave an organization, decisions to retire, organizational citizenship behaviour among others. Due to the acceptance of job satisfaction within the field of industrial and organizational psychology (Spector, 1997), numerous researchers and practitioners have provided their individual definitions of what job satisfaction is. Spector (1997) described job satisfaction as a collection of feelings toward a job. He expressed that satisfaction is multidimensional. Some of the common aspects of measurement include “appreciation, communication, co-workers, fringe benefits, job conditions, nature of work itself, organization itself, organizational policies and procedures, pay, personal growth, promotion opportunities, recognition, security, supervision” (Spector, 1997, p. 3).

According to Xu and Zhao (2008), job satisfaction refers to a set of attitudes that workers have about their jobs. It also includes thought-provoking work, acceptable compensation, job opportunities and friendly or supportive colleagues, especially positive moods and emotions (Xu & Zhao, 2008). Nonetheless, two workers may communicate equal level of job satisfaction but reasons may differ (Xu & Zhao, 2008).

Turnover intention is considered to be a conscious and thoughtful willfulness to leave the organization (Tett & Meyer, 1993). Turnover intention can also be defined as intentions or thoughts about leaving a job (Simon, Müller & Hasselhorn, 2010). Turnover intentions have often been linked with turnover and have been researched for a long time among organizational scholars (Hinshaw & Atwood, 1984). Turnover intention is the behavioural disposition of employees to attempt to leave their work organization, which may lead to actual turnover (Chen

et al., 2013). Research has pointed to turnover intention as the key precursor to a person's action of organizational withdrawal. Actual turnover has in this vein been postulated to have the ability to cause lower standards in the organization and can be costly in terms of replacing the employee. It may also create a negative atmosphere at the workplace, employees remaining maybe pressured and that can lead to turnover intentions and more turnovers (Borda & Norman, 1997).

There are various factors that can influence thoughts of leaving a job or profession. Guðlaugsdóttir (2016) discovered that job satisfaction, positive attitude and mentality, training and salary all had a relationship to turnover intention. Saraih et al. (2016) also discovered in their research that organizational commitment was negatively associated with academician's turnover intention. Other factors that can influence turnover intentions as outlined by Du-Plooy and Roodt are burnout, organizational citizenship behaviour, work engagement and work alienation. Work engagement and organizational citizenship behaviour were significantly negatively related to turnover intentions. This means that employees who had high levels of work engagement (energetic, positive behaviour and dedicated to their work) and high levels of organizational citizenship behaviour (employees who exhibited voluntary actions and behaviours which are not part of the job) were less likely to have conscious thoughts of leaving the organization. Burnout and work alienation were significantly positively related to turnover intentions. This also indicates that the more an employee feels alienated from him/herself and others and experiences increased levels of burnout, this employee is more likely to have conscious thoughts of leaving the organization.

The concept of organizational commitment was introduced by Becker in 1960. He emphasized that organizational commitment can be used to predict employees' performance,

absence, turnover, and organizational efficiency (Ferris & Aranya, 1983). Organizational commitment as defined by Saraih et al. (2016) is an attempt by an employee to get involved in the organization and has no desire to leave. Kreitner and Kinicki (2012) divided organizational commitment into three components; affective commitment, continuance commitment and normative commitment.

According to them, employees who stay with a particular organization out of love or affection are displaying affective commitment. They further explained affective commitment as an emotionally based psychological state. Affective commitment could be the result of positive past work-related behaviours (Meyer et al., 2002) and is the preferred form of commitment for companies.

Continuance commitment, as stated by Meyer et al. (2002), refers to a person's decision to stay with an organization. This decision is dependent on the cost associated with leaving the organization. The main precursors of continuance commitment are an apparent absence of options or an inability to transfer skills and education to another organization. As mentioned by McMahan (2007), employees who exhibit continuance commitment can potentially sully the work group. The third type of organizational commitment model is called normative commitment. This happens when a worker feels a sense of obligation and responsibility towards an organization and the worker feels that being committed to that particular organization is the right and appropriate thing to do (Meyer et al., 2002). The feeling of indebtedness is an example of normative commitment (Saraih et al., 2016). Normative commitment can be developed when an organization offers special treatment such as advance payments, paying for child tuition and special needs and training for employees (Meyer et al., 2002). Thus, employees tend to develop the sense that they ought to stay with the organization.

Most organizations want to make the best usage of employed personnel in order to increase organizational performance and sustainability. Industrial/Organizational Psychologists and Human Resource Managers want to achieve this goal by boosting job satisfaction, organizational commitment and reduce turnover intentions and also encourage employees to work well together. In the process of working together to achieve these goals, informal groups are spontaneously formed. Mullins (2010) explains that informal groups are very powerful social networks which are constructed in response to and through actions of their members. It is therefore important to understand if informal groups have an influence on these organizational outcomes.

## **1.2 Problem Statement**

Informal groups exist in every organization categorized by individuals as this is the interlocking structure that governs and impacts how individuals interact at the work place to get the goals and the objectives of the organization accomplished (Nkala & Barbara, 2013). Cross and Parker (2004), posit that most managers have little to no knowledge and understanding of how their employees actually relate with each other to get work done. According to Sorge and Warner (1997), informal groups can exercise desirable and undesirable control over individual members.

Employees who are members of informal groups are able to rely on their groups to deal with issues, release feelings, social support and help each other with work (Xu & Zhao, 2008). Sorge and Warner (1997), argue that informal groups might put pressure on its members to conform to its standard of behaviour by manipulating rewards and punishments. Also, Conway (2002) observed that informal groups can ostracize certain members or give them the silent treatment for

not following group standards of acceptable behaviour and this treatment may threaten an employee's social, safety and esteem needs, which may lead to low job commitment and satisfaction.

Mullins (2010) explains that informal groups are very powerful social networks which are constructed in response to and through actions of their members. Mullins (2010) further expresses that managers and supervisors frequently face problems due to failure to identify that within every organization there are often informal group pressures that influence and regulate employee performance, commitment, among others. Owusu-Boateng, Attoh and Acheampong (2016) described informal groups in the banking sector in Ghana as being helpful and supportive. They also discovered in their study that managers failed to recognize that there are informal group pressures within every organization which are likely to influence and determine employees' work behaviour.

In view of this, it is important to study the work attitudes of employees in informal groups in the organization because employees in informal groups have been shown to be influenced by the rules, norms and culture of that group. Friendship at the workplace has shown to offer many benefits to the individual, such as, support, energy, trust, security and growth (Reohr, 1991; Riordan & Griffeth, 1995), which in turn can influence work related attitudes and behaviours. Report prepared by the Financial Stability Department of the Bank of Ghana stated that in 2018, more than 2,170 cases of fraud were reported out of which 1,239 cases were committed by banks' staff (informal groups) in the form of suppressing cash or deposits from customers (graphic.com.gh, September 2, 2019). This is a huge concern for managers and employers. The questions to ask are, is group influence negative or positive at the workplace in regards to work outcomes? Should informal group formation be encouraged? This study seeks to answer these

pertinent questions. Studies on informal groups (Riordan & Griffeth, 1995; Sheldon, 1971; Xu & Zhao, 2008) have been conducted in developed countries like China and United States of America, however, in Ghana, not much has been done in that area. It is relevant to conduct this study in Ghana because although there are many similarities among cultures, there also exist a variety of differences between cultures that exist across human societies. Adams and Plaut (2003), proposed that friendship is not a universal form; instead it takes different forms in different cultural worlds. In their study, even though they considered Americans as individualistic and Ghanaians as collectivist, American participants were significantly more likely than Ghanaian participants to indicate a large friendship network and to emphasize emotional support. This research seeks to investigate job satisfaction, organizational commitment and turnover intentions of informal groups in the organization.

### **1.3 Aim and Objectives of the study**

#### **Aim**

The aim of this study is to investigate job satisfaction, organizational commitment and turnover intentions of employees in informal groups.

#### **Objectives**

- To assess the levels of turnover intentions between employees in informal groups and employees in aloneness groups
- To examine job satisfaction of employees in informal groups as compared to employees in aloneness groups
- To analyze organizational commitment of employees in informal groups as compared to employees in aloneness groups

- To determine if groups, job satisfaction and organizational commitment will predict turnover intentions among employees

#### **1.4 Significance of the study**

This study sought to investigate job satisfaction, organizational commitment and turnover intentions of employees in informal groups. It is important for management to examine these work attitudes of employees in informal groups to help them monitor performance in the organization. Good performance of employees helps the organization attain its goals and improves productivity.

In addition, this study will help employers, management and other stakeholders to be aware of the existence of informal groups in the organizations and its influence on organizational commitment, job satisfaction and turnover intentions. Also, findings will help Industrial/Organizational Psychologists, Human resource managers and supervisors improve on human resource management policies and team and group formation.

Finally, this study helps address the issue of paucity of research when it comes to informal groups in the Ghanaian context. It will also serve as a basis for further studies on job satisfaction, organizational commitment and turnover intentions of employees in informal groups.

## **CHAPTER TWO**

### **LITERATURE REVIEW**

#### **2.0 Introduction**

This chapter looks at the theoretical framework guiding this study and further delves into review of related studies. The rationale of the study, stated hypotheses and operational definitions used are also given in this section

#### **2.1 Theoretical framework**

These theories were used as the underlying theories guiding this research. They are: group think and social identity theory plus conceptual notes on job satisfaction, intermediate linkage model, organizational commitment, informal groups and aloneness groups

##### **2.1.1 Groupthink (Janis, 1972)**

The importance of informal groups in the workplace has been identified by scholars most of the last century (Morrison, 2005). Informal groups and informal relations at the workplace was brought to light by Elton Mayo (1945). He wrote a management book centered on the social needs of employees. Mayo (1945) contended that the extent to which employees received social satisfaction from coworkers they form friendships with was the most influential impact on productivity, this strengthens the role of emotional factors in determining employee behaviour.

Groupthink theory has continued relevance to organizations because of the organizational trend toward self-managing work teams (Moorhead, Neck & West, 1998). The concept of groupthink is explained when members in a group reach a peak of shared illusions observed in cohesive groups and friendship cliques. Groupthink is a term first used in 1972 by a social

psychologist named Irving L. Janis. He explained groupthink as a psychological phenomenon in which members in a group strive for consensus within a group. In many cases, group members will set aside their own individual beliefs and embrace the opinion of the rest of the group. For more years, Janis's (1972) groupthink was offered as a theoretical description for faulty decision making (Henningsen, Henningsen, Eden & Cruz, 2006). This concept captured the minds of the media and press, providing coherent explanations for some of the fiascoes in major decision in history, such as the Bay of Pigs decision, Watergate, the Viet Nam War escalation decision, Pearl Harbor, and so forth (Turner & Pratkanis, 1998). Janis (1972, 1982) argued that groupthink leads to an inability to arrive at a high quality or good decision. Fuller and Aldag (1998) also added that bad group decisions have become almost synonymous with the concept of groupthink.

However, counter to Janis and Mann's (1977) conceptual model, Janis (1989) again proposed that if the leader advocates a good decision, even in the face of group think, the group will arrive at a good decision. Janis's (1972) concept of groupthink has been a widely popular theory since its introduction (Henningsen et al., 2006). The impacts of groupthink are expansive and it very well may be found in a differed number of fields ranging from political science, social psychology and counseling to organizational studies, management studies, organizational behaviour and everything in between. This phenomenon can influence each of these fields, which is why it is integral to identify such behaviour and is also the first step to finding a solution to problems caused by groups.

Janis (1977) conceptualized the theory as a five-step causal model, which included, antecedents of groupthink, concurrence seeking, symptoms of groupthink, decision-making defects, and poor decision outcomes (Janis & Mann, 1977). Janis (1972, 1982) explained antecedents as a number of conditions outlined that represented the antecedents of groupthink.

These antecedents or conditions outlined included structural defects, provocative situational context and high levels of cohesiveness. Structural defects are represented as insulation, that is, members of the group are guarded from outside opinions and views. Lack of leader impartiality; group leaders push their ideas and opinions unto their teammates. Lack of procedural norms; there is no proper procedure used by group members to validate group decisions since decision making is highly opinion based. Member homogeneity was explained by Janis (1972) as members with similar social backgrounds tend to share the same views, opinions and ideals on a certain subject matter, leaving no room for varied opinions.

Provocative situational contexts include low group efficacy and high stress. The fear of being rejected, ostracized, being removed from the group, and being stereotyped causes stress in the members, leading to conformity. High levels of cohesiveness occurs when people assign more value to group unity than individual expression and opinions (Janis, 1972).

According to Janis, of these antecedents, cohesiveness was more important than the other factors (Janis & Mann, 1977). In Janis's (1972) words, "I use the term 'groupthink' as a quick and easy way to refer to a mode of thinking that people engage in when they are deeply involved in a cohesive in-group" (p. 9). In his 1982 account, Janis referred to cohesiveness as the greatest single hazard that can cause groupthink to occur. Despite his assertions about the importance of high levels of cohesiveness, Janis (1982) argued that groupthink cannot occur if any or all of the antecedents were not present. Thus, all antecedents were portrayed as important.

The groupthink theory has had its fair share of criticisms. Baron (2005) stated that after many years of investigations, the theory lacks experimental validation. Baron (2005) explained that experimental results for groupthink are limited and at best gives mixed results. Other

researchers have suggested model adjustments. Whyte (1998) and Baron (2005) suggested that the antecedent cohesion be replaced with efficacy. Turner and Pratkanis (1998) also proposed an incorporation of a social identity model.

### **2.1.2 Social Identity Theory (Tajfel, 1979)**

Tajfel (1979) proposed that the groups which people belonged to were an important source of social identity. The social identity theory describes how group members perceive themselves as having distinct characteristics which are similar to others in the group. Organizational identification has been recognized as a critical construct on organizational behaviour, affecting both the satisfaction of the employee and the effectiveness of the organization (Ashforth & Mael, 1989). Tajfel and Turner (1979) propose three mental processes that individuals use to evaluate themselves and others. The first is social categorization. Individuals categorize themselves and others in order to understand their social environment. Examples of such categorizations include gender, age, status, race, religion among others. People identify with others who share similar characteristics with them. By doing this they find out things about themselves and define appropriate behaviour by reference to the norms of the group they belong to.

The second process is social identification. Individuals compare themselves to others in their society by perceiving themselves as being members of a certain group. The group identity is adopted by its members. Members begin to act in the ways and beliefs of the group, they also conform to the norms and rules of the group. However, according to Ashforth and Mael (1989) even though members of a group associate themselves with the beliefs and values of the given group, it does not necessarily mean they accept the beliefs and values of the group. In an organizational setting, social identification occurs when employees adopt the identification of the

organization (Ashforth & Mael, 1989). Other identifications could be from work groups, unions, lunch group, department, interest groups and so on. An individual may define himself in terms of the organization he works for and yet disagree with the principal values, rules and culture of that organization. According to Ashforth and Mael (1989), social identification with an organization enhances an employee's support for the organization, commitment, self-esteem and prestige.

The final stage is the social comparison stage. Once an individual has categorized himself as part of a group and has identified with that group, he then tends to compare that group with other groups. McLeod (2019) argued that for self-esteem to be maintained, groups need to compare favourably with other groups. Once two groups identify themselves as competition, they are forced to compete in order for members to maintain their self-esteem. This competition between groups is not only a matter of striving for resources and self-esteem but also the result of competing identities (McLeod, 2019).

Social identity theory describes how individuals obtain some sense of identity from the groups that they perceive that they belong to. Group member actively attempt to maintain and enhance their evaluations of the group and its actions (Ashforth & Mael, 1989). In an organizational setting, social identity theory suggests that a group can change a group member's behaviour, if it can modify the member's self-identity that he derives from the knowledge of and emotional attachment to the group (Tajfel & Turner, 1979).

### **2.1.3 Job Satisfaction (Spector, 1997)**

There is a plethora of research and differing viewpoints on job satisfaction. According to Janssen and Yperen (2004), there are important and recurring questions in organizational psychology which determine employees performing well in their jobs and being satisfied with

their jobs. Spector (1997) described job satisfaction as a collection of feelings toward a job. He measured satisfaction based on nine facets: pay, promotion, supervision, benefits, contingent rewards, operating procedures, coworkers, nature of work, and communication (Spector, 1997). Some of the common features under the nine facets include appreciation, communication, fringe benefits, job conditions, organization itself, organizational policies and procedures, personal growth, promotion opportunities, recognition and security (Spector, 1997).

From a business perspective, employees' job satisfaction can affect organizational goals (Haas, 2015). As a result, human resources managers and industrial/organizational psychologists study job satisfaction. According to Henne and Locke (1985), employees want fairness in regard to pay, to make enough money to cover expenditures, clarity on job descriptions and promotion availability. They also want to work in a suitable and nontoxic environment (Henne & Locke, 1985). Henne and Locke (1985) noted that employees can increase their satisfaction by changing the way that they think about the job. It is possible that an employee has misjudged a situation such as a disagreement with a colleague or manager, and it affected their satisfaction towards their job. An employee would also be able to change job values for a situation, which might lead to an increase in job satisfaction.

Literature on job satisfaction is usually referred to as an emotional affective response to specific aspects of a job or the job itself (Locke, 1976). Smith, Kendall and Hulin (1969) postulated that job satisfaction with various aspects of a job is derived from comparing an individual's focus with the existing job characteristic which is as a result of a cognitive process. Locke (1976) outlined three major approaches to the causes of job attitudes. These approaches can be derived from differences between the person's expectation of the job and what the job offers, from the extent to which the existing job fulfills individual needs and from the degree to

which individual values (desires, wants) are satisfied (Locke, 1976). Locke (1976) further states that job attitudes arise from an interaction of certain aspects of the job which should lead to satisfaction of particular job aspects. For example, level of pay should be related to satisfaction with pay, job description or expectation should be related to satisfaction with the job itself. The attitudinal nature of satisfaction implies that an individual would tend to approach (or stay with) a satisfying job and avoid (or quit) a dissatisfying job (Spector, 1985). Consequences of low satisfaction include withdrawal behaviour, turnover and absenteeism and withdrawal intentions (Horn, Katerberg & Hulin, 1979). Benefits of high satisfaction as outlined by Levy (2003) include better performance, reduction in withdrawal, reduced turnover and turnover intentions and counterproductive behaviours.

The antecedents of job satisfaction that are of primary interest in this study are the social factors. The informal relationship that employees form with their coworkers and supervisors seem to be important contributing factors to whether employees are satisfied with their jobs (Levy, 2003). Mayo (1945) argued that the key determinant of job satisfaction was group interaction and emphasized on the significance of good headship and sustaining personal relations at the workplace.

#### **2.1.4 Intermediate Linkage Model (Mobley, 1977)**

Mobley's (1977) demonstrates how complex the decision for an employee to leave the organization truly is. He introduced the model to explain the process by which an employee decides to leave the organization. The model process starts with an employee's evaluation of their existing job. The next step is an emotional state; employees evaluate whether they are satisfied or dissatisfied with the job. If the employee is dissatisfied with the job, the next process

occurs: thoughts of quitting. Thoughts of quitting leads to an evaluation for the expected utility of searching for another job and the cost of quitting. If perceived possibility of finding a comparable job is quite high and the cost of quitting is not much, an employee will proceed to the next step. The employee follows with intentions of searching for alternative jobs. Intentions for searching leads to actual searching for alternative jobs. Once alternatives are existent and favourable, an evaluation of these alternatives are made and the best one among them is selected.

Afterwards, the employee compares the best alternative with the existing job. If the comparison favours the alternative, intention to quit will be stimulated. Followed by the last step which is actual turnover. According to Mobley (1977), job satisfaction was a major contributor of the model. Job satisfaction was most directly related to withdrawal cognitions associated with the decision to leave and only indirectly related to actual turnover process (Mobley, 1977). However, the model failed to outline the determinants of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction.

The aspect of organizational functioning that can be affected by informal groups particularly in the workplace is turnover and turnover intentions (Morrison, 2005). The relationship between an organization and its employees is both critical and fragile. In many ways, it is an exchange relationship in which both parties bring to the table something the other wants or needs. The intention to leave an organization is caused by many factors, such as organizational culture, employability, labour market conditions, relational satisfaction, which would in turn affect whether an employee intends to stay with or leave the organization (Akgün & Lynn, 2002; Allen & Meyer, 1997; Carmeli & Gefen, 2005).

As high-performing employees' voluntary turnover is especially detrimental to organizational performance (Kwon & Rupp, 2013), it is crucial to identify and understand

possible causes that predict employee turnover intention. Turnover intentions, that is, intentions to stay or leave the organization is an important criterion for organizational development.

Fishbein and Ajzen's (1975) described turnover intention as an individual's behavioural intention or conation in the framework of planned behaviour, to leave the organization. Chen et al. (2013) also defined turnover intention as a behavioural tendency of employees to attempt to leave their work organization, which may lead to actual turnover. Much research points to turnover intention as the main antecedent to a person's act of turnover (Chen et al., 2013).

### **2.1.5 Organizational Commitment (Allen & Meyer, 1997)**

The model of organizational commitment has been of interest to many researchers studying organizational behaviour. Dozens of studies addressing organizational commitment have been published in the major organizational behaviour journals (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990). Much of this interest is due to the idea that organizational commitment is an important part of an employee's psychological state because employees who experience high organizational commitment are theorized to engage in many behaviours, such as citizenship activities and high job performance, that are believed to be beneficial to the organization (Jaros, 1997).

Allen and Meyer (1997) identified three components of commitment. These were affective, normative commitment and continuance commitment. Continuance commitment is the intent to remain with the organization, usually through an evaluation of the perceived costs of leaving the organization (Becker, 1960). Continuance commitment is sometimes referred to as "sunk-costs" commitment because it is a function of what an employee has sunk into the organization (Levy, 2003). Normative commitment, on the other hand reflects a perceived obligation to remain in the organization. As Meyer and Allen (1997) put it, an individual with strong affective commitment

stays with an organization because he or she wants to do so, an individual with strong continuance commitment stays with an organization because he or she needs to do so, while individuals with strong normative commitment stay with an organization because they feel they ought to do so.

Mathieu and Zajac (1990) performed a large meta-analysis of the commitment literature and identified the antecedents, correlates and consequences of commitment. They identified personal characteristics of the employee as being antecedent to commitment; these include the attitudes, beliefs and skills of individuals in the organization. Other antecedents identified were job characteristics, group and leader relations, co-worker relations and organizational characteristics.

A further antecedent of organizational commitment is the existence of organizational mechanisms such as reward systems and socialization; these mechanisms lead to affective commitment by communicating to employees that the organization is both supportive of them and fair to them (Levy, 2003; Meyer & Allen, 1997). In addition, research has shown that commitment has been positively related to other individual and job characteristics and work experiences such as age (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990), length of service in a particular organization (Luthans, McCaul & Dodd, 1985), marital status (Janis, 1989), task autonomy (Dunham, Grube & Castaneda, 1994), feedback (Hutchison & Garstka, 1996), job challenge (Meyer, Irving & Allen, 1998), job security (Yousef, 1998), promotion opportunities (Gaertner & Nollen, 1989), training and mentoring opportunities (Scandura, 1997), and supportive and considerate leadership (DeCottis & Summers, 1987). Finally, research studies have revealed that commitment is influenced by employee's perceptions of their social and personal development in the organization (McFarlin & Sweeny, 1992).

The concept of organizational commitment has been defined in various ways in the past, depending on the background of the scholars (Yousef, 2003). Steers (1977) and Levy (2003) define it as identification with and involvement in an organization. Sheldon (1971) states that organizational commitment is an attitude or an orientation towards the organization which links or attaches the identity of the person to the organization. Porter (1974) defined it as a strong belief in and acceptance of the organizational goals and values, a willingness to exert effort on behalf of the organization and a desire to remain in the organization.

Benefits of organizational commitment include a reduction in withdrawal behaviours such as absenteeism (Levy, 2003; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990) and intention to leave. In addition, Levy (2003) suggests that commitment will result in a reduction of counterproductive behaviours such as theft and sabotage. Other benefits of commitment include improved performance, although, because of the complexity of performance, the relationship between performance and commitment is not strong (Levy, 2003).

### **2.1.6 Informal groups**

Informal groups are natural groupings of people in the work situation in response to social, psychological and personal needs (Gidson et al., 1985). These needs include security, attraction, association, proximity, goals, esteem, self-actualization, economics etc. (Gidson et al., 1985). Informal groups consist of members who share a common interest and goals or have formed a friendship with their coworkers (Robbin & Judge, 2010). Some informal groups can be supportive, helpful and productive to members and the whole organization (Owusu-Boateng, Attoh & Acheampong, 2016). On the other hand, other informal groups can become troublesome, distracting and influential to group members and also to the overall formal

organization (Nkala & Barbara, 2013). Individuals tend to seek connections with others they can relate with. Informal groups form because individual coworkers have a connection with other coworkers. Informal groups form as a result of similar lifestyles (Fisher, 2018). For example, an informal group might be formed when coworkers discover that they live in the same neighbourhood or share a passion for football. Having such connections makes it possible for employees to get informal advice and assistance when they are having difficulties with a project or task. Fisher (2018) states that informal groups may also be created with a purpose. An employee may have an idea or protest which will push coworkers to rally around and support. For example, employees might get together to organize a fundraising project to help other coworkers, the community or the organization.

According to Cross and Pruzak (2002), members of informal groups drift towards certain unwritten roles. In an informal group, there may be members or a member who serves as a 'specialist'. This person helps the group members with particular tasks. Cross and Pruzak (2002) explained that there may also be members who keep different individuals and sub-groups within the overall informal group informed. They termed such members as 'information brokers'. Again, in an informal group, the group might have a central person or group of people most members connect with in a way. The final role Cross and Pruzak (2002) outlined was the ambassador-like role. Such individuals bring other people into the group from different departments or sections in the organization.

Informal work groups have been linked to certain work outcomes. Jahan (2011) conducted a study on the working of informal groups and its impact on organizational effectiveness. Employees in informal groups described their jobs as more interesting as compared to employees who were not in any informal group. Informal groups have been known to satisfy certain

emotional, social and psychological needs of its members that formal groups may fail to offer; or alternatively, they can moderate undesirable outcomes caused by formal groups (Raef, 1990).

These informal groups which are formed spontaneously have been described to be quite unstable in its nature and as a result of the natural desire for human interaction, informal groups tend to be difficult to abolish in an organization (Fisher, 2018).

### **2.1.7 Aloneness groups**

Gibson et al. (1985) postulated that without a group to lean on, employees who decide not to join or establish any informal group may assume that they are standing alone when various management demands are made. This 'aloneness' as termed by Gibson et al. (1985) may lead to a degree of insecurity and low esteem. Some employees may see informal groups as troublesome or rebellious and may not want to involve themselves with such groups. Also, some employees who choose not to join informal groups may do so to avoid the pressure of conforming to the norms and beliefs of the group. In addition, workers may decide not to join an informal group because, informal groups may be susceptible for the use of spreading rumors in the organization.

A study by Xu and Zhao (2008) confirmed that employees who did not join informal groups had stronger independence and lower reliance on informal groups. However, they have smaller promotion opportunity, lower trust and confidence. After interviewing these employees, it was revealed that employees who did not join informal groups usually had a poorer relationship with their coworkers and received less support from them. As a result, they gained less attention and recognition from their coworkers and management.

Based on the theories and conceptual explanations given above, employees in informal groups will report higher turnover intentions, higher job satisfaction and higher organizational commitment.

## **2.2 Review of Related Studies**

### **2.2.1 Informal groups and job satisfaction**

Spector (1997) suggested that one of the factors that influence job satisfaction was one's relationship with his or her coworkers. This concept has been investigated in some studies.

A study by Xu and Zhao (2008) investigated the relationship between informal groups and perceived job satisfaction in the context of Chinese firms. Respondents were full time employees selected from ten companies in the Shandong province. Results showed that employees who joined informal groups had higher satisfaction from team collaboration, rules and disciplines, career development, trust from boss and work recognition. On the other hand, employees who did not join informal groups had stronger independence and lower reliance on other members. In addition, it was found that the usage of informal groups significantly contributed to job satisfaction. Mullins (2010) proposes in his study that informal groups are very influential social networks which are fashioned in response to and through activities of their members.

Another study examining the impact of friendship on satisfaction (among other things) was by Riordan and Griffeth (1995). They tested a theoretical model of the relationship between perceived friendship opportunities in the workplace and work related outcomes. Riordan and Griffeth's (1995) study was based on 174 survey responses from employees in a small electric utility company in the South-Eastern United States. Riordan and Griffeth (1995) found that

friendship opportunities were associated with increases in job satisfaction, job involvement and organizational commitment and with a significant decrease in intention to turnover.

Riordan and Griffeth's (1995) findings are supported in a study by Nielsen, Jex and Adams (2000) who conducted two studies to develop and provide evidence for the construct validity of the workplace friendship scale used in this study. Nielsen et al. (2000) collected data from a total sample of 116 part-time graduate students who were employees of three American organizations. Support was provided for convergent and discriminant validity of scale scores. In addition, Nielsen et al. (2000) reported a positive correlation between friendship opportunities, friendship prevalence and job satisfaction. Furthermore, they found that those experiencing friendship at work were less likely to want to leave their current jobs. These findings highlight the positive impact workplace friendships can have for employees within organizations, particularly in terms of their satisfaction with their jobs.

Research has shown that informal groups can incrementally contribute to perceived job satisfaction, employee performance, and organizational effectiveness, among others (Jahan, 2011; Nkala & Barbara, 2013; Xu & Zhao, 2008). Studies stated above were conducted in developed countries like United States of America and China and hence may have certain cultural explanations for their findings.

### **2.2.2 Informal group and turnover intentions**

The relationship between an organization and its employees is both critical and fragile. The intention to leave an organization is caused by many factors, such as labour market conditions, satisfaction, organizational culture among others (Allen & Meyer, 1996; Carmeli & Gefen, 2005)

Ellingwood (2001) states that in the thousands of employee interviews and hundreds of focus groups conducted by Gallup, friendship trumped such seemingly obvious employee motivators as pay, benefits and work conditions. In addition, having a best friend at work was strongly related to intention to leave. Seventy-five percent of respondents who had a best friend at work planned to be with the company for at least another year, as opposed to only 51 % who did not have a best friend at work.

Sheridan (1992) investigated employee's voluntary turnover rates of new employees of accounting firms with varying organizational cultures. Findings from his study indicated that new employees stayed longer in organizations that fostered a culture emphasizing interpersonal relationship values than in a culture emphasizing work task values. Sheridan states;" the most parsimonious explanation of employee retention may simply be that an organizational culture emphasising interpersonal relationship values is uniformly more attractive to professionals than a culture emphasising work task values" (p. 1 052). He further explains that in a work environment which is highly task oriented, employees are likely to develop negative attitudes towards others and thus fewer opportunities for friendships are created which will result in higher turnover.

Morrison (2005) stated that informal relationships should still have an effect on intention to leave. She proposed that strong relationships make it harder for people to leave or have intentions of leaving the organization and the existence of negative relationships is a reason people seek to leave their organization. Social involvement may be regarded as an employee's relations and associations with other members of the organization (Morrison, 2005). This involvement is intrinsically rewarding, so that the decision to leave the organization or depart from these significant others is made more difficult.

Studies stated above have linked informal groups/ workplace friendships to employee turnover intentions. Having a friend at work is likely to reduce turnover intentions (Ellingwood, 2001).

### **2.2.3 Informal group and organizational commitment**

Benefits of organizational commitment have been associated with reduction in withdrawal behaviour, absenteeism, turnover intentions, turnover and increase in organizational citizenship behaviour (Levy, 2003; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990). Mathieu and Zajac (1990) identified influencers of organizational commitment in their study. These influencers included job characteristics, co-worker relations and organizational characteristics among others.

Sheldon (1971) examined the relationship between organizational commitment and informal organizational relationships, he investigated the link between social involvement and the commitment of employees to their organization. Participants in the study were exclusively male scientists and engineers with PhD's. These participants were understood to have high career commitment. It was therefore expected that these individuals would be more socialized, more likely to have professional prerogatives and less likely to desire organizational rewards than their less qualified colleagues. It was assumed that because these individuals were less likely to seek organizational rewards, it is not unreasonable to expect relatively low organizational commitment and indeed, Sheldon (1971) found that those who were not socially involved with peers in the organization were also not committed to the organization, compared to those who had friends in the organization or were socially involved. This finding suggests that workplace relationships are one way that commitment to an organization is shaped.

In 2002, Sherony and Green conducted a study on the relationships between coworkers, leader–member exchange and work attitudes. Their study investigated the relationship between

coworker exchange which refers to relations among coworkers who report to the same supervisor and their work attitudes. As predicted, greater diversity in an employee's coworker exchange relationships was found to be negatively related to his or her organizational commitment. This finding suggests that there is some burden involved in managing diverse relationships with coworkers. In addition, it is often in times of difficulty or misunderstanding strong friendships will form (Carr, 2003).

Ellingwood (2001) reported on a study conducted by Gallup in 1999, an American analytics and advisory company based in Washington, D.C. The results of the study showed that having a best friend at work is related to how engaged and committed an individual is to his or her job, which supports the findings that friendships and socially supportive environments at work are related to commitment (Ellingwood, 2001). In the Gallup study, a random sample of American workers over the age of 18 were given the Q 12 workplace evaluations; "Do I have a best friend at work?" is one of the 12 questions in the survey. It was found that 51 % of respondents who agreed with this statement were engaged in their jobs, compared to only 10% who disagreed (Ellingwood, 2001).

Sias and Jablin (1995) found that, when a supervisor or group leader was perceived to treat group members unfairly, group members became more cohesive; they interacted more and their communication relationships became more intimate, suggesting that perceptions of low quality supervision and feelings of dissatisfaction may lead co-workers to maintain more close friendships as a form of alliance against the organization. Sias and Jablin's (1995) finding was supported by Odden and Sias (1997), who found that perceptions of inconsiderate supervision increased special peer relationships. Findings have suggested that, special peer relationships provide a sounding board or social support, also, special peers may act as confidantes with whom

to discuss bad experiences at work and unpleasant experiences with supervisors (Jablin & Sias, 1995; Odden & Sias, 1997)

According to Hellriegel and Slocam (2007), some managers view informal groups as a possible cause of anti-establishment power, and as a result, members of informal groups hold back information when the group does not agree with organizational goals or pressurize employees to slow down production. Withholding of information occurs when the group is very cohesive. Allen and Meyer (1990) specifically linked organizational commitment to cohesion. Their study indicated that group cohesion is an antecedent to commitment.

Studies on organizational commitment and informal groups/ friendships and relationships at work have revealed a link between the two variables. Social involvement at work, supervisor and peer relations have been linked to the formation and strengthening of informal groups and friendships at the work place. Workplace relationships are one way that commitment to an organization is shaped (Sheldon, 1971).

From the researches above it can be concluded that organizational outcomes such as job productivity, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, turnover and turnover intentions are linked closely with peer relationships, workplace friendships or informal groups. Employees who engage in peer relationships or informal groups adapt to the organization more quickly and efficiently than those not involved in peer relationships

#### **2.2.4 Job satisfaction and turnover intentions**

In the age of temporariness, human resource managers are facing remarkable challenges regarding retention of their skilled workforce (Karan et al., 2018). At present it is challenging to ignore the effects of an employees' job satisfaction on their intention to leave the organization.

Alam and Asim (2019) conducted a study on the relationship between job satisfaction and turnover intentions among nurses in Karachi, Pakistan. Findings from their study showed that satisfaction with organizational policies and strategies, satisfaction with supervision, compensation levels, task clarity, and career development all have significant negative correlation with turnover intention and overall job satisfaction was found to have a significant negative association with turnover intention. In that, as job satisfaction increased, turnover intentions decreased and vice versa.

An earlier study that also reported same results was conducted by Buda (2012). The objective of the study was to determine the effect of job satisfaction on turnover intentions among the employees in XYZ Sdn. Bhd, Malaysia. Results identified both intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction as influencers of turnover intention. The statistical results obtained in his study showed that both forms of job satisfaction (intrinsic and extrinsic satisfaction) have inverse relationship on employee's turnover intentions.

A more detailed study of job satisfaction and turnover intentions was investigated by Siddiqui (2019). A sample of 70 faculty members who worked in different colleges in Karachi were selected for the study. The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire was used to assess the satisfaction levels of selected faculty members. The study revealed that 10 facets of satisfaction were considered to have an important bearing on turnover intentions. Six out of the 10 facets were found to be significant predictors of turnover intentions. These included satisfaction with pay, security, working conditions, principal, promotion and recognition.

Research has clearly linked job satisfaction as a predictor of turnover intentions. As an employee's satisfaction increases, their intention to leave the organization decreases.

### **2.2.5 Organizational commitment and turnover intentions**

Kim and Stoner (2008) stressed that workers expect to leave on account of variables identified with individual (e.g. statistic components or identity), work (e.g. nature, substance or outline of employment) or association (e.g. pay, director or associate). In order to allow an organization to design and implement an effective retention strategy, it is important for senior and line management to understand the reasons that prompt high performers to leave and find alternative employment.

Schwepker, Jr. (1999) states that employees with a lower organizational commitment have a greater turnover intention. This is supported by Hollingworth and Valentine (2013). Their research results states that organizational commitment and turnover intentions have a strong negative relationship. Santoso, Sitompul and Budiartanto (2018) also discovered similar results. Organizational commitment negatively affects the turnover intentions of participants in their study.

In addition, Karan, Rahman and Biswas (2018) examined the relationship of major job attitudes with turnover intentions. Data was collected from 157 executives working at different manufacturing, education, finance, services and other sectors in Chittagong city. Outcome of the study suggested that employee job attitudes had significant negative associations with employee turnover intentions. However, in comparison to other attitudes, organizational commitment was found to have a stronger negative association with employee turnover intention.

Garcia-Cabrera and Gracia-Soto (2012) studied how organizational commitment affected manager's intent to leave their firms. Outcome of their study showed that manager's intent to leave was determined by affective and continuance commitments.

Literature stated above shows that job satisfaction and organizational commitment has been linked to turnover intentions.

It is worth noting that, most of the studies described above were not conducted in Ghana. This highlights the importance of examining the generalizability of these findings, looking at the impact of informal groups at work in environments and countries other than the western countries.

### **2.3 Rationale of the study**

Studies on job satisfaction, organizational commitment and turnover intentions in Ghana have focused on variables like salary, leadership, organizational culture and so on as influencers of these organizational outcomes. However, attention has not been directed to the likely influence of informal group on these organizational outcomes. The concept of informal groups in the Ghanaian workplace have not been fully explored. This study seeks to fill that gap and to examine the likely impact of informal groups on job satisfaction, organizational commitment and turnover intentions.

Mullins (2010) states that managers and supervisors frequently encounter problems due to failure to identify that within every organization there are often informal group pressures that influence and regulate individual behaviour. Informal groups convey an unspoken or implied code of ethics or objectionable set of standards forming acceptable behaviours for a group of employees (Mullins, 2010). Informal groups have been known to satisfy certain emotional, social and psychological needs of its members (Raef, 1990). Research conducted to examine the attitudinal consequences of informal groups have investigated work attitudes such as job satisfaction, organizational involvement, turnover, job productivity (Riordan & Griffeth, 1995;

Owusu-Boateng, Attoh & Acheampong, 2016; Sheldon, 1971; Xu & Zhao, 2008) Most researches on informal groups (Riordan & Griffeth, 1995; Sheldon, 1971; Xu & Zhao, 2008) have been conducted in developed countries, however, in Ghana, not much has been done in that area. Although there are many similarities among cultures, there also exist a variety of differences between cultures that exist across human societies. What are the attitudinal consequences of employees in informal groups in Ghana?

## **2.4 Statement of Hypotheses**

Hypothesis 1: employees in informal groups will report significantly higher turnover intentions than employees in aloneness groups

Hypothesis 2: employees in informal groups will report significantly higher job satisfaction than employees in aloneness groups

Hypothesis 3: employees in informal groups will report significantly higher organizational commitment than employees in aloneness groups

Hypothesis 4: groups, job satisfaction and organizational commitment will significantly predict turnover intentions

## **2.5 Operational definitions**

Groups: - employees in informal and aloneness groups

Informal group: - two or more employees who have formed friendships with their coworkers or consider their coworkers as friends

Aloneness group: - an employee who has not formed any friendship with his/her coworkers or does not consider them as friends or has decided not to join any informal group (Gidson et al. 1985). These employees are not necessarily a group but they have been classified as such for the purpose of this study

Work attitudes: - job satisfaction, organizational commitment and turnover intentions of employees

## **CHAPTER THREE**

### **METHODOLOGY**

#### **3.0 Introduction**

This chapter covers the methods used to get results relating to the objectives and hypotheses of this study. This section also describes the research processes involved in undertaking this study. It covers the research design, the population and sample characteristics as well as the sampling technique employed. The research instruments used to study the constructs under study were also appropriately described. The procedures followed in terms of the main study and ethical consideration taken into account were explained.

#### **3.1 Research Settings/ Population**

The research setting was the Greater Accra Region, primarily Accra. Accra is the nation's capital with majority of the businesses located there. According to Ghana Statistical Services, in 2019 Accra has an estimated population of 2,475,000 people. There are various sectors such as telecommunication, health/safety, advertising and banking industries in Accra. The questionnaire was sent to various organizations; data was collected from 6 organizations. The target population for the study were full and part time employees of organizations.

#### **3.2 Research Design**

A quantitative cross sectional survey design was used for this study. Quantitative research design allows for relationships that exist with regard to the phenomenon under study to be established, empirically measured and explained statistically. A cross sectional survey design is a descriptive research used to describe characteristics that exist in a community and make inferences about

possible relationships or to gather preliminary data for further research, it is however not used to determine cause-and-effect relationships between variables. A cross – sectional survey was chosen because respondents from various organizations with different demographic characteristics such as educational level, age, gender etc. were sampled. This method was appropriate as it allowed for primary data to be collected from population too large to be observed directly (Babbie, 2004). According to Shanahan (2010), there is generally no fixed time frame for cross sectional studies. The time frame for a cross sectional study depends on the kind of data collected and the nature of the research. For example, collecting data on 25-year-old males on their intention to adopt a particular technology within the next 12 months, data collection should not exceed 12 months. Research may not be relevant if data collection takes more than 12 months to complete. This is because many variables may have changed, example participants may no longer be 25 years and surveyed technology may be obsolete. Hence conducting a research which is time sensitive requires a researcher to minimize the time frame for data collection. Considering time, for this study, data collection lasted for two months.

### **3.3 Sampling and Sampling Procedure**

A sample represents a small fraction of the population under study that is selected randomly to serve as a representative of the whole (Buckingham & Saunders 2004; Sansonetti, 2004). This allows generalization to be made to the population under study. Purposive sampling technique as well as the convenient sampling technique was used to recruit participants for this study.

Organizations from different sectors were approached. Those that agreed to partake in the study after being approached and the purpose of the research explained to them were used. Purposive sampling is used for special situations where the researcher uses his/her discretion, judgment and expertise in selecting participants with a specific purpose or characteristic in mind. To avoid

interns and national service personnel from taking part in the study, purposive sampling was used to select full and part time employees. This ensured that the criteria set was met. The sample size for this study was arrived at by using Tabachnick and Fidell (2007) formula for calculating sample size  $N > 50 + 8m$ , where  $N$  = number of participants and  $m$  = number of IVs.

### **3.4 Instruments**

The questionnaire included instructions on how respondents should complete the five sections of the questionnaire. The first part of the questionnaire instructed respondents to answer some personal questions about themselves. This section was meant to capture the demographic characteristics of the respondents. They included questions on age, gender, industry, level of education etc. The remaining parts of the questionnaire instructed respondents to indicate their level of agreement or disagreement with statements found in each scale of measurement.

#### **3.4.1 Demographic Characteristics**

This section was used in order to get a fair idea on the type of respondents in the study. Information solicited included age, gender, industry, educational background, number of years worked, position at work etc.

#### **3.4.2 Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (Mowday, Steers & Porter, 1979)**

To assess the organizational commitment of participants, the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire was used. The Organizational Commitment Questionnaire is designed to assess acceptance of organizational values, desire to remain with the organization and willingness to exert effort. Responses to the 15 items are captured on 7-point Likert scale (1= strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree). Although it was validated with a western population in mind, other

researches using the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire have provided evidence for its generalizability and validity in the measurement of organizational commitment in non-western populations such as China (Siu, 2002), the United Arab Emirates (Yousef, 2003) and South Korea (Lee, Allen & Meyer, 2001). Mowday et al. (1979) recorded Cronbach's alpha of 0.82-0.93. For this study, the Cronbach alpha coefficient for the scale was 0.60. A sample item in the questionnaire was "I am proud to tell others I am part of this organization". Scores range from 13 to 59, with mean 32.40 and standard deviation of 7.54. High scores indicate that a participant is highly committed or has a sense of commitment to his or her job. Low scores indicate otherwise.

### **3.4.3 Job Satisfaction Survey (Spector, 1985)**

Job satisfaction was measured with the Job Satisfaction Survey. The Job Satisfaction Survey was developed in human service, public and nonprofit organizations to measure the major dimensions of job satisfaction (Spector, 1985). It consists of 9 subscales with 36 items captured on a 6-point Likert scale (1= disagree very much to 6 = agree very much). These subscales included satisfaction with pay, promotional opportunities, fringe benefits, contingent rewards (appreciation and recognition), supervision, co-workers, nature of work itself, communication, and work conditions. A sample item on the questionnaire was "When I do a good job, I receive the recognition for it that I should receive". Spector (1986) recorded Cronbach's alpha of 0.61-0.80. The Cronbach's alpha obtained for this study was .90 Scores for this scale range from 64 to 212, with mean 131.66 and standard deviation of 25.44. High scores indicate that the participant is highly satisfied or pleased with his or her job. On the other hand, lower scores show that participants are dissatisfied with their jobs.

#### **3.4.4 Employee Turnover Intention (Mobley, Horner & Hollingsworth, 1978)**

Employee's turnover intention was assessed by the instrument created by Mobley, Horner and Hollingsworth in 1978 which consist of three-items. Response ranged by five-point ordinal scaling from 1= "Strongly disagree" to 5= "Strongly agree". A sample item on the questionnaire was "I often think about quitting my present job". Intention to leave has been described as the last in a sequence of withdrawal cognitions, along with thinking of quitting and intent to search for alternative employment (Mobley, Homer, & Hollingsworth, 1978). Amjad et al. (2015) recorded Cronbach's alpha of 0.82. The Cronbach's alpha obtained for this study was .80. Minimum and maximum scores for this scale were 4 and 20 respectively with mean 10.98 and standard deviation of 4.15. High scores indicate that respondent has high intentions of quitting or is more likely to quit their job. Low scores show that respondent is less likely to leave his or her job.

#### **3.4.5 Workplace Friendship Scale (Nielsen et al., 2000)**

This questionnaire measured the opportunity and prevalence of informal groups in the organization. The scale measures two aspects of work place friendship: (a) the opportunity for friendship (e.g., I have the opportunity to get to know my co-workers), and (b) the prevalence of friendship (e.g., I have formed strong friendships at work). There are twelve items, rated on a 5-point Likert scale from strongly disagree to strongly agree. The items in the workplace friendship scale were derived by Nielsen et at. (2000) from previous workplace friendship measures (Riordan & Griffeth, 1995) and a literature review of previous social psychological research (Morrison, 2005). Nielsen et al. (2000) conducted item analysis to assess how each item related to the overall scale. The items in the scale are the 12 (of an original 35) that correlated most

highly with the total sub-scale score. Amjad et al. (2015) recorded Cronbach's alpha of 0.86. This scale was also used in a research by Morrison (2005) to study informal relationships at the workplace and its association with job satisfaction, organizational commitment and turnover intentions. The Cronbach's alpha reported for this study was 0.82. Scores range from 12 to 57, with mean 41.03 and standard deviation of 7.18. High scores on the scale indicate that a participant has formed a friendship relationship with his or her colleagues. Participants who had high scores were categorized as an informal group. A participant who had low scores showed that he or she has not formed any friendship relationship with his or colleagues. These participants were categorized as the aloneness group.

### **3.5 Data Collection Procedure**

Data collection began after ethical approval was given by the Ethics Committee for Humanities (ECH), University of Ghana. This study adhered to the ethical standards provided by the American Psychological Association Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct (2017), Ghana Psychological Council and the ECH.

Questionnaires were sent to organizations that agreed to partake in the study. These organizations were given the relevant and required information pertaining to the nature and purpose of study, expected duration, information on their right to decline or withdraw and person to contact for further clarification. Some organizations preferred the online questionnaires while others opted for the physical questionnaire.

Information about the participants was kept confidential and the rights of participants were respected. There was an explanation of the research and participants were informed of their right to end their participation if they did not feel comfortable at any point and time of the study,

although they were encouraged to participate. Proper steps were taken to ensure that respondents did not provide any information that will lead to their identity being known. Thus anonymity and confidentiality were ensured. In order to ensure anonymity, respondents were specifically instructed not to write their names or use any markings or identifier that might lead to them be identified. Questionnaires were given out in sealed envelope and responses collected in similar manner. The questionnaire was left with the respondents as they were given a week to fill them. However, some of the questionnaires took more than a week to fill.

At the end of data collection process, five (5) questionnaires were rejected and valid data collected was two hundred (200). Eighty-six (86) questionnaires were filled online and one hundred and fourteen (114) questionnaires were filled physically.

### **3.6 Pilot Study**

To identify various issues that might be faced in conducting the main study, a pilot study was conducted. The pilot study allows for pretesting or ‘trying out’ the instrument to be used in the study (Baker, 1994). According to Teijlingen and Hundley (2001), the need for a pilot study is emphasized in some of these reasons; developing and testing the adequacy of the research instrument, assessing whether conducting a full scale study or survey is feasible, help in designing a research protocol and assessing whether the protocol is appropriate. Basically it helps in unearthing any difficulties that might crop up in the main study and appropriate remedies put in place in order to address the said issues. This will ensure the suitability of the questionnaire and the likely success of the said project. In undertaking the pilot study, all ethical considerations were adhered to. A sample of 30 employees were conveniently and purposively sampled from randomly selected organizations in Dansoman, Accra. This allowed for the

reliability of the research instrument to be tested and also to ensure that the items were clearly understood.

### **3.7 Participants**

A total of 200 respondents (n = 89, male; n = 111, female) between the ages of 20 and 50 (M= 30.18, SD= 4.87) completed the study. Participants were full time employees of the organizations they worked for and they were sampled from six (6) organizations. The six (6) organizations were a travel agency, a hospital, bank, two service providers and an advertising agency. Employees had worked for a year or more in the organization, participants who had worked for less than a year were excluded from the study. 1% of the sample size had had primary level education, 10 participants that represents 5% of the sample had had their secondary level education. A majority of the sample size have gained tertiary level education. 10.5% had attained other educational qualifications. Table 1 summarizes the demographic characteristics of the respondents in this study.

### **3.8 Ethical Considerations**

Participants were informed of their right to withdraw from the study at any point in time during data collection. For the sake of confidentiality, participants were advised not to write their names or any form of identity on the instrument. Information provided by the participants on the questionnaire was kept secure and not shared with any third party.

### **3.9 Data Analyses**

All the analyses were done using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 21. The stated hypotheses were tested using the most appropriate statistical method. Hypothesis 1, 2

and 3 were analyzed using Independent t-test. An independent t-test was used to compare the means of two independent groups. Hypothesis 4 was tested using Multiple Regression Analysis. Multiple regression analysis is a predictive analysis tool used to explain the relationship between one continuous dependent variable (turnover intentions) and two or more independent variables (groups, job satisfaction and organizational commitment). Descriptive statistics was used to analyze demographics.

## CHAPTER FOUR

### RESULTS

#### 4.0 Introduction

The main aim of this study was to investigate job satisfaction, organizational commitment and turnover intentions of informal groups in Ghanaian organizations. An independent t test was used to compare the differences between work attitudes of employees in informal groups and aloneness groups. The first 3 hypotheses were tested using Bonferroni adjusted alpha levels of 0.02 as the probability (p) value. The Bonferroni correction adjusted probability (p) value was used because of the increased risk of a type 1 error when using multiple statistical tests (Armstrong, 2014). Multiple regression analysis was also used to determine if groups (employees in informal and aloneness groups), job satisfaction and organizational commitment will predict turnover intentions. All the analyses were done using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 21. This chapter gives the preliminary and hypotheses results of the analysis carried out.

#### 4.1 Preliminary Results

The means, standard deviations, Cronbach's alphas, skewness and kurtosis of the study variables are reported in Table 1 below

**Table 1:** Descriptive statistics and reliability

Variable	Mean	Min.	Max	SD	Skewness	Kurtosis	Alpha
Organizational Commitment	32.40	13	59	7.54	-.021	.399	.60
Turnover Intentions	10.98	4	20	4.15	.063	-.785	.81
Job Satisfaction Survey	131.66	64	212	25.44	.333	.575	.90
Friendship Opportunity Dimension	41.03	12	57	7.18	-.799	1.48	.82

Using the SPSS statistical tool, the mean, minimum (Min) scores, maximum (Max) scores, standard deviation (SD), Cronbach's Alpha and the Skewness and Kurtosis of the data were determined. Garson (2012) points out that, normality is acceptable when the Skewness and Kurtosis fall within the range of +2 to -2. Garson (2012) further supported that, in the case of kurtosis, a range of +3 and -3 is even acceptable. The data presented in this analysis was normally distributed as it falls within the acceptable ranges suggested by Garson (2012), as indicated in Table 1. Further analysis employing parametric statistics could therefore be performed.

**Table 2** *Demographic Characteristics of respondents*

Variables	N	%	M	SD
Gender				
Male	89	44.5		
Female	111	55.5		
<b>Total</b>	<b>200</b>			
Age			30.18	4.87
Level of Education				
Primary	2	1		
Secondary	10	5		
Tertiary	163	81.5		
Other	21	10.5		
<b>Total</b>	<b>196</b>			
Industry				
Entertainment	8	4.0		
Telecommunication	25	12.5		
Finance/Banking	36	18.0		
Education	12	6.0		
Marketing	9	4.5		
Health/Safety	24	12.0		
Other	84	42.0		
<b>Total</b>	<b>198</b>			
Groups				
Informal groups	115	41.6		
Aloneness groups	82	58.4		
<b>Total</b>	<b>197</b>			

Table 2 illustrates the demographic characteristics of the participants. There were 89 male respondents (45.5%) and 111 female respondents (55.5). Majority of respondents had attained tertiary education (81.5%). Only 2 respondents had only primary education (1%). Data was collected from the industries presented in the table. Number of participants in informal groups were 115, which represents 41.6% of the sample size and 82 participants were not in any informal group (aloneness group).

**Table 3:** *Inter-correlation matrix between study variables*

Variable	1	2	3	4
1. Group	-			
2. Turnover intentions	-.008	-		
3. Job satisfaction	.184**	-.540**	-	
4. Organizational Commitment	-.171**	.444**	-.563**	-

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

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

Table 3 indicates correlations between the study variables. Group had a negative relationship with organizational commitment ( $r = -.171$ ), with turnover intentions ( $r = -.088$ ) and a positive relationship with job satisfaction ( $r = .184$ ). Organizational commitment also had a positive relationship with turnover intentions ( $r = .444$ ) and a negative relationship with job satisfaction ( $r = -.563$ ). Job satisfaction had a negative relationship with turnover intentions ( $r = -.540$ ).

## 4.2 Hypothesis Testing

**4.2.1 Hypothesis 1:** Hypothesis one (1) states that employees in informal groups will report significantly higher turnover intentions than employees in aloneness groups.

Table 4 *Independent T-Test comparing informal groups and aloneness groups on turnover intentions (N =198)*

Groups	n	M	SD	t	df	P
Informal Group	136	10.96	4.31	-.108	196	.91
Aloneness Group	62	11.03	3.82			

Note: M=mean SD=standard deviation

Using an independent samples t-test the results showed that employees in informal groups (M = 10.96, SD =4.31) reported slightly lower levels of intentions to leave than employees who were in aloneness groups (M = 11.03, SD = 3.82). However, this result was not statistically significant ( $t [196] = -.108; p = .91$ ). This means that the hypothesis was not supported (see Table 4).

**4.2.2 Hypothesis 2:** Hypothesis two (2) states that employees in informal groups will report significantly higher job satisfaction than employees who are in aloneness groups.

Table 5 *Independent T-Test comparing informal groups and aloneness groups on job satisfaction (N =163)*

Groups	n	M	SD	t	df	P
Informal Group	117	134.59	25.37	2.38	161	.02
Aloneness Group	46	124.22	24.32			

Note: M=mean SD=standard deviation

Using an independent samples t-test the results showed that employees in informal groups (M = 134.59, SD =25.37) had a higher score than employees who were in aloneness groups (M = 124.22, SD = 24.32) on job satisfaction. This difference was found to be statistically significant (t [161] = 2.38; p = .02). Table 5 summarizes the results

**4.2.3 Hypothesis 3:** Hypothesis three (3) postulates that employees in informal groups will report significantly higher organizational commitment than employees who are in aloneness groups.

Table 6 *Independent T-Test comparing informal groups and aloneness groups on organizational commitment (N =197)*

Groups	n	M	SD	t	df	P
Informal Groups	134	31.51	7.30	-2.42	195	.02
Aloneness Groups	63	34.27	7.76			

Note: M=mean SD=standard deviation

Using an independent samples t-test the results show that employees in informal groups ( $M = 31.51$ ,  $SD = 7.30$ ) had a lower score than employees who were in aloneness groups ( $M = 34.27$ ,  $SD = 7.76$ ) on organizational commitment. The results of the independent t-test showed a statistical significance ( $t [195] = -2.42$ ;  $p = .02$ ). Table 6 presents the results indicating that hypothesis 3 was not supported.

**4.2.4 Hypothesis 4:** Hypothesis four (4) examines whether groups (employees in informal and aloneness groups), job satisfaction and organizational commitment will significantly predict turnover intentions.

Table 7 *Multiple Linear Regression Analysis Results on predicting turnover intentions based on groups, job satisfaction and organizational commitment*

Predictors	B	SE	$\beta$	T	p
Organizational commitment	.15	.05	.25	3.11	.00
Job satisfaction	-.07	.01	.43	-5.45	.00
Groups	1.12	.65	.12	1.71	.09

A multiple linear regression was calculated to predict turnover intentions based on group, job satisfaction and organizational commitment. The results of the regression indicated that the model explained 34.4% of the variance. A significant regression equation was found ( $F(3, 157) = 27.50$ ,  $p = .01$ ). While job satisfaction ( $B = -.07$ ,  $p < .05$ ) and organizational commitment ( $B = .15$ ,  $p < .05$ ) contributed significantly to the model, groups did not ( $B = 1.12$ ,  $p = .09$ ). The final predictive model was  $\text{Turnover intentions} = 15.35 - .07 + .15 + 1.12$ . Hypothesis four (4) was partially supported. Table 7 illustrates the results

### 4.3 Summary of the results

Following analysis of the data, results indicated a support for hypothesis 2. Hypothesis 1 and 3 were not supported and hypothesis 4 was partially supported.

- For hypothesis 1, employees in informal groups reported lower levels of turnover intentions than employees in aloneness groups. However, result was not significant which indicates that there is no significant difference between the two groups. Thus the hypothesis was not supported.
- Employees in informal groups were more satisfied with their jobs than employees in aloneness groups, for hypothesis 2. The hypothesis was therefore supported.
- Results for hypothesis 3 showed that employees in informal groups recorded lower organizational commitment than employees in aloneness groups. Hypothesis 3 was not supported.
- Lastly, job satisfaction and organizational commitment were predictors of turnover intentions but groups were not a predictor. The hypothesis was partially supported.

## CHAPTER FIVE

### DISCUSSION

#### 5.0 Introduction

This study sought to investigate job satisfaction, organizational commitment and turnover intentions of informal groups. The study also sought to make organizations aware of the existence of informal groups in the organization. The study added the additional dimension of investigating whether groups (employees in informal and aloneness groups), job satisfaction and organizational commitment will predict turnover intentions. This chapter discusses the findings, implications, recommendations and limitations of the study.

#### 5.1 Job satisfaction and informal groups

The study examined job satisfaction between employees in informal groups and those who are not in informal groups (aloneness group). It was therefore hypothesized that employees in informal groups will report significantly higher job satisfaction than employees in aloneness groups. The results supported this prediction.

This result suggests that an employee's satisfaction for his or her job is influenced by his or her association or involvement with an informal group. This finding is supported by a study by Xu and Zhao (2008). Results from their study showed that employees who joined informal groups had higher satisfaction than employees who did not join any informal group. Likewise, Riordan and Griffeth (1995) found that friendship opportunities were associated with increases in job satisfaction, job involvement and organizational commitment and with a significant decrease in intention to turnover.

Even though job satisfaction is described as a collection of feelings toward a job by Spector (1997), one of the facets under which job satisfaction is measured is coworkers. According to Morrison (2005) informal relationships with coworkers has an effect on employee work attitudes.

In addition, Nielsen et al. (2000) reported a positive correlation between friendship opportunities, friendship prevalence at work and job satisfaction. As friendship opportunities and prevalence increased, employee job satisfaction also increased. Mayo (1945) argued that the key determinant of job satisfaction was group interaction and emphasized on the significance of good leadership and sustaining personal relations at the workplace.

Culture of a group also plays a role in influencing work attitudes. Every or most informal groups have a culture, whether it is clear or hidden. Pirraglia (2019) stated that culture can often enhance or reduce employee job satisfaction. This depends on the how the group perceives job satisfaction.

Again, the groupthink theory by Irvin (1972) explains that in a cohesive group, members are more likely to forgo their personal beliefs and values and embrace that of the groups. Applying this explanation to the current findings, in a cohesive informal group, members who may not be satisfied with their jobs are more likely to change their attitude or perception towards their jobs based on the group's perception of job satisfaction. Hence the higher levels of satisfaction among employees in informal groups as compared to employees who are not in informal groups (aleness group).

It can therefore be inferred that employee job satisfaction can be increased through an association with informal groups in the organization. It is therefore in the best interest of

management, business owners and other stakeholders in the organization to embrace these informal groups by encouraging group formation in their organizational culture and learn how to maximize the positive and minimize the negative effects of these groups on employee job satisfaction.

## **5.2 Organizational commitment and informal groups**

Organizational commitment is an important part of an employee's psychological state because employees who experience high organizational commitment are theorized to engage in many behaviours, such as citizenship activities and high job performance, that are believed to be beneficial to the organization (Jaros, 1997).

This study examined the commitment levels between employees in informal and aloneness groups. It was predicted that employees in informal groups will report significantly higher organizational commitment than employees who are in aloneness groups. This hypothesis was not supported by the findings of this study. Employees in aloneness group reported higher levels of commitment than employees in informal group. Findings of this study suggests that an employee's commitment to the organization is not influenced by informal groups.

Findings from this study can be attributed to personal characteristics of the employee as being antecedent to commitment and not the employee's association with informal groups. Mathieu and Zajac (1990) identified these personal characteristics as attitudes, beliefs and skills of individuals in the organization. Even though groups, co-worker and leader relations are also antecedents of organizational commitment, they did not play an influential role in the current findings.

This finding therefore supports Allen and Meyer's (1990) theory on organizational commitment. Organizational mechanisms such as reward systems lead to affective commitment; the organization communicates to employees that the organization is both understanding of them and fair to them (Levy, 2003; Meyer & Allen, 1997). The employee in turn decides to stay with the organization despite their relationship with coworkers in the organization. Again, if an employee evaluates the cost of leaving the organization (continuance commitment) and the cost of leaving outweighs staying, that employee is likely to stay in the organization regardless of his or her association with a group in the organization or not. An employee with a strong normative commitment will decide to commit to the organization based on their perceived obligation to remain in the organization. Findings of the study strengthens the theory.

In addition, research has shown that commitment has been positively related to other individual and job characteristics and work experiences such as age (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990), length of service in a particular organization (Luthans, McCaul & Dodd, 1985), marital status (John & Taylor, 1999), task autonomy (Dunham, Grube & Castaneda, 1994), feedback (Hutchison & Garstka, 1996), job challenge (Meyer, Irving & Allen, 1998), job security (Yousef, 1998), promotion opportunities (Gaertner & Nollen, 1989), training and mentoring opportunities (Scandura, 1997), and supportive and considerate leadership (DeCottis & Summers, 1987). Finally, research has revealed that commitment is influenced by employee's perceptions of their social and personal development in the organization (McFarlin & Sweeny, 1992).

Sheldon (1971) found that employees who were not socially involved with their peers were also not committed to the organization as compared to those who were socially involved in the organization. The current study did not support these findings. This is could be due to cultural differences of the two studies and changes of human behaviour overtime.

### **5.3 Turnover intentions and informal groups**

This study sought to assess the levels of employee turnover intentions between employees in informal groups and employees in aloneness groups. It was hypothesized that employees in informal groups will report higher turnover intentions than employees in aloneness groups. The hypothesis was however not supported by the findings. Hypothesis 1 was not statistically significant. This indicates that there was no significant difference between employees in informal groups and employees in aloneness groups.

Nielsen et al. (2000), reported that those who experienced friendship at work were less likely to want to leave their current jobs. Again, a study conducted by Gallup (1999), 75% percent of respondents from their study who had a best friend at work planned to be with the company for at least another year, as opposed to only 51% percent who did not have a best friend at work (Ellingwood, 2001). Furthermore, as Morrison (2005) stated, strong friendships formed at work make it harder for people to leave or have intentions of leaving the organization.

Sheridan (1992) investigated employee's voluntary turnover intention rates of new employees of accounting firms with varying organizational cultures. Findings from his study indicated that new employees stayed longer in organizations that fostered a culture emphasizing interpersonal relationship values than in a culture emphasizing work task values.

Research findings have indicated that workplace friendship/informal groups do have a connection with turnover intentions. However, findings from the current study did not support these findings.

The underlying theory for turnover intentions for this study was the Intermediate Linkage Model (Mobley, 1977). Mobley (1977) outlines steps that lead to turnover intentions and finally turnover. According to Mobley (1977), job satisfaction was a major contributor of the model. Job satisfaction was most directly related to withdrawal cognitions associated with the decision to leave and only indirectly related to actual turnover process. Dissatisfaction or satisfaction with one's job was the antecedent attributed to turnover intentions (Mobley, 1977). Using the theory to explain the current result, it can be proposed that job satisfaction or dissatisfaction may be the contributing factor to turnover intentions of employees in both informal and aloneness groups. An employee's association or non-association with a group does not necessarily play a contributing role in the intent to leave the organization.

#### **5.4 Groups, job satisfaction, organizational commitment and turnover intentions**

Intention to leave an organization has serious implication for workforce planning. Much research points to turnover intention as the main antecedent to a person's act of turnover (Chen et al., 2013). It is therefore judicious to suggest that understanding an employee's intention to leave may facilitate managers and other stakeholders to introduce appropriate retention strategies.

This study hypothesized that groups (employees in informal and aloneness groups), job satisfaction and organizational commitment will significantly predict turnover intentions. Job satisfaction and organizational commitment predicted turnover intentions, groups however did not predict turnover intentions.

Job satisfaction and organizational commitment has been reported in many studies to have a significant relationship with turnover intentions (Alam & Asim, 2019; Attiah & AbouDahab, 2017; Garcia-Cabrera & Gracia-Soto, 2012; Karan et al., 2018; Siddiqui, 2019). Again, from the

findings it can be inferred that employee turnover intentions are not influenced by the employee's association or involvement with an informal group or not.

The intention to leave an organization has been revealed to be influenced by many factors such as organizational culture, employability, labour market conditions, relational satisfaction (Akgün & Lynn, 2002; Allen & Meyer, 1996; Carmeli & Gefen, 2005).

The Intermediate Linkage Model (Mobley 1977) supports the findings and assertions that an increase in job satisfaction is likely to reduce turnover intentions. Mobley (1977) posit that during the turnover intention process, an employee evaluates their existing job. The next step in the process is an emotional state; employees evaluate whether they are satisfied or dissatisfied with the job. If the employee is dissatisfied with the job, the next process occurs, that is thoughts of quitting. However, if the employee is satisfied with the job, intention to leave is reduced.

Also, according to Allen and Meyer (1991) organizational commitment has a relationship with turnover intentions. An employee who has strong affective, normative or continuance commitment is likely to report low levels of turnover intentions. This is could the result of an employee's emotional attachment to the organization, their perceived obligation to remain in the organization or their evaluation of the cost of leaving the organization.

Although results did not support groups (employees in informal and aloneness groups) as a predictor of turnover intentions. Research has linked turnover intentions to workplace friendship/informal groups (Ellingwood, 2001; Morrison, 2005; Nielsen et al., 2000).

## 5.5 Limitations of the Study

This study used a cross sectional design which is descriptive in nature. Data were recorded at a single point in time. Cross sectional studies can therefore not be used to determine causation. One can only infer association between the variables studied. Making a categorical cause and effect statement among the variables would not be warranted. For instance, a categorical statement cannot be made that, the predictor variables (groups, job satisfaction and organizational commitment) cause turnover intentions. Only an inference can be made that job satisfaction and organizational commitment are associated with turnover intentions. Thus extending the result to explain the relationship between the variables at play will be inaccurate.

In addition to the cross-sectional nature of the study, the reliance of self-report data raises concerns about self-report bias. Even though self-report is a measure used to gather valuable and important information about a person, people are likely to be biased when reporting their own experiences and beliefs (Devaux & Sassi, 2016). Experiences and beliefs shared by participants are likely to be exaggerated, undermined or considered to be socially acceptable. This may affect the findings of the research as shared experiences and beliefs of participants will not be a true reflection of their actual experiences and beliefs. It is possible that the self-report of organizational commitment and turnover intentions may have confounded the current results and thus may explain the reason why findings of the current study did not support other findings. Even though there is the tendency of bias in subjective measures of the variables, this methodology is accepted in the scientific community.

Sample size was not a representation of all organizations in Ghana, so findings cannot be generalized to the whole country.

## **5.6 Recommendations for future studies**

In order to account for some of the limitations of the cross sectional survey method future studies should look beyond the use of cross sectional survey method and use other methods such as a qualitative method. A qualitative method will help give a better understanding of the nature of informal groups in the Ghanaian context. A qualitative method can be carried out on an identified informal group in a particular organization as opposed to the general population. This method will offer more opportunities to gather other important clues about informal groups through interviews or focus groups discussions, than a limited questionnaire would. A qualitative measure will perhaps explain why there was no difference between the two groups in regards to turnover intentions, even though other studies revealed that employees in informal groups were more likely to stay in the organization than those who were not in any group.

Also other variables should be investigated, for example, personality types in informal groups and difference between organizational citizenship behaviour among employees in informal and aloneness groups. These variables have not been investigated in connection to informal groups in the organization. To get a better understanding of the nature of informal groups, personality types and extra-role behaviours of employees in informal groups can be investigated. This will be a significant add on to the literature on informal groups.

## **5.7 Implications of the study**

Practically, from this study it can be confirmed that informal groups exist in organizations in Ghana. It is in the best interest of the organization to identify these groups and work with them to achieve organizational goals. Employees in informal groups reported higher job satisfaction

which is an indication of the positive sides of informal groups in the organization even though there may be negative sides too.

Findings from this study will help supervisors, managers, industrial/organizational psychologists and all other stakeholders improve on group forming policies and improve on strategies to enhance positive work attitudes. This can be done by fostering an organizational culture that encourages the formation of informal groups. Management can set a time and space where employees can chat with each other. However, this set time should not affect productivity or interfere with working hours. Again, other creative ways of encouraging the formation of informal groups are by celebrating birthdays with cake or lunch, organizing annual parties or barbecues for employees and their families and organizing end-of-year retreats and team projects. Creating employee resource or support groups in the organization, for example, groups celebrating or supporting working mothers, people with disabilities, among others. With a little monitoring system, employees in these informal groups can be influenced positively to be satisfied with their jobs and be committed. This will in tend help reduce intentions to leave the organization. As Morgan (1997) suggested, managers should clearly define organizational functions to informal groups in the organizations and also inform employees of the implications of employee behaviours, as well as monitoring adherence to organizational standards, as this helps to improve the performance and work attitudes of employees.

Theoretically, findings from this study strengthens the Intermediate Linkage Model by confirming the assertion by the theory which states that job satisfaction is a major predictor and influencer of turnover intention. Also, findings confirm that relationship with coworkers, does have an influence on employee job satisfaction as postulated by Spector (1997).

In addition, commitment to an organization as described by Allen and Meyer (1990), is determined by an employee's beliefs, obligations and personal choices, is confirmed. Result revealed that employees in informal groups reported lower organizational commitment than employees in aloneness groups. It can therefore be inferred that organizational commitment is based on individual beliefs, obligations and choices and not based on group decisions.

## **5.8 Conclusion**

This study sought to investigate job satisfaction, organizational commitment and turnover intentions of employees in informal groups. It went on further to determine if groups (informal and aloneness groups), job satisfaction and organizational commitment will predict turnover intentions. A quantitative research design was used to collect data from 200 employees in some organizations in Ghana. Results from this study revealed that employees in informal groups reported higher job satisfaction and lower organizational commitment than employees who were not in any informal group. However, there was no significant difference between employees in informal groups and employees in aloneness group on turnover intentions. Job satisfaction and organizational commitment were significant predictors of turnover intentions, groups on the other hand failed to predict turnover intentions.

Employees are said to be an integral part of an organization, employee satisfaction with the job, commitment and intention of leaving are very important for organizational growth and productivity. An employee's involvement or association with an informal group in the organization may have an influence on their work attitudes. Literature has linked informal work groups to work attitudes like performance and commitment (Morrison, 2005). This study linked job satisfaction with an employee's association with an informal group. It is therefore in the best interest of the organization to monitor informal groups in the organizations and use them to

achieve organizational goals. Nonetheless, organizations should create an organizational culture that fosters good interpersonal relationships and formation of informal groups. This will help shape employee's work attitudes.

## REFERENCES

- Adams, L., & Plaut, C. V. (2003). The cultural grounding of personal relationship: Friendship in North America and West African worlds. *International Society for the Study of Personal Relationships, 10*, 333-347
- Armstrong, R. A. (2014). When to use the Bonferroni correction. *Journal of the College of Optometrists, 34*(5), 502-508. <https://doi.org/10.1111/opo.12131>
- Anderson, C., Srivastava, S., Beer, J. S., Spataro, S. E., & Chatman, J. A. (2006). Knowing your place: Self-perceptions of status in face-to-face groups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 91*(6), 1094–1110. DOI:10.1037/0022-3514.91.6.1094
- Akgün, A.E., & Lynn, G.S. (2002). Antecedents and consequences of team stability on new product development performance. *Journal of Engineering and Technology Management, 19*, 263–286. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0923-4748\(02\)00021-8](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0923-4748(02)00021-8)
- Allen, N.J., & Meyer, J.P. (1997). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organisation: An examination of construct validity. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 49*, 252–276. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.1996.0043>, PMID:8980084
- Ashforth, B. E., & Mael, F. (1989). Social Identity Theory and the Organization. *The Academy of Management Review, 14*(1), 20. doi:10.2307/258189
- Babbie, E. (2004). Laud Humphreys and research ethics. *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy, 24*(3/4/5), 12-19. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01443330410790849>
- Banks lose GHc19.1m to theft committed by own employees – BoG report. (2019, September 2). *Graphic Online*. <https://www.graphic.com.gh/business/business-news/banks-lose-ghc19->

1m-to-theft-committed-by-own-employees-bog-report.html

Barber, A. E., Dunham, R. B., & Formisano, R. A. (1992). The impact of flexible benefits on employee satisfaction: A field study. *Personnel Psychology, 45*(1), 55-75.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1992.tb00844.x>

Baron, R. S. (2005). So right its wrong: Groupthink and the ubiquitous nature of polarized group decision making. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 37*, 219-253.

[http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601\(05\)37004-3](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601(05)37004-3)

Becker, H. S. (1960). Notes on the concept of commitment. *American Journal of Sociology, 66*, 32-42. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/222820>

Bennett, N., & Dunne, E. (1991). The nature and quality of talk in co-operative classroom groups. *Science Direct, 1*(2), 103-118. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0959-4752\(91\)90021-Y](https://doi.org/10.1016/0959-4752(91)90021-Y)

Borda, R. & Norman, I. (1997). Factors influencing turnover research and absence of nurses: a research review. *International Journal of Nursing Studies, 34* (6), 385–394.

[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0020-7489\(97\)00031-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0020-7489(97)00031-X)

Buda. (2012). The Relationship Between Job Satisfaction and Turnover Intention  
*American Journal of Applied Sciences, 9*(9),1518-1526 DOI:

10.3844/ajassp.2012.1518.1526

Carmeli, A., & Gefen, D. (2005). The relationship between work commitment models and employee withdrawal intentions. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 20*(2), 63–85.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/02683940510579731>

Carr, S. C. (2003). *Social psychology. Context, communication and culture*. Milton,  
Qld: John Wiley & Sons Australia.

Chen et al. (2013). An empirical study on the factors influencing the turnover intention of

Dentists in hospitals in Taiwan. *Journal of Dental Sciences*

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jds.2013.01.003>

Cross, R., & Pruzak, L. (2002). The People Who Make Organizations Go—or Stop. *Harvard Business Review*. Retrieved from <https://hbr.org/2002/06/the-people-who-make-organizations-go-or-stop>

Cross, R., & Parker, A. (2004). *Leadership of Organisational Networks*. Retrieved from [https://books.google.com.gh/books?hl=en&lr=&id=PIPwCgAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PR5&dq=Cross+and+Parker+\(2004\),+Leadership+of+Organisational+Networks&ots=wDQiK\\_Q0to&sig=w7hGoxgDDSb95\\_UcUjCHAt4\\_MM&redir\\_esc=y#v=onepage&q=Cross%20and%20Parker%20\(2004\)%2C%20Leadership%20of%20Organisational%20Networks&f=false](https://books.google.com.gh/books?hl=en&lr=&id=PIPwCgAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PR5&dq=Cross+and+Parker+(2004),+Leadership+of+Organisational+Networks&ots=wDQiK_Q0to&sig=w7hGoxgDDSb95_UcUjCHAt4_MM&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q=Cross%20and%20Parker%20(2004)%2C%20Leadership%20of%20Organisational%20Networks&f=false)

Daniel, C. O. (2015). Impact of Informal Groups on Organisational Performance. *International Journal of Scientific Research and Management*, 6(9), 686-694. DOI: 10.18535/ijstrm/v6i9.em04

DeCotiis, T., & Summers, T. (1987): A path analysis of a model of the antecedents and consequences of organizational commitment. *Human Relations*, 40, 445-470. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001872678704000704>

Devaux, M., & Sassi, F. (2016). Social disparities in hazardous alcohol use: self-report bias may lead to incorrect estimates. *European Journal of Public Health*. 26, 129-134. <https://doi.org/10.1093/eurpub/ckv190>

Draper, S. (2006). *Finding: The Hawthorne, Pygmalion, placebo and other effects of expectation*. University of Glasgow: UK. Retrieved from

<http://www.psy.gla.ac.uk/~steve/hawth.html>

Dunham, R. B., Grube, J. A., & Castaneda, M. B. (1994): Organization commitment: The utility of an integrative definition. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79, 370-380.

Du-Plooy, J & Roodt, G. (2010). Work engagement, burnout and related constructs as predictors of turnover intentions. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 36, 1- 13

Ellingwood, S. (2001). The collective advantage. *Gallup Management Journal* 1(3),

[Online]. Retrieved from

<http://www.gallupjournal.com/GMJarchive/issue3/2001915c.asp>

Ferris, K. R., & Aranya, N. (1983). A comparison of two organizational commitment scales.

*Personnel Psychology*, 36,87-98. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1983.tb00505.x>

Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. (1975). *Belief, Attitude, Intention, and Behavior: An Introduction to*

*Theory and Research*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley. Retrieved from

<https://people.umass.edu/aizen/f&a1975.html>

Fisher, C. (2018). How Informal Groups Emerge in the Workplace. *The Nest*. Retrieved from

<https://woman.thenest.com/informal-groups-emerge-workplace-20758.html>

Fuller, S. R., & Aldag, R. J. (1998). Organizational tonypandy: Lessons from a quarter century

of the groupthink phenomenon. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision*

*Processes*, 73(3), 163–184. <https://doi.org/10.1006/obhd.1998.2760>

Gaertner, K. N., & Nollen, S. D. (1989). Career experiences, perceptions of employment

practices, and psychological commitment to the organization. *Human Relations*, 42(11),

975-991. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/001872678904201102>

- García-Cabrera, M. A., & García-Soto, G. M. (2012). Organizational commitment in MNC subsidiary top managers: Antecedents and consequences. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 23(15), 3151-3177. DOI: 10.1080/09585192.2011.637057
- Gibson, L. J., Ivancevich M. J., & Donnelly, J. H. (1985). *Organizations, Behavior, Structure, Processes (5thEds)*. Business Publications Inc. Plano, Texas
- Greenberg, J., & Baron, R., A. (2003) *Behavior in Organizations: Understanding and Managing the Human Side of Work*. 18th Edition, Prentice-Hall, Upper Saddle River. Retrieved from <https://archive.org/details/behaviorinorgani00gree/page/n3>
- Guðlaugsdóttir, A. L. (2016). *Turnover Intention: What Influences Turnover among Employees in Healthcare?* Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/1946/25648>
- Haas, M. L. (2015). *Burnout and Job Satisfaction in Online Student Support Staff*. Benedictine University. Retrieved from <https://www.ben.edu/college-of...services/.../lisa-haas-dissertation.docx>
- Hellriegel, D., & Slocam J. W. (2007). *Fundamentals of organizational behavior (International student ed)*. Thomson South-Western, Australia. Retrieved from <http://library.perbanas.ac.id/images/book/PHKI11/principles%20of%20organizational%20behavior.pdf>
- Henne, D., & Locke, E. A. (1985). Job dissatisfaction: What are the consequences? *International Journal of Psychology*, 20, 221. doi:10.1080/00207598508247734

- Henningsen, D. D., Henningsen, M. L. M., Eden, J., & Cruz, M.G. (2006). Examining the symptoms of groupthink and retrospective sensemaking. *Small Group Research*, 37(1), 36-64. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1046496405281772>
- Hinshaw, A.S., & Atwood, J. R. (1984). *Nursing Staff Turnover, Stress, and Satisfaction: Models, Measures and Management*. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-40453-9\\_6](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-40453-9_6)
- Horn, P. W., Katerberg, R., Jr., & Hulin, C. L. (1979). Comparative examination of three approaches to the prediction of turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 64, 280-290. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.76.3.350>
- Hutchison, S., & Garstka, M. L. (1996): Sources of perceived organizational support: Goal setting and feedback. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 26, 1351-1366. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.1996.tb00075.x>
- Janis, I. L. (1972). *Victims of groupthink: A psychological study of foreign-policy decisions and fiascoes*. Oxford, England: Houghton Mifflin.
- Janis, I. L. (1982). *Groupthink: Psychological Studies of Policy Decisions and Fiascos*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Janis, I. L., & Mann, F. (1977). *Decision making*. New York: Free Press.
- Janis, N. A. (1989): Organizational commitment, career factors and career/life stage. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 10, 247-266. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.4030100305>
- Janssen, O., & Yperen, V. W. N. (2004). Employees' Goal Orientations, the Quality of Leader-Member Exchange, and the Outcomes of Job Performance and Job Satisfaction. *Academy of Management Journal*, 47(3), 368-384. <https://doi.org/10.5465/20159587>
- Jaros, J. S. (1997). An Assessment of Meyer and Allen's (1991) Three-Component Model of Organizational Commitment and Turnover Intentions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*,

- 51(3), 319-337. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.1995.1553>
- Jex, S. M., & Liu, X. (2015). Work Attitudes. *The Encyclopedia of Adulthood and Aging*, 1–4. doi:10.1002/9781118521373.wbeaa186
- Judge, T.A., & Church, A.H. (2000), “*Job satisfaction: research and practice*”, in Cooper, C.L. & Locke, E.A. (Eds), *Industrial and Organizational Psychology: Linking Theory with Practice*, Blackwell Business, Malden, MA, pp. 166-98.
- Karan, R., Rahman, S., & Biswas, R. S. (2018). Role of Job Attitudes on Executives’ Turnover Intention at the Different Organizations in Bangladesh. ResearchGate. Retrieved from [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/328412100\\_Role\\_of\\_Job\\_Attitudes\\_on\\_Executives'\\_Turnover\\_Intention\\_at\\_the\\_Different\\_Organizations\\_in\\_Bangladesh](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/328412100_Role_of_Job_Attitudes_on_Executives'_Turnover_Intention_at_the_Different_Organizations_in_Bangladesh)
- Kreitner, R. & Kinicki, A. (2012). *Organizational Behaviour (9th Ed.)*. New York: McGraw-Hill/Irwin.
- Kwon, K., & Rupp, D. E. (2013). High-performer turnover and firm performance: The Moderating role of human capital investment and firm reputation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 34(1): 129–150
- Levy, P. L. (2003). *Industrial/Organizational Psychology. Understanding the Workplace*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company
- Locke, E. A. (1968). Toward a theory of task motivation and incentives. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 3, 157-189. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073\(68\)90004-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073(68)90004-4)
- Lum, L., Kervin, J., Clark, K., Reid, F., & Sirola, W. (1998) Explaining Nursing Turnover

- Intent: Job Satisfaction, Pay Satisfaction, or Organisational commitment? *Journal of Organisational Behaviour*, 19 (3) 305–320. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1099-1379\(199805\)19](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-1379(199805)19)
- Luthans, F., McCaul, H. S., & Dodd, N. G. (1985). Organizational commitment: A comparison of American, Japanese, and Korean employees. *Academy of Management Journal*, 28(1), 213-219. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/256069>
- Mathieu, J.E., & Zajac, D.M. (1990). A Review and Meta-Analysis of the Antecedents, Correlates and Consequences of Organizational Commitment. *Psychological Bulletin*, 108, 171-194. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.108.2.171>
- Mayo, E. (1945). *The social problems of industrial civilisation*. Harvard: Harvard University Press.
- McCarthy, G., Tyrrell, M. P., & Lehane, E. (2007). Intention to 'leave' or 'stay' in nursing. *Journal of Nursing Management*, 15(3), 248-255. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2834.2007.00648.x>
- McFarlin, D., & Sweeney, P. (1992). Distributive and procedural justice as predictors of satisfaction with personal and organizational outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal*, 35, 626-637. DOI: 10.2307/256489
- McLeod, S. A. (2019). Social identity theory. *Simply Psychology*. Retrieved from <https://www.simplypsychology.org/social-identity-theory.html>
- McMahon, B. (2007). *Organizational commitment, relationship commitment and their association with attachment style and locus of control*. Unpublished Master Thesis,

- Georgia Institute of Technology. Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/1853/14502>
- McMillan, A. (2018). Group dynamics. *Reference for business*. Retrieved from <https://www.referenceforbusiness.com/management/Gr-Int/Group-Dynamics.html>
- Mehmet, S., Murat, C., Mustafa, E. C., & Deniz, G. (2015). Groups and their Effects in Organizations. *European Scientific Journal*, 11(32), 1857 – 7881. Retrieved from <https://ejournal.org/index.php/esj/article/viewFile/6562/6333>
- Meyer, J. P., Irving, G. P., Allen, N. J. (1998): Test of the moderating effect of work values on the relations between early work experiences and organizational commitment. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 19, 29-52. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1099-1379\(199801\)19:1<29::AID-JOB818>3.0.CO;2-U](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-1379(199801)19:1<29::AID-JOB818>3.0.CO;2-U)
- Meyer, J. P., Stanley, D. J., Herscovitch, L., & Topolnysky, L. (2002). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: A meta-analysis of antecedents, correlates, and consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 61(1), 20-52. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.2001.1842>
- Mobley, W.H. (1982). Some unanswered questions in turnover and withdrawal research. *Academy of Management Review*, 7, 111–116. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5465/AMR.1982.4285493>
- Moorhead, G., Neck, C. P., & West, S. W. (1998). The Tendency toward Defective Decision Making within Self-Managing Teams: The Relevance of Groupthink for the 21st Century. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision Process*, 73(3), 327-351. <https://doi.org/10.1006/obhd.1998.2765>
- Morgan, J. (2018). Difference Between Formal Groups and Informal Groups. *Difference between.net*. Retrieved from <http://www.differencebetween.net/business/organizations->

business/difference-between-formal-groups-and-informal-groups/

Mowday, R. F., Steers, R. M., & Porter, L. M. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 14 (2), pp. 224-247.

[https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-8791\(79\)90072-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-8791(79)90072-1)

Mullins, L. J. (2010). *Management and Organisational Behaviour*: Financial Times

Prentice Hall. Retrieved from

[https://researchportal.port.ac.uk/portal/en/publications/management-andorganisational-behaviour\(4d6c9534-ae1e-4161-9523-337c3680e605\)/export.html](https://researchportal.port.ac.uk/portal/en/publications/management-andorganisational-behaviour(4d6c9534-ae1e-4161-9523-337c3680e605)/export.html)

Nielsen, I. K., Jex, S. M., & Adams, G. A. (2000). Development and validation of scores on a two dimensional workplace friendship scale. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 60(4), 628-643. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00131640021970655>

Nkala, P., & Barbara, M. (2013). An Assessment of the effects of informal groups on employee performance: A case of High Schools in Bulawayo Province. (2012-2013). *Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 19(7), 106-112. Retrieved from

<https://www.iosrjournals.org>

Odden, C. M., & Sias, P. M. (1997). Peer communication relationships, psychological climate, and gender. *Communication Quarterly*, 45(1), 53- 1 66.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/01463379709370058>

Owusu-Boateng, W., Attah, S., & Acheampong, F. (2016). Empirical Analysis of the Effects of Informal Relations on Banks at University Campus. *British Journal of Education, Society & Behavioural Science*, 17(3), 1-10. DOI: 10.9734/BJESBS/2016/27011

Pirraglia, W. (2019). Cultural Effects on Employee Satisfaction. Work - Chron.com.

Retrieved from <http://work.chron.com/cultural-effects-employee-satisfaction-2702.html>.

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(5), 603-609. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/h0037335>
- Raef, T. H. (1990). Understanding and Managing Informal Groups. *Management Decision* (V), 28, 8. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00251749010000038>
- Reohr, J.R. (1991). *Friendship: An exploration of structure and processes*. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc.
- Riordan, M. C., & Griffeth, W. R. (1995). The Opportunity for Friendship in the Workplace: An Unexplored Construct. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 10 (2). <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02249575>
- Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. (2010). *Organizational Behavior*. Retrieved from [https://www.academia.edu/38367771/Organizational\\_Behaviour\\_17th\\_edition\\_Robbins\\_and\\_Judge\\_.pdf](https://www.academia.edu/38367771/Organizational_Behaviour_17th_edition_Robbins_and_Judge_.pdf)
- Robert, E. T., Young, J. S., & Kelly, A. V. (2011). Relationships Between Adult Workers' Spiritual Well-Being and Job Satisfaction: A Preliminary Study. *Wiley Online Library*, 50(3), 165-175. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2161-007X.2006.tb00053.x>
- Roznowski, M., & Hulin, C. (1992). *The scientific merit of valid measures of general constructs with special reference to job satisfaction and job withdrawal*. In Cranny, C. J., Smith, P. C., & Stone, E. F. (Eds.), *Job satisfaction* (pp. 123-163). New York: Lexington.
- Santoso, A. L., Sitompul, A. S., & Budiatmanto, A. (2018). Burnout, Organizational Commitment and Turnover Intention. *Journal of Business and Retail Management Research*, 13. Retrieved from <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/328067208>
- Sarah et al. (2016). Factors Affecting Turnover Intention among Academician in the Malaysian Higher Educational Institution. *Review Integrative Business Economics*

- Research*, 6. Retrieved from [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/309737932\\_Factors\\_Affecting\\_Turnover\\_Intention\\_among\\_Academician\\_in\\_the\\_Malaysian\\_Higher\\_Educational\\_Institution](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/309737932_Factors_Affecting_Turnover_Intention_among_Academician_in_the_Malaysian_Higher_Educational_Institution)
- Sarkwa, J. (2011). Informal relations and its effects on industrial organizations. Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology: Ghana science research change? *Transformations in Education* 6(1), 97–111. Retrieved from <http://ir.knust.edu.gh/bitstream/123456789/3998/1/Final.pdf>
- Scandura, T. A. (1997). Mentoring and organizational justice. An empirical investigation. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 51,58-69. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.1997.1588>
- Sheldon, M. E. (1971). Investments and involvements as mechanisms producing commitment to the organization. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 16(2), 143-150.
- Sheridan, J.E. (1992). Organizational Culture and Employee Retention. *Academy of Management Journal*, 35, 1036-1056. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/256539>
- Sherony, K. M., & Green, G. S. (2002). Coworker Exchange: Relationships Between Coworkers, Leader–Member Exchange, and Work Attitudes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(3), 542–548. DOI: 10.1037//0021-9010.87.3.542
- Sias, P. M., & Jablin, F. M. (1995). Differential superior / subordinate relations, perceptions of fairness, and coworker communication. *Human Communication Research*, 22(5), 3-8. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2958.1995.tb00360.x>
- Siddiqui, R. (2019). Relationship between Job Satisfaction & Employee Turnover Intention. *ResearchGate*. Retrieved from

[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/331638978\\_Relationship\\_between\\_Job\\_Satisfaction\\_Employee\\_Turnover\\_Intention](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/331638978_Relationship_between_Job_Satisfaction_Employee_Turnover_Intention)

- Simon, M., Muller, B.H., & Hasselhorn, H. M. (2010). Leaving the organization or the profession – a multilevel analysis of nurses’ intentions. *Journal of Advanced Nursing* 66(3), 616–626. [https://doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2648.2009.05204.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2648.2009.05204.x)
- Smith, P. C., Kendall, L., & Hulin, C. L. (1969). *The measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement*. Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.
- Sorge, A., & Warner, M. (1997). *The IEBM handbook of Organisational Behaviour*. Retrieved from [https://books.google.com.gh/books/about/The\\_IEBM\\_Handbook\\_of\\_Organizational\\_Behavior.html?id=uAD0AAAAMAAJ&redir\\_esc=y](https://books.google.com.gh/books/about/The_IEBM_Handbook_of_Organizational_Behavior.html?id=uAD0AAAAMAAJ&redir_esc=y)
- Spector, P.E. (1985). Measurement of human service staff satisfaction: Development of the job satisfaction survey. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 13(6), 693-713. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF00929796>
- Spector, P.E. (1997). *Job Satisfaction: Application, Assessment, Causes, and Consequences*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781452231549>
- Steers, R. M. (1977) Antecedents and Outcomes of Organisational Commitment. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 22, 46-56. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2391745>
- Sunder, R. (2018). Understanding Psychological Phenomenon of Groupthink with Examples. Psychologenie. Retrieved from <https://psychologenie.com/understanding-psychological-phenomenon-of-groupthink-with-examples>
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics (5th ed.)*. Boston, MA,: Allyn & Bacon/Pearson Education.

- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. G. Austin, & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations*. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole. 33-37.
- Teijlingen van, E., & Hundley, V. (2001). The importance of pilot studies. *Social Research Update*, 35. Retrieved <http://www.soc.surrey.ac.uk/sru/SRU35.html>
- Tett P. R., & Meyer P. J. (1993). *Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment, Turnover Intention and Path Analyses based on Meta-analytic findings*. University of Western Ontario. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1993.tb00874.x>
- Turner, E. M., & Pratkanis, R. M. (1998). Twenty-Five Years of Groupthink Theory and Research: Lessons from the Evaluation of a Theory. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision Process*, 73(3), 105-115. <https://doi.org/10.1006/obhd.1998.2756>
- Vance, R. J. (2006). *Employee engagement and commitment: A guide to understanding, measuring and increasing engagement in your organization*. Retrieved from <https://shrm.org/about/foundation/research/Documents/1006EmployeeEngagementOnlineReport.pdf>
- Whyte, G. (1998). Recasting Janis's groupthink model: the key role of collective efficacy in decision fiascos", *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 73(3), 185-209. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118785317.weom110157>
- Xu, B. L., & Zhao, T. (2008). An Empirical Study of Relationship between Informal Groups and Perceived Job Satisfaction from China. *International Conference on Management Science & Engineering (15th)*. DOI: 10.1109/ICMSE.2008.4669038
- Yin-Fah, B., Foon, Y., Chee-Leong, L., Osman, S. (2010). An Exploratory Study on

Turnover Intention among Private Sector Employees. *International Journal of Business and Management* (V), 5, 8. DOI: 10.5539/ijbmv5n8p57

Yousef, D. (1998). Satisfaction with job security as a predictor of organizational commitment and job performance in a multicultural environment. *International Journal of Manpower*, 19 (3), 184-194. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01437729810216694>

## APPENDICES

### *Appendix 1: Ethical Clearance Letter from ECH*



## UNIVERSITY OF GHANA

ETHICS COMMITTEE FOR THE HUMANITIES (ECH)

*P. O. Box LG 74, Legon, Accra, Ghana*

My Ref. No.....

8<sup>th</sup> May, 2019

Ms. Mercy Allotey  
Department of Psychology  
University of Ghana  
Legon.

Dear Ms. Allotey,

**ECH 060/18-19: INFORMAL GROUPS, WORK ATTITUDES AND TURNOVER INTENTIONS: A STUDY AMONG SELECTED ORGANIZATIONS IN ACCRA.**

This is to advise you that the above reference study has been presented to the Ethics Committee for the Humanities for a full board review and the following actions taken subject to the conditions and explanation provided below:

Expiry Date:	06/05/20
On Agenda for:	Initial submission
Date of Submission:	19/11/18
ECH Action:	Approved
Reporting:	Bi-Annually

Please accept my congratulations.

Yours Sincerely,

Prof. C. Charles Mate-Kole.  
ECH Vice Chair



Cc: Dr. Benjamin Amponsah, Department of Psychology, University of Ghana.  
Dr. Kingsley Nyarko, Department of Psychology, University of Ghana.

Tel: +233-303933866

Email: [ech@ug.edu.gh](mailto:ech@ug.edu.gh)

*Appendix 2: ECH Consent form*



UNIVERSITY OF GHANA



Official Use only  
Protocol number

**Ethics Committee for Humanities (ECH)**

**PROTOCOL CONSENT FORM**

**Section A- BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

Title of Study:	Informal Groups, Work Attitudes and Turnover Intentions: A study among selected organizations in Accra
Principal Investigator:	Mercy Allotey
Certified Protocol Number	

**Section B- CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH**

**General Information about Research**

The aim of this study is to examine job satisfaction, organizational commitment and turnover intentions of employees in informal groups. The study seeks to create awareness of informal groups in the organization and its possible influence on employee work attitudes in Accra, Ghana. Data will be collected from full and part time employees and data will be gathered using mainly questionnaires.

**Benefits/Risks of the study**

The benefits of the study include awareness of informal groups in the organization and its possible influence on employee work attitudes in Accra, Ghana. This study will also help

Industrial/Organizational Psychologists and Human Resource Managers to improve on human resource management and group policies. There are no minor or major risks associated with the study.

### **Confidentiality**

Privacy and confidentiality will be assured. The questionnaires do not contain any item that reveals respondent's identity. Personal information included is socio-demographic characteristics (e.g. gender, educational level, age, number of years worked) which do not identify any specific individual. Data collected will be kept with caution. Apart from the principal student investigator, other groups that may have direct access to the research records include principal and co-supervisor, and if need be, the Head of Psychology Department and or the Dean of the Graduate School of University of Ghana. All data collected will be used for academic purposes only and as such ethical principles of privacy and confidentiality will be guaranteed.

### **Compensation**

Participants will not be compensated for partaking in the study.

### **Withdrawal from Study**

Participation is strictly voluntary and participants reserve the right to pull out of the study anytime without any penalty or obligations to provide justification. Participants will not be adversely affected in anyway should they decline to participate or later stop participating. Participants will be allowed to continue participation once they express interest in the study again.

### **Contact for Additional Information**

Should you have any concerns or further clarifications, you can contact the researcher on 0246764398/ 0265568824 or through the mail at [mercier700@gmail.com](mailto:mercier700@gmail.com). You can also write to the Department of Psychology, University of Ghana, Legon.

If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant in this study you may also contact the Administrator of the Ethics Committee for Humanities, ISSER, University of Ghana at [ech@isser.edu.gh](mailto:ech@isser.edu.gh) / [ech@ug.edu.gh](mailto:ech@ug.edu.gh) or 00233- 303-933-866.

Section C- PARTICIPANT AGREEMENT

**"I have read or have had someone read all of the above, asked questions, received answers regarding participation in this study, and am willing to give consent for me, my child/ward to participate in this study. I will not have waived any of my rights by signing this consent form. Upon signing this consent form, I will receive a copy for my personal records."**

\_\_\_\_\_

Name of Participant

\_\_\_\_\_

Signature or mark of Participant

\_\_\_\_\_

Date

**If participant cannot read and or understand the form themselves, a witness must sign here:**

I was present while the benefits, risks and procedures were read to the volunteer. All questions were answered and the volunteer has agreed to take part in the research.

\_\_\_\_\_

Name of witness

\_\_\_\_\_

Signature of witness / Mark

\_\_\_\_\_

Date

I certify that the nature and purpose, the potential benefits, and possible risks associated with participating in this research have been explained to the above individual.

\_\_\_\_\_

Name of Person who Obtained Consent

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_



**SECTION B**

Please answer all of the questions to the best of your ability by circling the correct answer

No.	Items measuring Friendship Opportunity Dimension	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
1	I have the opportunity to get to know my co-workers	1	2	3	4	5
2	I am able to work with my co-workers to collectively solve problems	1	2	3	4	5
3	In my organization I have the opportunity to talk informally and visit with others	1	2	3	4	5
4	Communication among employees is encouraged by my organization	1	2	3	4	5
5	Informal talk is tolerated by my organization as long as the work is completed	1	2	3	4	5
6	I have the opportunity to develop close friendships at my workplace	1	2	3	4	5
7	I have formed strong friendships at work	1	2	3	4	5
8	I socialize with co-workers outside the workplace	1	2	3	4	5
9	I can confide in people at work	1	2	3	4	5
10	I feel I can trust many co-workers a great deal	1	2	3	4	5
11	Being able to see my co-workers is one reason I look forward to my job	1	2	3	4	5
12	I do not feel that anyone I work with is a true friend	1	2	3	4	5

**SECTION C**

Below are some statements about you. Use the following scale to indicate your level of agreement or disagreement

Key: SA-strongly agree, MA- moderately agree, A- agree, N- neutral, D- disagree, MD- moderately disagree, SD- strongly disagree

No.	Organizational Commitment	SA	MA	A	N	D	MD	SD
1	I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help this organization to be successful because my co-workers are doing same	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2	My co-workers talk up this organization to their friends as a great organization to work for so I also do same	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3	I feel very little loyalty to this organization	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4	I would accept almost any type of job assignment in order to keep working for this organization	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5	I find that my values and the organization's values are very similar	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6	I am proud to tell others that I am part of this organization	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7	I could just as well be working for a different organization as long as the type of work was similar	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	This organization really inspires the very best in me in the way of job performance	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9	It would take very little change in my present circumstances to cause me to leave this organization	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10	I am extremely glad that I chose this organization to work for over others I was considering	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11	There is not too much to be gained by sticking with this organization indefinitely	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12	Often I find it difficult to agree with this organization's policies on important matters relating to its employees	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

13	My co-workers care about the fate of this organization so I also care	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14	For me this is the best of all possible organizations for which to work	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15	Deciding to work for this organization was a definite mistake on my part	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

**SECTION D**

Please read each statement carefully and decide if you feel this way about your job. Indicate how you feel by circling the number that best describes how you feel.

<b>JOB SATISFACTION SURVEY</b>							
No.		Disagree very much	Disagree moderately	Disagree slightly	Agree slightly	Agree moderately	Agree very much
1	I feel I am being paid a fair amount for the work I do.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2	There is really too little chance for promotion on my job.	1	2	3	4	5	6
3	My supervisor is quite competent in doing his/her job.	1	2	3	4	5	6
4	I am not satisfied with the benefits I receive.	1	2	3	4	5	6
5	When I do a good job, I receive the recognition for it that I should receive.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6	Many of our rules and procedures make doing a good job difficult.	1	2	3	4	5	6
7	I like the people I work with.	1	2	3	4	5	6
8	I sometimes feel my job is meaningless.	1	2	3	4	5	6
9	Communications seem good within this organization.	1	2	3	4	5	6
10	Raises are too few and far between.	1	2	3	4	5	6

11	Those who do well on the job stand a fair chance of being promoted.	1	2	3	4	5	6
12	My supervisor is unfair to me.	1	2	3	4	5	6
13	The benefits we receive are as good as most other organizations offer.	1	2	3	4	5	6
14	I do not feel that the work I do is appreciated.	1	2	3	4	5	6
15	My efforts to do a good job are rarely blocked by official rules.	1	2	3	4	5	6
16	I find I have to work harder at my job because of the incompetence of people I work with.	1	2	3	4	5	6
17	I like doing the things I do at work.	1	2	3	4	5	6
18	The goals of this organization are not clear to me.	1	2	3	4	5	6
19	I feel unappreciated by the organization when I think about what they pay me.	1	2	3	4	5	6
20	People get ahead as fast here as they do in other places.	1	2	3	4	5	6
21	My supervisor shows too little interest in the feelings of subordinates.	1	2	3	4	5	6
22	The benefit package we have is fair.	1	2	3	4	5	6
23	There are few rewards for those who work here.	1	2	3	4	5	6
24	I have too much to do at work.	1	2	3	4	5	6
25	I enjoy my coworkers.	1	2	3	4	5	6
26	I often feel that I do not know what is going on with the organization.	1	2	3	4	5	6
27	I feel a sense of pride in doing my job.	1	2	3	4	5	6
28	I feel satisfied with my chances for salary increases.	1	2	3	4	5	6
29	There are benefits we do not have which we should have.	1	2	3	4	5	6
30	I like my supervisor.	1	2	3	4	5	6

31	I have too much paperwork.	1	2	3	4	5	6
32	I don't feel my efforts are rewarded the way they should be.	1	2	3	4	5	6
33	I am satisfied with my chances for promotion.	1	2	3	4	5	6
34	There is too much bickering and fighting at work.	1	2	3	4	5	6
35	My job is enjoyable.	1	2	3	4	5	6
36	Work assignments are not fully explained.	1	2	3	4	5	6

### SECTION E

Please answer all of the questions to the best of your ability by circling the correct answer

No.	Turnover Intentions	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
1	I often think about quitting my present job	1	2	3	4	5
2	I will probably look for a new job in the next year	1	2	3	4	5
3	As soon as possible, I will leave the organization	1	2	3	4	5

Appendix 4: Tables from Data Analysis

**Correlations**

		Informal group	JSS	TI	OC
Informal group	Pearson Correlation	1	.184*	-.008	-.171*
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000
	N	136	117	136	134
JSS	Pearson Correlation	.184*	1	-.540**	-.563**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000
	N	117	136	136	136
TI	Pearson Correlation	-.008	-.540**	1	.444**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000
	N	136	136	136	136
OC	Pearson Correlation	-.171*	-.563**	.444**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	
	N	134	136	136	136

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

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

**Correlations**

		Aloneness group	JSS	TI	OC
Aloneness group	Pearson Correlation	1	.019	.914	.016
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000
	N	64	46	62	63
JSS	Pearson Correlation	.019*	1	-.540**	-.563**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000
	N	46	64	64	64
TI	Pearson Correlation	.914	-.540**	1	.444**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000
	N	62	64	64	64
OC	Pearson Correlation	.016	-.563**	.444**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	

N	63	64	64	64
---	----	----	----	----

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

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

**Group Statistics**

	Groups	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
TI	Informal	136	10.96	4.309	.370
	Aloneness	62	11.03	3.824	.486

**Independent Samples Test**

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means	
		F	Sig.	t	df
TI	Equal variances assumed	.788	.376	-.108	196
	Equal variances not assumed			-.113	132.074

**Independent Samples Test**

		t-test for Equality of Means			
		Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference
					Lower
TI	Equal variances assumed	.914	-.069	.638	-1.327
	Equal variances not assumed	.910	-.069	.610	-1.276

**Independent Samples Test**

		t-test for Equality of Means
		95% Confidence Interval of the Difference
		Upper
TI	Equal variances assumed	1.189
	Equal variances not assumed	1.138

**Group Statistics**

	Groups	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
OC	Informal	134	31.51	7.299	.631
	Aloneness	63	34.27	7.755	.977

**Independent Samples Test**

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means	
		F	Sig.	t	df
OC	Equal variances assumed	.193	.661	-2.422	195
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.369	115.095

**Independent Samples Test**

		t-test for Equality of Means		
		Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference
OC	Equal variances assumed	.016	-2.755	1.138
	Equal variances not assumed	.019	-2.755	1.163

**Independent Samples Test**

		t-test for Equality of Means	
		95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		Lower	Upper
OC	Equal variances assumed	-4.998	-.511
	Equal variances not assumed	-5.058	-.452

**Group Statistics**

	Groups	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
JSS	Informal	117	134.59	25.368	2.345
	Aloneness	46	124.22	24.320	3.586

**Independent Samples Test**

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances	t-test for Equality of Means

		F	Sig.	t	df
JSS	Equal variances assumed	.579	.448	2.376	161
	Equal variances not assumed			2.421	85.655

**Independent Samples Test**

		t-test for Equality of Means		
		Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference
JSS	Equal variances assumed	.019	10.372	4.365
	Equal variances not assumed	.018	10.372	4.285

**Independent Samples Test**

		t-test for Equality of Means	
		95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		Lower	Upper
JSS	Equal variances assumed	1.753	18.992
	Equal variances not assumed	1.854	18.890

**Model Summary**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.587 <sup>a</sup>	.344	.332	3.626

a. Predictors: (Constant), Group, JSS, OC

**ANOVA<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	1084.784	3	361.595	27.497	.000 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	2064.595	157	13.150		
	Total	3149.379	160			

a. Dependent Variable: TI

**Coefficients<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients
		B	Std. Error	Beta
1	(Constant)	17.599	3.036	
	OC	.145	.046	.246
	JSS	-.074	.014	-.428
	Groups	-1.123	.650	-.115
Model	Groups			
1				

b. Predictors: (Constant), Predictors: (Constant), Group, JSS, OC

**Coefficients<sup>a</sup>**

Model		95.0% Confidence Interval for B
		Upper Bound
1	(Constant)	23.595
	OC	.236
	JSS	-.047
	Groups	.161

a. Dependent Variable: TI

*Appendix 5: Reliability Tables*

Employee Turnover Intentions

**Case Processing Summary**

		N	%
Cases	Valid	198	99.0
	Excluded <sup>a</sup>	2	1.0
	Total	200	100.0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

**Reliability Statistics**

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.807	.796	3

**Item Statistics**

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
I often think about quitting my present job	3.01	1.346	198
I will probably look for a new job in the next year	3.15	1.361	198
As soon as possible, I will leave the organization	2.68	1.369	198

**Inter-Item Correlation Matrix**

	I often think about quitting my present job	I will probably look for a new job in the next year	As soon as possible, I will leave the organization
I often think about quitting my present job	1.000	.751	.717
I will probably look for a new job in the next year	.751	1.000	.709
As soon as possible, I will leave the organization	.717	.709	1.000

**Item-Total Statistics**

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation
I often think about quitting my present job	7.98	9.401	.732
I will probably look for a new job in the next year	7.84	9.263	.741
As soon as possible, I will leave the organization	8.30	9.085	.763

**Item-Total Statistics**

	Squared Multiple Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
I often think about quitting my present job	.633	.702
I will probably look for a new job in the next year	.624	.697
As soon as possible, I will leave the organization	.603	.684

Workplace Friendship Scale

**Case Processing Summary**

		N	%
Cases	Valid	197	98.5
	Excluded <sup>a</sup>	3	1.5
	Total	200	100.0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

**Reliability Statistics**

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.822	.826	12

**Item Statistics**

	Mean	Std. Deviation
I have the opportunity to get to know my co-workers	3.72	.974
I am able to work with my co-workers to collectively solve problems	4.08	.949
In my organization I have the opportunity to talk informally and visit with others	3.40	1.028
Communication among employees is encouraged by my organization	3.99	1.000
Informal talk is tolerated by my organization as long as the work is completed	3.55	1.113
I have the opportunity to develop close friendships at my workplace	3.64	.988
I have formed strong friendships at work	3.46	1.081
I socialize with co-workers outside the workplace	3.51	1.038
I can confide in people at work	3.05	1.027
I feel I can trust many co-workers a great deal	2.79	.996
Being able to see my co-workers is one reason I look forward to my job	3.05	1.053
I do not feel that anyone I work with is a true friend	2.80	1.097

**Item Statistics**

	N
I have the opportunity to get to know my co-workers	197
I am able to work with my co-workers to collectively solve problems	197
In my organization I have the opportunity to talk informally and visit with others	197
Communication among employees is encouraged by my organization	197
Informal talk is tolerated by my organization as long as the work is completed	197
I have the opportunity to develop close friendships at my workplace	197
I have formed strong friendships at work	197

I socialize with co-workers outside the workplace	197
I can confide in people at work	197
I feel I can trust many co-workers a great deal	197
Being able to see my co-workers is one reason I look forward to my job	197
I do not feel that anyone I work with is a true friend	197

**Inter-Item Correlation Matrix**

	I have the opportunity to get to know my co-workers
I have the opportunity to get to know my co-workers	1.000
I am able to work with my co-workers to collectively solve problems	.588
In my organization I have the opportunity to talk informally and visit with others	.566
Communication among employees is encouraged by my organization	.479
Informal talk is tolerated by my organization as long as the work is completed	.273
I have the opportunity to develop close friendships at my workplace	.555
I have formed strong friendships at work	.483
I socialize with co-workers outside the workplace	.412
I can confide in people at work	.130
I feel I can trust many co-workers a great deal	.223
Being able to see my co-workers is one reason I look forward to my job	.138
I do not feel that anyone I work with is a true friend	-.188

**Inter-Item Correlation Matrix**

	I am able to work with my co-workers to collectively solve problems
I have the opportunity to get to know my co-workers	.588
I am able to work with my co-workers to collectively solve problems	1.000
In my organization I have the opportunity to talk informally and visit with others	.463
Communication among employees is encouraged by my organization	.565
Informal talk is tolerated by my organization as long as the work is completed	.252
I have the opportunity to develop close friendships at my workplace	.504
I have formed strong friendships at work	.347
I socialize with co-workers outside the workplace	.258
I can confide in people at work	.059

I feel I can trust many co-workers a great deal	.061
Being able to see my co-workers is one reason I look forward to my job	.128
I do not feel that anyone I work with is a true friend	-.141

**Inter-Item Correlation Matrix**

	In my organization I have the opportunity to talk informally and visit with others
I have the opportunity to get to know my co-workers	.566
I am able to work with my co-workers to collectively solve problems	.463
In my organization I have the opportunity to talk informally and visit with others	1.000
Communication among employees is encouraged by my organization	.480
Informal talk is tolerated by my organization as long as the work is completed	.450
I have the opportunity to develop close friendships at my workplace	.608
I have formed strong friendships at work	.447
I socialize with co-workers outside the workplace	.392
I can confide in people at work	.176
I feel I can trust many co-workers a great deal	.310
Being able to see my co-workers is one reason I look forward to my job	.222
I do not feel that anyone I work with is a true friend	-.168

**Inter-Item Correlation Matrix**

	Communication among employees is encouraged by my organization
I have the opportunity to get to know my co-workers	.479
I am able to work with my co-workers to collectively solve problems	.565
In my organization I have the opportunity to talk informally and visit with others	.480
Communication among employees is encouraged by my organization	1.000
Informal talk is tolerated by my organization as long as the work is completed	.326
I have the opportunity to develop close friendships at my workplace	.637
I have formed strong friendships at work	.420
I socialize with co-workers outside the workplace	.344
I can confide in people at work	.159
I feel I can trust many co-workers a great deal	.162
Being able to see my co-workers is one reason I look forward to my job	.233
I do not feel that anyone I work with is a true friend	-.030

**Inter-Item Correlation Matrix**

	Informal talk is tolerated by my organization as long as the work is completed
I have the opportunity to get to know my co-workers	.273
I am able to work with my co-workers to collectively solve problems	.252
In my organization I have the opportunity to talk informally and visit with others	.450
Communication among employees is encouraged by my organization	.326
Informal talk is tolerated by my organization as long as the work is completed	1.000
I have the opportunity to develop close friendships at my workplace	.372
I have formed strong friendships at work	.328
I socialize with co-workers outside the workplace	.323
I can confide in people at work	.094
I feel I can trust many co-workers a great deal	.141
Being able to see my co-workers is one reason I look forward to my job	.015
I do not feel that anyone I work with is a true friend	-.071

**Inter-Item Correlation Matrix**

	I have the opportunity to develop close friendships at my workplace
I have the opportunity to get to know my co-workers	.555
I am able to work with my co-workers to collectively solve problems	.504
In my organization I have the opportunity to talk informally and visit with others	.608
Communication among employees is encouraged by my organization	.637
Informal talk is tolerated by my organization as long as the work is completed	.372
I have the opportunity to develop close friendships at my workplace	1.000
I have formed strong friendships at work	.618
I socialize with co-workers outside the workplace	.455
I can confide in people at work	.323
I feel I can trust many co-workers a great deal	.338
Being able to see my co-workers is one reason I look forward to my job	.331
I do not feel that anyone I work with is a true friend	-.167

**Inter-Item Correlation Matrix**

	I have formed strong friendships at work
I have the opportunity to get to know my co-workers	.483
I am able to work with my co-workers to collectively solve problems	.347
In my organization I have the opportunity to talk informally and visit with others	.447
Communication among employees is encouraged by my organization	.420
Informal talk is tolerated by my organization as long as the work is completed	.328
I have the opportunity to develop close friendships at my workplace	.618
I have formed strong friendships at work	1.000
I socialize with co-workers outside the workplace	.577
I can confide in people at work	.473
I feel I can trust many co-workers a great deal	.440
Being able to see my co-workers is one reason I look forward to my job	.401
I do not feel that anyone I work with is a true friend	-.214

**Inter-Item Correlation Matrix**

	I socialize with co-workers outside the workplace
I have the opportunity to get to know my co-workers	.412
I am able to work with my co-workers to collectively solve problems	.258
In my organization I have the opportunity to talk informally and visit with others	.392
Communication among employees is encouraged by my organization	.344
Informal talk is tolerated by my organization as long as the work is completed	.323
I have the opportunity to develop close friendships at my workplace	.455
I have formed strong friendships at work	.577
I socialize with co-workers outside the workplace	1.000
I can confide in people at work	.428
I feel I can trust many co-workers a great deal	.395
Being able to see my co-workers is one reason I look forward to my job	.377
I do not feel that anyone I work with is a true friend	-.092

**Inter-Item Correlation Matrix**

	I can confide in people at work
I have the opportunity to get to know my co-workers	.130
I am able to work with my co-workers to collectively solve problems	.059
In my organization I have the opportunity to talk informally and visit with others	.176
Communication among employees is encouraged by my organization	.159

Informal talk is tolerated by my organization as long as the work is completed	.094
I have the opportunity to develop close friendships at my workplace	.323
I have formed strong friendships at work	.473
I socialize with co-workers outside the workplace	.428
I can confide in people at work	1.000
I feel I can trust many co-workers a great deal	.728
Being able to see my co-workers is one reason I look forward to my job	.503
I do not feel that anyone I work with is a true friend	-.196

**Inter-Item Correlation Matrix**

	I feel I can trust many co-workers a great deal
I have the opportunity to get to know my co-workers	.223
I am able to work with my co-workers to collectively solve problems	.061
In my organization I have the opportunity to talk informally and visit with others	.310
Communication among employees is encouraged by my organization	.162
Informal talk is tolerated by my organization as long as the work is completed	.141
I have the opportunity to develop close friendships at my workplace	.338
I have formed strong friendships at work	.440
I socialize with co-workers outside the workplace	.395
I can confide in people at work	.728
I feel I can trust many co-workers a great deal	1.000
Being able to see my co-workers is one reason I look forward to my job	.555
I do not feel that anyone I work with is a true friend	-.095

**Inter-Item Correlation Matrix**

	Being able to see my co-workers is one reason I look forward to my job
I have the opportunity to get to know my co-workers	.138
I am able to work with my co-workers to collectively solve problems	.128
In my organization I have the opportunity to talk informally and visit with others	.222
Communication among employees is encouraged by my organization	.233
Informal talk is tolerated by my organization as long as the work is completed	.015
I have the opportunity to develop close friendships at my workplace	.331
I have formed strong friendships at work	.401
I socialize with co-workers outside the workplace	.377
I can confide in people at work	.503

I feel I can trust many co-workers a great deal	.555
Being able to see my co-workers is one reason I look forward to my job	1.000
I do not feel that anyone I work with is a true friend	.049

**Inter-Item Correlation Matrix**

	I do not feel that anyone I work with is a true friend
I have the opportunity to get to know my co-workers	-.188
I am able to work with my co-workers to collectively solve problems	-.141
In my organization I have the opportunity to talk informally and visit with others	-.168
Communication among employees is encouraged by my organization	-.030
Informal talk is tolerated by my organization as long as the work is completed	-.071
I have the opportunity to develop close friendships at my workplace	-.167
I have formed strong friendships at work	-.214
I socialize with co-workers outside the workplace	-.092
I can confide in people at work	-.196
I feel I can trust many co-workers a great deal	-.095
Being able to see my co-workers is one reason I look forward to my job	.049
I do not feel that anyone I work with is a true friend	1.000

**Item-Total Statistics**

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted
I have the opportunity to get to know my co-workers	37.31
I am able to work with my co-workers to collectively solve problems	36.95
In my organization I have the opportunity to talk informally and visit with others	37.63
Communication among employees is encouraged by my organization	37.04
Informal talk is tolerated by my organization as long as the work is completed	37.48
I have the opportunity to develop close friendships at my workplace	37.39
I have formed strong friendships at work	37.57
I socialize with co-workers outside the workplace	37.52
I can confide in people at work	37.98
I feel I can trust many co-workers a great deal	38.24
Being able to see my co-workers is one reason I look forward to my job	37.98
I do not feel that anyone I work with is a true friend	38.23

**Item-Total Statistics**

	Scale Variance if Item Deleted
I have the opportunity to get to know my co-workers	43.411
I am able to work with my co-workers to collectively solve problems	44.742
In my organization I have the opportunity to talk informally and visit with others	42.315
Communication among employees is encouraged by my organization	42.927
Informal talk is tolerated by my organization as long as the work is completed	44.741
I have the opportunity to develop close friendships at my workplace	41.392
I have formed strong friendships at work	41.001
I socialize with co-workers outside the workplace	42.312
I can confide in people at work	44.505
I feel I can trust many co-workers a great deal	43.917
Being able to see my co-workers is one reason I look forward to my job	44.153
I do not feel that anyone I work with is a true friend	53.323

**Item-Total Statistics**

	Corrected Item-Total Correlation
I have the opportunity to get to know my co-workers	.564
I am able to work with my co-workers to collectively solve problems	.469
In my organization I have the opportunity to talk informally and visit with others	.615
Communication among employees is encouraged by my organization	.586
Informal talk is tolerated by my organization as long as the work is completed	.378
I have the opportunity to develop close friendships at my workplace	.726
I have formed strong friendships at work	.682
I socialize with co-workers outside the workplace	.608
I can confide in people at work	.441
I feel I can trust many co-workers a great deal	.507
Being able to see my co-workers is one reason I look forward to my job	.453
I do not feel that anyone I work with is a true friend	-.183

**Item-Total Statistics**

	Squared Multiple Correlation
I have the opportunity to get to know my co-workers	.534
I am able to work with my co-workers to collectively solve problems	.476
In my organization I have the opportunity to talk informally and visit with others	.523
Communication among employees is encouraged by my organization	.507
Informal talk is tolerated by my organization as long as the work is completed	.281
I have the opportunity to develop close friendships at my workplace	.628

I have formed strong friendships at work	.559
I socialize with co-workers outside the workplace	.432
I can confide in people at work	.616
I feel I can trust many co-workers a great deal	.618
Being able to see my co-workers is one reason I look forward to my job	.419
I do not feel that anyone I work with is a true friend	.140

**Item-Total Statistics**

	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
I have the opportunity to get to know my co-workers	.802
I am able to work with my co-workers to collectively solve problems	.809
In my organization I have the opportunity to talk informally and visit with others	.797
Communication among employees is encouraged by my organization	.799
Informal talk is tolerated by my organization as long as the work is completed	.818
I have the opportunity to develop close friendships at my workplace	.788
I have formed strong friendships at work	.790
I socialize with co-workers outside the workplace	.797
I can confide in people at work	.811
I feel I can trust many co-workers a great deal	.806
Being able to see my co-workers is one reason I look forward to my job	.811
I do not feel that anyone I work with is a true friend	.862

**Job Satisfaction Survey**

**Case Processing Summary**

		N	%
Cases	Valid	163	81.5
	Excluded <sup>a</sup>	37	18.5
	Total	200	100.0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

**Reliability Statistics**

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.900	.899	36

**Item Statistics**

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
I feel I am being paid a fair amount for the work I do.	3.24	1.519	163
I feel satisfied with my chances for salary increases.	3.20	1.491	163
There is really too little chance for promotion on my job	2.74	1.448	163
I am satisfied with the benefits I receive	2.79	1.539	163
Many of our rules and procedures make doing a good job difficult	3.32	1.447	163
I sometimes feel my job is meaningless	4.51	1.513	163
Raises are too few and far between	2.99	1.546	163
My supervisor is unfair to me	4.33	1.409	163
I do not feel that the work I do is appreciated	3.66	1.533	163
I find I have to work harder at my job because of the incompetence of the people I work with	3.98	1.486	163
The goals of the organization are not clear to me	4.02	1.571	163
I feel unappreciated by the organization when I think about what they pay me	3.25	1.503	163

My supervisor shows too little interest in the feeling of subordinates	3.48	1.545	163
There are few rewards for those who work here	3.21	1.505	163
I have too much to do at work	3.26	1.327	163
I often feel that I do not know what is going on with the organization	3.45	1.454	163
There are benefits we do not have which we should have	2.39	1.484	163
I have too much paperwork	3.74	1.523	163
I do not feel my efforts are rewarded the way they should	2.82	1.500	163
There is too much bickering and fighting at work	3.67	1.688	163
Work assignments are not fully explained	3.77	1.358	163
My supervisor is quite competent in doing his/her job.	4.36	1.444	163
When I do a good job, I receive the recognition for it that I should receive.	3.71	1.594	163
I like the people I work with.	4.64	1.148	163
Communications seem good within this organization.	3.99	1.419	163
Those who do well on the job stand a fair chance of being promoted.	3.29	1.591	163
The benefits we receive are as good as most other organizations offer.	2.96	1.555	163
I like doing the things I do at work.	4.39	1.234	163
People get ahead as fast here as they do in other places.	3.03	1.497	163

The benefit package we have is fair.	3.15	1.522	163
I enjoy my coworkers.	4.38	1.150	163
I feel a sense of pride in doing my job.	3.98	1.535	163
I like my supervisor.	4.15	1.437	163
I am satisfied with my chances for promotion.	3.21	1.642	163
My job is enjoyable.	4.07	1.336	163
My co-workers are satisfied with the job, so am I	3.13	1.470	163
My efforts to do a good job are rarely blocked by official rules.	3.42	1.456	163

**Inter-Item Correlation Matrix**

	I feel I am being paid a fair amount for the work I do.	I feel satisfied with my chances for salary increases.	There is really too little chance for promotion on my job	I am not satisfied with the benefits I receive	Many of our rules and procedures make doing a good job difficult	I sometimes feel my job is meaningless	Raises are too few and far between	My supervisor is unfair to me	I do not feel that the work I do is appreciated	I find I have to work harder at my job because of the incompetence of people I work with	The goals of the organization are not clear to me
I feel I am being paid a fair amount for the work I do.	1.000	.398	.251	.329	.128	.309	.222	.113	.234	.044	.202
I feel satisfied with my chances for salary increases.	.398	1.000	.311	.226	.193	.176	.116	.180	.382	-.087	.253

There is really too little chance for promotion on my job	.251	.311	1.000	.271	.323	.169	.322	.136	.334	.149	.177
I am satisfied with the benefits I receive	.329	.226	.271	1.000	.355	.275	.288	.152	.285	.176	.298
Many of our rules and procedures make doing a good job difficult	.128	.193	.323	.355	1.000	.396	.216	.267	.378	.225	.317
I sometimes feel my job is meaningless	.309	.176	.169	.275	.396	1.000	.075	.350	.398	.211	.280
Raises are too few and far between	.222	.116	.322	.288	.216	.075	1.000	.128	.278	.261	.094
My supervisor is unfair to me	.113	.180	.136	.152	.267	.350	.128	1.000	.403	.060	.055
I do not feel that the work I do is appreciated	.234	.382	.334	.285	.378	.398	.278	.403	1.000	.235	.232
I find I have to work harder at my job because of the incompetence of the people I work with	.044	-.087	.149	.176	.225	.211	.261	.060	.235	1.000	.331
The goals of the organization are not clear to me	.202	.253	.177	.298	.317	.280	.094	.055	.232	.331	1.000
I feel unappreciated by the organization when I think about what they pay me	.326	.294	.194	.346	.245	.251	.412	.210	.355	.251	.298

My supervisor shows too little interest in the feeling of subordinates	.082	.263	.175	.179	.199	.159	.151	.385	.278	.244	.104
There are few rewards for those who work here	.116	.229	.286	.246	.236	.227	.303	.180	.309	-.036	.097
I have too much to do at work	.116	.186	.090	.188	.153	-.026	.227	-.045	.026	.232	.184
I often feel that I do not know what is going on with the organization	.197	.203	.230	.170	.331	.496	.095	.242	.391	.331	.328
There are benefits we do not have which we should have	.328	.335	.192	.224	.346	.227	.211	.095	.274	.111	.186
I have too much paperwork	-.029	-.044	.027	.105	.282	.230	.036	.181	.157	.251	.098
I do not feel my efforts are rewarded the way they should	.412	.329	.242	.448	.383	.186	.282	.215	.289	.087	.277
There is too much bickering and fighting at work	.057	.178	.043	.113	.212	.217	-.001	.151	.178	.248	.145
Work assignments are not fully explained	.056	.126	.051	.183	.248	.279	-.068	.219	.280	.184	.254
My supervisor is quite competent in doing his/her job.	.194	.101	.073	.171	.122	.178	.090	.479	.282	.211	.083

When I do a good job, I receive the recognition for it that I should receive.	.493	.399	.312	.226	.206	.087	.089	.061	.348	.041	.289
I like the people I work with.	.184	.136	.040	.012	.273	.418	-.113	.309	.298	.154	-.077
Communications seem good within this organization.	.328	.302	.284	.120	.272	.135	-.003	.141	.265	-.038	.305
Those who do well on the job stand a fair chance of being promoted.	.423	.264	.433	.296	.337	.230	.192	.144	.323	.053	.160
The benefits we receive are as good as most other organizations offer.	.487	.386	.462	.559	.351	.202	.267	.110	.269	.077	.304
I like doing the things I do at work.	.234	.252	.209	.122	.159	.201	-.012	.140	.110	-.018	-.014
People get ahead as fast here as they do in other places.	.420	.398	.440	.236	.203	.165	.134	.086	.319	.125	.165
The benefit package we have is fair.	.499	.272	.273	.505	.334	.143	.229	.184	.332	.081	.184
I enjoy my coworkers.	-.045	.196	.012	.029	.038	.083	.015	.167	.138	.164	-.033
I feel a sense of pride in doing my job.	.087	.326	.344	.249	.356	.324	-.023	.283	.345	.094	.243
I like my supervisor.	.162	.369	.259	.232	.224	.144	.087	.449	.267	.149	.105

I am satisfied with my chances for promotion.	.349	.426	.379	.221	.187	.168	.283	.131	.357	.012	.106
My job is enjoyable.	.292	.318	.288	.239	.291	.345	.060	.233	.293	.184	.214
My co-workers are satisfied with the job, so am I	.412	.410	.236	.233	.143	.170	.057	.012	.258	-.078	.025
My efforts to do a good job are rarely blocked by official rules.	-.043	.049	-.313	-.155	-.412	-.262	-.024	-.265	-.217	-.320	-.177

**Inter-Item Correlation Matrix**

	I feel unappreciated by the organization when I think about what they pay me	My supervisor shows too little interest in the feelings of subordinates	There are few rewards for those who work here	I have too much to do at work	I often feel that I do not know what is going on with the organization	There are benefits we do not have which we should have	I have too much paperwork	I don't feel my efforts are rewarded the way they should be	There is too much bickering and fighting at work	Work assignments are not fully explained	My supervisor is quite competent in doing his/her job.
I feel I am being paid a fair amount for the work I do.	.326	.082	.116	.116	.197	.328	-.029	.412	.057	.056	.194
I feel satisfied with my chances for salary increases.	.294	.263	.229	.186	.203	.335	-.044	.329	.178	.126	.101
There is really too little chance for promotion on my job	.194	.175	.286	.090	.230	.192	.027	.242	.043	.051	.073

I am satisfied with the benefits I receive	.346	.179	.246	.188	.170	.224	.105	.448	.113	.183	.171
Many of our rules and procedures make doing a good job difficult	.245	.199	.236	.153	.331	.346	.282	.383	.212	.248	.122
I sometimes feel my job is meaningless	.251	.159	.227	-.026	.496	.227	.230	.186	.217	.279	.178
Raises are too few and far between	.412	.151	.303	.227	.095	.211	.036	.282	-.001	-.068	.090
My supervisor is unfair to me	.210	.385	.180	-.045	.242	.095	.181	.215	.151	.219	.479
I do not feel that the work I do is appreciated	.355	.278	.309	.026	.391	.274	.157	.289	.178	.280	.282
I find I have to work harder at my job because of the incompetence of the people I work with	.251	.244	-.036	.232	.331	.111	.251	.087	.248	.184	.211
The goals of the organization are not clear to me	.298	.104	.097	.184	.328	.186	.098	.277	.145	.254	.083
I feel unappreciated by the organization when I think about what they pay me	1.000	.159	.305	.352	.243	.313	.112	.483	.202	.136	.240

My supervisor shows too little interest in the feeling of subordinates	.159	1.000	.140	.105	.303	.308	.175	.339	.214	.170	.392
There are few rewards for those who work here	.305	.140	1.000	.131	.107	.394	.135	.378	.168	.060	.127
I have too much to do at work	.352	.105	.131	1.000	.001	.237	.208	.266	.148	-.029	.102
I often feel that I do not know what is going on with the organization	.243	.303	.107	.001	1.000	.250	.104	.222	.419	.236	.243
There are benefits we do not have which we should have	.313	.308	.394	.237	.250	1.000	.207	.535	.118	.081	.063
I have too much paperwork	.112	.175	.135	.208	.104	.207	1.000	.273	.120	.287	.134
I do not feel my efforts are rewarded the way they should	.483	.339	.378	.266	.222	.535	.273	1.000	.186	.052	.319
There is too much bickering and fighting at work	.202	.214	.168	.148	.419	.118	.120	.186	1.000	.331	.249
Work assignments are not fully explained	.136	.170	.060	-.029	.236	.081	.287	.052	.331	1.000	.162
My supervisor is quite competent in doing his/her job.	.240	.392	.127	.102	.243	.063	.134	.319	.249	.162	1.000

When I do a good job, I receive the recognition for it that I should receive.	.277	.122	.123	.190	.189	.249	.154	.492	.084	.087	.188
I like the people I work with.	.101	.253	-.053	-.085	.311	.079	.214	.076	.278	.158	.309
Communications seem good within this organization.	-.010	.022	.062	.097	.263	-.027	.133	.129	.171	.072	.084
Those who do well on the job stand a fair chance of being promoted.	.266	.083	.255	.025	.226	.285	.083	.388	.123	.020	.295
The benefits we receive are as good as most other organizations offer.	.342	.174	.309	.136	.188	.397	.006	.505	.064	.090	.080
I like doing the things I do at work.	.025	.087	.006	-.012	.175	-.056	.084	.012	.156	.075	.202
People get ahead as fast here as they do in other places.	.301	.258	.214	.158	.232	.245	.199	.352	.089	.058	.132
The benefit package we have is fair.	.385	.305	.255	.118	.239	.397	.172	.575	.128	.107	.222
I enjoy my coworkers.	.010	.248	.011	.053	.252	.017	.167	.016	.350	.158	.199
I feel a sense of pride in doing my job.	.110	.273	.275	-.009	.306	.167	.098	.188	.156	.285	.252
I like my supervisor.	.055	.599	.117	.067	.290	.198	.100	.279	.208	.175	.465

I am satisfied with my chances for promotion.	.354	.211	.207	.015	.206	.303	.007	.351	.031	.091	.241
My job is enjoyable.	.237	.252	.069	.010	.320	.023	.158	.164	.230	.288	.201
My co-workers are satisfied with the job, so am I	.209	.225	.080	.087	.239	.268	.001	.316	.156	-.019	.211
My efforts to do a good job are rarely blocked by official rules.	-.019	-.191	-.155	.033	-.141	-.130	-.334	-.179	-.100	-.173	-.284

**Inter-Item Correlation Matrix**

	When I do a good job, I receive the recognition for it that I should receive.	I like the people I work with.	Communications seem good within this organization.	Those who do well on the job stand a fair chance of being promoted.	The benefits we receive are as good as most other organizations offer.	I like doing the things I do at work.	People get ahead as fast here as they do in other places.	The benefit package we have is fair.	I enjoy my coworkers.
I feel I am being paid a fair amount for the work I do.	.493	.184	.328	.423	.487	.234	.420	.499	-.045
I feel satisfied with my chances for salary increases.	.399	.136	.302	.264	.386	.252	.398	.272	.196
There is really too little chance for promotion on my job	.312	.040	.284	.433	.462	.209	.440	.273	.012
I am satisfied with the benefits I receive	.226	.012	.120	.296	.559	.122	.236	.505	.029

Many of our rules and procedures make doing a good job difficult	.206	.273	.272	.337	.351	.159	.203	.334	.038
I sometimes feel my job is meaningless	.087	.418	.135	.230	.202	.201	.165	.143	.083
Raises are too few and far between	.089	-.113	-.003	.192	.267	-.012	.134	.229	.015
My supervisor is unfair to me	.061	.309	.141	.144	.110	.140	.086	.184	.167
I do not feel that the work I do is appreciated	.348	.298	.265	.323	.269	.110	.319	.332	.138
I find I have to work harder at my job because of the incompetence of the people I work with	.041	.154	-.038	.053	.077	-.018	.125	.081	.164
The goals of the organization are not clear to me	.289	-.077	.305	.160	.304	-.014	.165	.184	-.033
I feel unappreciated by the organization when I think about what they pay me	.277	.101	-.010	.266	.342	.025	.301	.385	.010
My supervisor shows too little interest in the feeling of subordinates	.122	.253	.022	.083	.174	.087	.258	.305	.248

There are few rewards for those who work here	.123	-.053	.062	.255	.309	.006	.214	.255	.011
I have too much to do at work	.190	-.085	.097	.025	.136	-.012	.158	.118	.053
I often feel that I do not know what is going on with the organization	.189	.311	.263	.226	.188	.175	.232	.239	.252
There are benefits we do not have which we should have	.249	.079	-.027	.285	.397	-.056	.245	.397	.017
I have too much paperwork	.154	.214	.133	.083	.006	.084	.199	.172	.167
I do not feel my efforts are rewarded the way they should	.492	.076	.129	.388	.505	.012	.352	.575	.016
There is too much bickering and fighting at work	.084	.278	.171	.123	.064	.156	.089	.128	.350
Work assignments are not fully explained	.087	.158	.072	.020	.090	.075	.058	.107	.158
My supervisor is quite competent in doing his/her job.	.188	.309	.084	.295	.080	.202	.132	.222	.199
When I do a good job, I receive the recognition for it that I should receive.	1.000	.136	.476	.557	.501	.038	.400	.535	.006

I like the people I work with.	.136	1.000	.164	.159	.041	.263	.204	.166	.384
Communications seem good within this organization.	.476	.164	1.000	.286	.282	.183	.233	.287	.109
Those who do well on the job stand a fair chance of being promoted.	.557	.159	.286	1.000	.548	.045	.380	.463	-.068
The benefits we receive are as good as most other organizations offer.	.501	.041	.282	.548	1.000	.052	.393	.589	-.027
I like doing the things I do at work.	.038	.263	.183	.045	.052	1.000	.197	.064	.222
People get ahead as fast here as they do in other places.	.400	.204	.233	.380	.393	.197	1.000	.461	.176
The benefit package we have is fair.	.535	.166	.287	.463	.589	.064	.461	1.000	.157
I enjoy my coworkers.	.006	.384	.109	-.068	-.027	.222	.176	.157	1.000
I feel a sense of pride in doing my job.	.164	.387	.232	.210	.310	.341	.229	.348	.295
I like my supervisor.	.162	.305	.189	.124	.284	.246	.331	.297	.384
I am satisfied with my chances for promotion.	.379	.131	.255	.428	.399	.179	.306	.377	-.065
My job is enjoyable.	.271	.299	.398	.118	.284	.406	.397	.328	.207

My co-workers are satisfied with the job, so am I	.403	.276	.211	.361	.361	.204	.408	.435	.135
My efforts to do a good job are rarely blocked by official rules.	.018	-.147	-.111	-.173	-.132	-.011	-.114	-.135	.089

**Inter-Item Correlation Matrix**

	I feel a sense of pride in doing my job.	I like my supervisor.	I am satisfied with my chances for promotion.	My job is enjoyable.	My co-workers are satisfied with the job, so am I	My efforts to do a good job are rarely blocked by official rules.
I feel I am being paid a fair amount for the work I do.	.087	.162	.349	.292	.412	-.043
I feel satisfied with my chances for salary increases.	.326	.369	.426	.318	.410	.049
There is really too little chance for promotion on my job	.344	.259	.379	.288	.236	-.313
I am satisfied with the benefits I receive	.249	.232	.221	.239	.233	-.155
Many of our rules and procedures make doing a good job difficult	.356	.224	.187	.291	.143	-.412
I sometimes feel my job is meaningless	.324	.144	.168	.345	.170	-.262
Raises are too few and far between	-.023	.087	.283	.060	.057	-.024
My supervisor is unfair to me	.283	.449	.131	.233	.012	-.265
I do not feel that the work I do is appreciated	.345	.267	.357	.293	.258	-.217

I find I have to work harder at my job because of the incompetence of the people I work with	.094	.149	.012	.184	-.078	-.320
The goals of the organization are not clear to me	.243	.105	.106	.214	.025	-.177
I feel unappreciated by the organization when I think about what they pay me	.110	.055	.354	.237	.209	-.019
My supervisor shows too little interest in the feeling of subordinates	.273	.599	.211	.252	.225	-.191
There are few rewards for those who work here	.275	.117	.207	.069	.080	-.155
I have too much to do at work	-.009	.067	.015	.010	.087	.033
I often feel that I do not know what is going on with the organization	.306	.290	.206	.320	.239	-.141
There are benefits we do not have which we should have	.167	.198	.303	.023	.268	-.130
I have too much paperwork	.098	.100	.007	.158	.001	-.334
I do not feel my efforts are rewarded the way they should	.188	.279	.351	.164	.316	-.179
There is too much bickering and fighting at work	.156	.208	.031	.230	.156	-.100
Work assignments are not fully explained	.285	.175	.091	.288	-.019	-.173
My supervisor is quite competent in doing his/her job.	.252	.465	.241	.201	.211	-.284

When I do a good job, I receive the recognition for it that I should receive.	.164	.162	.379	.271	.403	.018
I like the people I work with.	.387	.305	.131	.299	.276	-.147
Communications seem good within this organization.	.232	.189	.255	.398	.211	-.111
Those who do well on the job stand a fair chance of being promoted.	.210	.124	.428	.118	.361	-.173
The benefits we receive are as good as most other organizations offer.	.310	.284	.399	.284	.361	-.132
I like doing the things I do at work.	.341	.246	.179	.406	.204	-.011
People get ahead as fast here as they do in other places.	.229	.331	.306	.397	.408	-.114
The benefit package we have is fair.	.348	.297	.377	.328	.435	-.135
I enjoy my coworkers.	.295	.384	-.065	.207	.135	.089
I feel a sense of pride in doing my job.	1.000	.346	.271	.455	.338	-.208
I like my supervisor.	.346	1.000	.238	.438	.233	-.142
I am satisfied with my chances for promotion.	.271	.238	1.000	.421	.467	-.145
My job is enjoyable.	.455	.438	.421	1.000	.240	-.200
My co-workers are satisfied with the job, so am I	.338	.233	.467	.240	1.000	.041
My efforts to do a good job are rarely blocked by official rules.	-.208	-.142	-.145	-.200	.041	1.000

## Item-Total Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item- Total Correlation	Squared Multiple Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
I feel I am being paid a fair amount for the work I do.	128.42	606.776	.507	.676	.896
I feel satisfied with my chances for salary increases.	128.46	605.670	.533	.585	.896
There is really too little chance for promotion on my job	128.93	611.451	.468	.560	.897
I am satisfied with the benefits I receive	128.88	607.121	.495	.518	.896
Many of our rules and procedures make doing a good job difficult	128.34	608.313	.513	.574	.896
I sometimes feel my job is meaningless	127.15	610.933	.452	.594	.897
Raises are too few and far between	128.67	621.396	.302	.488	.899
My supervisor is unfair to me	127.34	618.842	.374	.520	.898
I do not feel that the work I do is appreciated	128.01	600.710	.585	.534	.895
I find I have to work harder at my job because of the incompetence of the people I work with	127.69	625.550	.259	.536	.900
The goals of the organization are not clear to me	127.64	615.837	.368	.515	.898
I feel unappreciated by the organization when I think about what they pay me	128.42	607.010	.510	.609	.896
My supervisor shows too little interest in the feeling of subordinates	128.18	610.966	.441	.506	.897
There are few rewards for those who work here	128.45	617.842	.360	.473	.898

I have too much to do at work	128.40	630.205	.226	.406	.900
I often feel that I do not know what is going on with the organization	128.21	608.725	.505	.518	.896
There are benefits we do not have which we should have	129.27	611.445	.455	.572	.897
I have too much paperwork	127.93	625.822	.248	.509	.900
I do not feel my efforts are rewarded the way they should	128.85	600.192	.607	.672	.894
There is too much bickering and fighting at work	127.99	616.037	.336	.475	.899
Work assignments are not fully explained	127.89	626.012	.282	.436	.899
My supervisor is quite competent in doing his/her job.	127.30	616.063	.403	.614	.898
When I do a good job, I receive the recognition for it that I should receive.	127.95	602.788	.533	.680	.896
I like the people I work with.	127.02	625.450	.353	.578	.898
Communications seem good within this organization.	127.67	618.480	.376	.581	.898
Those who do well on the job stand a fair chance of being promoted.	128.37	604.543	.511	.630	.896
The benefits we receive are as good as most other organizations offer.	128.70	599.434	.593	.659	.895
I like doing the things I do at work.	127.28	629.201	.264	.422	.899
People get ahead as fast here as they do in other places.	128.63	605.197	.538	.538	.896
The benefit package we have is fair.	128.51	597.807	.630	.688	.894
I enjoy my coworkers.	127.28	631.661	.243	.473	.900

I feel a sense of pride in doing my job.	127.69	606.994	.498	.634	.896
I like my supervisor.	127.52	609.609	.498	.661	.896
I am satisfied with my chances for promotion.	128.45	603.854	.502	.584	.896
My job is enjoyable.	127.59	610.725	.523	.638	.896
My co-workers are satisfied with the job, so am I	128.53	610.868	.468	.536	.897
My efforts to do a good job are rarely blocked by official rules.	128.25	667.384	-.299	.541	.908

### Organizational Commitment

#### Case Processing Summary

		N	%
Cases	Valid	192	96.0
	Excluded <sup>a</sup>	8	4.0
	Total	200	100.0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

#### Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.604	.603	15

#### Item Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help this organization to be successful because my co-workers are doing same	2.80	1.692	192
My co-workers talk up this organization to their friends as a great organization to work for so I also do same	3.81	1.597	192
I feel very little loyalty to this organization	4.46	1.672	192
I would accept almost any type of job assignment in order to keep working for this organization	4.25	1.769	192
I find that my values and the organization's values are very similar	3.56	1.561	192
I am proud to tell others that I am part of this organization	2.83	1.430	192
I could just as well be working for a different organization as long as the type of work was similar	3.37	1.419	192
This organization really inspires the very best in me in the way of job performance	3.23	1.579	192
It would take very little change in my present circumstances to cause me to leave this organization	3.98	1.523	192
I am extremely glad that I chose this organization to work for over others I was considering	3.23	1.451	192
There is not too much to be gained by sticking with this organization indefinitely	4.02	1.623	192
Often I find it difficult to agree with this organization's policies on important matters relating to its employees	3.73	1.500	192

My co-workers care about the fate of this organization so I also care	3.91	1.482	192
For me this is the best of all possible organizations for which to work	3.96	1.713	192
Deciding to work for this organization was a definite mistake on my part	5.05	1.594	192

Inter-Item Correlation Matrix

	I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help this organization to be successful because my co-workers are doing same	My co-workers talk up this organization to their friends as a great organization to work for so I also do same	I feel very little loyalty to this organization	I would accept almost any type of job assignment in order to keep working for this organization	I find that my values and the organization's values are very similar	I am proud to tell others that I am part of this organization	I could just as well be working for a different organization as long as the type of work was similar	This organization really inspires the very best in me in the way of job performance	It would take very little change in my present circumstances to cause me to leave this organization
I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help this organization to be successful because my co-workers are doing same	1.000	.608	.013	.285	.162	.246	.249	.267	.135
My co-workers talk up this organization to their friends as	.608	1.000	-.070	.230	.259	.236	.049	.244	.016

a great organization to work for so I also do same									
I feel very little loyalty to this organization	.013	-.070	1.000	-.060	-.272	-.224	-.023	-.213	.013
I would accept almost any type of job assignment in order to keep working for this organization	.285	.230	-.060	1.000	.389	.308	.126	.286	.147
I find that my values and the organization's values are very similar	.162	.259	-.272	.389	1.000	.467	.055	.539	-.036
I am proud to tell others that I am part of this organization	.246	.236	-.224	.308	.467	1.000	.134	.534	-.085
I could just as well be working for a different organization as long as the type of work was similar	.249	.049	-.023	.126	.055	.134	1.000	.052	.172
This organization really inspires the very best in me in the way	.267	.244	-.213	.286	.539	.534	.052	1.000	-.014

of job performance									
It would take very little change in my present circumstances to cause me to leave this organization	.135	.016	.013	.147	-.036	-.085	.172	-.014	1.000
I am extremely glad that I chose this organization to work for over others I was considering	.166	.279	-.234	.290	.581	.546	.002	.678	.004
There is not too much to be gained by sticking with this organization indefinitely	.098	-.148	.347	-.012	-.262	-.310	.259	-.122	.263
Often I find it difficult to agree with this organization's policies on important matters relating to its employees	.189	-.144	.288	-.110	-.183	-.211	.195	-.218	.030
My co-workers care about the fate of this organization so I also care	.264	.369	-.083	.204	.275	.250	-.059	.228	.152

For me this is the best of all possible organizations for which to work	.169	.275	-.182	.285	.362	.378	-.087	.487	.108
Deciding to work for this organization was a definite mistake on my part	-.177	-.177	.297	-.118	-.243	-.453	.005	-.450	.005

**Inter-Item Correlation Matrix**

	I am extremely glad that I chose this organization to work for over others I was considering	There is not too much to be gained by sticking with this organization indefinitely	Often I find it difficult to agree with this organization's policies on important matters relating to its employees	My co-workers care about the fate of this organization so I also care	For me this is the best of all possible organizations for which to work	Deciding to work for this organization was a definite mistake on my part
I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help this organization to be successful because my co-workers are doing same	.166	.098	.189	.264	.169	-.177

My co-workers talk up this organization to their friends as a great organization to work for so I also do same	.279	-.148	-.144	.369	.275	-.177
I feel very little loyalty to this organization	-.234	.347	.288	-.083	-.182	.297
I would accept almost any type of job assignment in order to keep working for this organization	.290	-.012	-.110	.204	.285	-.118
I find that my values and the organization's values are very similar	.581	-.262	-.183	.275	.362	-.243
I am proud to tell others that I am part of this organization	.546	-.310	-.211	.250	.378	-.453
I could just as well be working for a different organization as long as the type of work was similar	.002	.259	.195	-.059	-.087	.005
This organization really inspires the very best in me in the way of job performance	.678	-.122	-.218	.228	.487	-.450
It would take very little change in my present circumstances to cause me to leave this organization	.004	.263	.030	.152	.108	.005

I am extremely glad that I chose this organization to work for over others I was considering	1.000	-.202	-.311	.207	.551	-.533
There is not too much to be gained by sticking with this organization indefinitely	-.202	1.000	.432	-.150	-.139	.230
Often I find it difficult to agree with this organization's policies on important matters relating to its employees	-.311	.432	1.000	-.190	-.330	.358
My co-workers care about the fate of this organization so I also care	.207	-.150	-.190	1.000	.343	-.189
For me this is the best of all possible organizations for which to work	.551	-.139	-.330	.343	1.000	-.335
Deciding to work for this organization was a definite mistake on my part	-.533	.230	.358	-.189	-.335	1.000

**Item-Total Statistics**

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Squared Multiple Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
--	----------------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------------

I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help this organization to be successful because my co-workers are doing same	53.41	66.829	.509	.553	.522
My co-workers talk up this organization to their friends as a great organization to work for so I also do same	52.39	70.941	.383	.499	.549
I feel very little loyalty to this organization	51.74	82.987	-.066	.222	.629
I would accept almost any type of job assignment in order to keep working for this organization	51.95	68.317	.422	.260	.538
I find that my values and the organization's values are very similar	52.64	71.216	.385	.496	.550
I am proud to tell others that I am part of this organization	53.37	73.554	.334	.481	.561
I could just as well be working for a different organization as long as the type of work was similar	52.83	76.684	.205	.211	.581
This organization really inspires the very best in me in the way of job performance	52.97	70.041	.426	.558	.542

It would take very little change in my present circumstances to cause me to leave this organization	52.22	76.968	.168	.172	.607
I am extremely glad that I chose this organization to work for over others I was considering	52.97	72.329	.379	.645	.553
There is not too much to be gained by sticking with this organization indefinitely	52.19	79.619	.053	.408	.608
Often I find it difficult to agree with this organization's policies on important matters relating to its employees	52.47	82.313	-.029	.407	.618
My co-workers care about the fate of this organization so I also care	52.29	73.841	.304	.267	.565
For me this is the best of all possible organizations for which to work	52.24	70.937	.343	.420	.555
Deciding to work for this organization was a definite mistake on my part	51.15	89.951	-.288	.425	.661

Appendix 6: Frequencies

**Statistics**

		Org. Comm.	Turnover	Job Satisfaction	Workplace Opportunity
N	Valid	197	198	163	197
	Missing	3	2	37	3
Mean		32.40	10.98	131.66	41.03
Median		33.00	11.00	129.00	42.00
Std. Deviation		7.539	4.154	25.437	7.183
Minimum		13	4	64	12
Maximum		59	20	212	57

**Frequency Table**

**Organizational Commitment**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
13	2	1.0	1.0	1.0
16	2	1.0	1.0	2.0
17	2	1.0	1.0	3.0
Valid 18	4	2.0	2.0	5.1
20	2	1.0	1.0	6.1
21	3	1.5	1.5	7.6
22	6	3.0	3.0	10.7

23	7	3.5	3.6	14.2
24	4	2.0	2.0	16.2
25	6	3.0	3.0	19.3
27	7	3.5	3.6	22.8
28	11	5.5	5.6	28.4
29	10	5.0	5.1	33.5
30	9	4.5	4.6	38.1
31	8	4.0	4.1	42.1
32	10	5.0	5.1	47.2
33	11	5.5	5.6	52.8
34	12	6.0	6.1	58.9
35	14	7.0	7.1	66.0
36	12	6.0	6.1	72.1
37	9	4.5	4.6	76.6
38	8	4.0	4.1	80.7
39	5	2.5	2.5	83.2
40	12	6.0	6.1	89.3
41	4	2.0	2.0	91.4
42	4	2.0	2.0	93.4
43	1	.5	.5	93.9
44	2	1.0	1.0	94.9
45	2	1.0	1.0	95.9
46	2	1.0	1.0	97.0

	47	2	1.0	1.0	98.0
	48	1	.5	.5	98.5
	50	2	1.0	1.0	99.5
	59	1	.5	.5	100.0
	Total	197	98.5	100.0	
Missing	System	3	1.5		
Total		200	100.0		

**Turnover Intentions**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
4	16	8.0	8.1	8.1
5	8	4.0	4.0	12.1
6	12	6.0	6.1	18.2
7	9	4.5	4.5	22.7
8	10	5.0	5.1	27.8
9	13	6.5	6.6	34.3
10	19	9.5	9.6	43.9
11	30	15.0	15.2	59.1
12	14	7.0	7.1	66.2
13	10	5.0	5.1	71.2
14	10	5.0	5.1	76.3
15	10	5.0	5.1	81.3

	16	19	9.5	9.6	90.9
	17	5	2.5	2.5	93.4
	18	8	4.0	4.0	97.5
	19	2	1.0	1.0	98.5
	20	3	1.5	1.5	100.0
	Total	198	99.0	100.0	
Missing	System	2	1.0		
Total		200	100.0		

Job Satisfaction

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
64	1	.5	.6	.6
74	2	1.0	1.2	1.8
78	1	.5	.6	2.5
87	1	.5	.6	3.1
88	1	.5	.6	3.7
Valid 93	1	.5	.6	4.3
94	2	1.0	1.2	5.5
95	1	.5	.6	6.1
96	3	1.5	1.8	8.0
98	3	1.5	1.8	9.8
100	2	1.0	1.2	11.0

101	1	.5	.6	11.7
102	1	.5	.6	12.3
104	2	1.0	1.2	13.5
105	2	1.0	1.2	14.7
107	3	1.5	1.8	16.6
110	1	.5	.6	17.2
111	5	2.5	3.1	20.2
114	3	1.5	1.8	22.1
115	1	.5	.6	22.7
116	4	2.0	2.5	25.2
117	1	.5	.6	25.8
118	2	1.0	1.2	27.0
119	4	2.0	2.5	29.4
120	3	1.5	1.8	31.3
121	2	1.0	1.2	32.5
122	3	1.5	1.8	34.4
123	4	2.0	2.5	36.8
124	2	1.0	1.2	38.0
126	9	4.5	5.5	43.6
127	2	1.0	1.2	44.8
128	7	3.5	4.3	49.1
129	5	2.5	3.1	52.1
130	4	2.0	2.5	54.6

131	4	2.0	2.5	57.1
133	3	1.5	1.8	58.9
134	1	.5	.6	59.5
135	1	.5	.6	60.1
136	3	1.5	1.8	62.0
137	5	2.5	3.1	65.0
138	2	1.0	1.2	66.3
139	2	1.0	1.2	67.5
141	2	1.0	1.2	68.7
142	3	1.5	1.8	70.6
143	1	.5	.6	71.2
144	2	1.0	1.2	72.4
147	3	1.5	1.8	74.2
148	2	1.0	1.2	75.5
150	2	1.0	1.2	76.7
151	3	1.5	1.8	78.5
152	2	1.0	1.2	79.8
153	1	.5	.6	80.4
154	5	2.5	3.1	83.4
155	4	2.0	2.5	85.9
156	3	1.5	1.8	87.7
158	1	.5	.6	88.3
159	1	.5	.6	89.0

	161	1	.5	.6	89.6
	163	1	.5	.6	90.2
	164	1	.5	.6	90.8
	166	1	.5	.6	91.4
	167	1	.5	.6	92.0
	174	5	2.5	3.1	95.1
	177	1	.5	.6	95.7
	183	1	.5	.6	96.3
	186	1	.5	.6	96.9
	189	1	.5	.6	97.5
	191	2	1.0	1.2	98.8
	204	1	.5	.6	99.4
	212	1	.5	.6	100.0
	Total	163	81.5	100.0	
Missing	System	37	18.5		
Total		200	100.0		

**Workplace Friendship**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	12	1	.5	.5
Valid	19	2	1.0	1.5
	24	1	.5	2.0

25	4	2.0	2.0	4.1
27	1	.5	.5	4.6
28	4	2.0	2.0	6.6
29	1	.5	.5	7.1
30	5	2.5	2.5	9.6
32	3	1.5	1.5	11.2
33	3	1.5	1.5	12.7
34	1	.5	.5	13.2
35	10	5.0	5.1	18.3
36	12	6.0	6.1	24.4
37	2	1.0	1.0	25.4
38	7	3.5	3.6	28.9
39	14	7.0	7.1	36.0
40	11	5.5	5.6	41.6
41	8	4.0	4.1	45.7
42	11	5.5	5.6	51.3
43	17	8.5	8.6	59.9
44	16	8.0	8.1	68.0
45	18	9.0	9.1	77.2
46	9	4.5	4.6	81.7
47	8	4.0	4.1	85.8
48	7	3.5	3.6	89.3
49	3	1.5	1.5	90.9

	50	5	2.5	2.5	93.4
	51	4	2.0	2.0	95.4
	52	1	.5	.5	95.9
	53	1	.5	.5	96.4
	54	2	1.0	1.0	97.5
	55	2	1.0	1.0	98.5
	56	2	1.0	1.0	99.5
	57	1	.5	.5	100.0
	Total	197	98.5	100.0	
Missing	System	3	1.5		
Total		200	100.0		