

**AN INVESTIGATION OF THE ANTECEDENTS AND
CONSEQUENCES OF ORGANIZATIONAL
COMMITMENT IN TURKEY**

Thesis Submitted to the Institute of Social Sciences
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the
Degree of Master of Arts
in
Psychology

by
Ella R. Israel
B.A. in Psychology
Boğaziçi University, 1993

Boğaziçi University

1996

Bogazici University Library



39001100118911

14

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my gratitude to my thesis advisor Prof. Hamit Fişek for his support, valuable suggestions and help in analyzing my data.

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to Prof. Diane Sunar for her support, help and guidance throughout the course of this study. Her critical and constructive suggestions helped me realize, reorganize and complete this thesis. Her emotional support has been the most precious of all.

I would like to thank Prof. Güler Fişek for her suggestions about the project on the whole and for participating in the committee.

I would like to thank Dr. Hayat Kabasakal for her help in constructing this study and getting me started, even though she could not continue to support me in the later stages of the study.

I would also like to thank the management of PhilSA for letting me do the pilot study and the employees for replying to the questionnaires.

I especially wish to thank the managements of Akbank, Bank Express, Emlak Bankası, Finans Bank, Garanti Bankası, Halk Bankası, İnterbank, Pamukbank, Türkiye Ekonomi Bankası, Tütünbank, and Ziraat Bankası who have let me do my project in their banks and all of their employees who have participated in the study for sparing time and filling in the questionnaires.

A very special thanks to my sister, my parents, my friends- David Behmuaras, Katrin Celardin, Nurcan Karamolla, Kıvanç İnemen, Serdar

Karabatı, Mutlu Oğuz and my boss Selahattin Akay for their emotional support, understanding, encouragement and patience at every stage of my project. Without them, it would be very difficult for me to finish this thesis.

ABSTRACT

The aim of this study was to analyze the meaningful determinants and consequences of organizational commitment in Turkish banks. Specifically, the impact of age, sex, education, and tenure of an individual, and the centralization and formalization of an organization on organizational commitment; and the effect of organizational commitment on the intention to leave an organization were investigated.

283 employees from eleven different banks participated in this study. The questionnaires which were used to measure the variables were the Turkish translated version of the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (Porter, Steers, Mowday, & Boulian, 1974) the Formalization Scale developed by Üsdiken (1979) and the shortened version of the Aston's Formalization Scale modified by Sözen (1985). Intention to leave the organization and the other variables measured by self-report.

The results of this study showed that the degree of formalization and centralization of the organization and the age of the individual are significant determinants of organizational commitment. The type of bank in which the employee works is found to be related to perceived centralization and formalization, and thus is also a significant determinant of organizational commitment. Organizational commitment is found to be a determinant of the intention to leave the organization and of the intention to look for alternative jobs.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
LIST OF TABLES	vi
INTRODUCTION	1
Theories on Organizational Commitment	2
Consequences of Organizational Commitment	4
Antecedents of Organizational Commitment	6
Personal factors	7
Role related factors	10
Work experiences	11
Structural factors	12
Cultural factors	13
The Proposed Research	<u>15</u>
METHOD	21
Subjects	21
Instruments	25
Procedure	27
RESULTS	29
DISCUSSION	38
REFERENCES	45
APPENDICES	60

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Frequency Distribution of Subjects by Where They Work	22
Table 2: Frequency Distribution of Subjects by Position	22
Table 3: Frequency Distribution of Subjects by Their Tenure	23
Table 4: Frequency Distribution of Subjects by Sex	24
Table 5: Frequency Distribution of Subjects by Educational Level	24
Table 6: Multiple Regression Analysis of Organizational Commitment	30
Table 7: Means and Standard Deviations of Organizational Commitment Scores According to Bank Type	32
Table 8: Means and Standard Deviations of Centralization Scores According to the Type of Bank	33
Table 9: Means and Standard Deviations of Formalization Scores According to the Type of Bank	34
Table 10: Logistic Regression Analysis of the Intention to Leave the Organization	35
Table 11: Logistic Regression Analysis of the Intention to Look for Alternative Jobs	37

The human factor in organizations is an important subject to be considered in order to understand how organizations work and how the organization can become more productive and more successful. No matter how good the structure of an organization is, how well the organization is known in the business, the capacity and the attitudes of individuals can influence and change the organization.

Even though it is very difficult to recruit and select the right personnel, it is harder to keep these individuals in the organization for a long period of time. In addition to economic factors, employees have certain needs regarding work conditions and work experiences, job satisfaction and other role related variables, the structure of the organization and their personal characteristics; and to meet these needs is not so easy.

Still, there are many people who work in the same organization for years, or even a lifetime. How do people or organizations succeed in this? How can an organization keep employees from whom it benefits so much? How can one be so satisfied that he or she does not change the organization in which he or she works?

The answers to these questions could be 'organizational commitment'. Organizational commitment is a multifaceted and complex concept, and therefore there are different views in explaining what it is exactly. A number of definitions exist in the literature, some being parallel views and some being more comprehensive than others.

Theories of organizational commitment

The definition given by Porter and Smith (1970) is the one which has been accepted as 'the' definition (Reichers, 1985) and it has been used in more than 90 published studies (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990). According to this view, organizational commitment is an identification with and an involvement in the organization, characterized by the internalization of values and goals of the organization, a willingness to work extra hard on behalf of the organization, and a strong desire to remain in the organization.

An alternative view is presented by Meyer and Allen (1991) who defined commitment in terms of three separate themes. They distinguished between commitment as an attachment based on the cost of leaving the organization (continuance commitment), as an emotional attachment and identification with and involvement in the organization (affective commitment), and a feeling of obligation to stay in the organization (normative commitment). They suggest that continuance commitment develops due to the number and amount of investments made in the organization, like pension contribution or the degree to which employees have employment alternatives. An economic rationale is the basis of continuance commitment. Affective commitment develops due to work experiences which increase the employee's feeling of challenge and comfort in the organization. Normative commitment develops due to early socialization experiences and other experiences taking place after entering the organization.

These components of organizational commitment are related with one another such that affective and normative commitment and normative and

continuance commitment correlate positively, and affective and continuance commitment correlate negatively (Meyer & Allen, 1990; Meyer, Allen, & Smith, 1993).

There is a similarity between affective commitment and Porter and Smith's (1970) definition. A correlation of .83 was also found between these concepts (Meyer & Allen 1990). Although this reinforces the emotional component of Allen and Meyer's definition, the rest of their theory has not received support. For example, Angle and Lawson (1993) have criticized the idea of normative commitment, stating that this is a factor causing commitment and not a type of it.

Another definition is proposed by Mowday, Porter, and Steers (1982). They distinguish between behavioral commitment which is persistent behavior and attitude and attitudinal commitment, which is an attachment to the social system. The concept of attitudinal commitment is similar to the definition of Porter and Smith. The behavioral component is more attributional and is due to the consequences of an individual's behavioral acts. Mowday et al. (1982) believe that there is a reciprocal relationship between these, where attitude forms behavior and behavior reinforces attitude.

The basis for behavioral commitment according to Salancik (1977) is that overt and volitional acts can not be denied and that this causes more commitment because people do it in public. The finding that commitment has an attributional nature (O'Reilly, & Caldwell, 1980) is the basis of attributional commitment.

Other theories of organizational commitment which are presented below are only theoretical and they have not been used in any research. However, as they suggest guidelines to this concept, brief descriptions are given.

According to organizational theory, organizations are made of coalitions and constituencies; therefore there are different goals and values. This suggests that organizational commitment can not be formed through one goal but that there should be multiple commitments to the organization. Accordingly, people related to an organization should be divided into groups sharing the same objective in order to be studied. March and Simons (1958) stated that organizational meaning is provided through a dominant group which is usually composed of managers.

Besides organizational theory, reference group theory and role theory also suggest multiple commitments to multiple constituencies, however all research done until now has shown consistent results in defining commitment 'globally'.

Consequences of organizational commitment

Researchers have focused on organizational commitment for several reasons: (1) committed workers contribute to innovations and creativity (Aven, Parker, & McEvoy, 1993); (2) committed workers are willing to work more to serve their organization, contributing to greater effectiveness in their organizations (Ostroff, 1992; Steers, 1975); (3) committed employees perform better (Jausch, Glueck, & Osborn, 1978); and (4) commitment predicts turnover (Porter, Steers, Mowday, & Boulian, 1974) which is a very costly

issue for organizations.

It has been found that commitment has a significant negative correlation with performance (Reichers, 1985; Wiener & Vardi, 1980; Blau, 1986). Organizational commitment correlates negatively with absenteeism and tardiness, (Reichers, 1985; Wiener & Vardi, 1980; Blau, 1986) which also influences the decrease of performance. Withdrawal, which correlates negatively with organizational commitment, is another consequence found by both Wiener and Vardi, (1980) and Blau (1986).

Since turnover is costly to an organization, this relation has been studied thoroughly. A negative relation between organizational commitment and turnover was found by Porter, Smith, Mowday, and Boulian (1974), where the more committed the employee is, the less turnover the organization has. This finding was supported by Allen and Meyer (1990); Angle and Perry (1981); Aven, Parker, and McEvoy (1993); Koch and Steers (1976); Mathieu, and Zajac (1990); Mowday, Porter, and Steers (1982); Reichers (1985) and Steers (1977).

In Japan, Marsh and Mannari (1977) found less turnover than in the United States and they explained this on the basis of the fact that there is more hierarchical authority in Japanese companies. In these companies, due to high hierarchical authority, there is a better chance of promotion; there is better bonus and regular pay and these lead to more commitment as well.

Steers (1977) found that low level of organizational commitment is an antecedent of the intention to leave the company. Arnold and Feldman (1982), Michels and Spector (1982) and Stumpf and Hartman (1984) support this with their findings of a negative relationship between organizational

commitment and intention to leave. Begley and Czajka (1993) and Lee and Mowday (1987) also support this finding. In a study conducted in Japan, Marsh and Mannari (1977) found that employees with low organizational commitment have more intention to leave the organization. In all of these studies, intention to leave has been measured through two different questions 'Do you intend to leave the organization in which you work?' and 'Are you looking for alternative jobs?', and the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire developed by Porter, Steers, Mowday and Boulian (1974) has been used to measure the degree of organizational commitment.

As a summary of all the above findings, it can be said that organizational commitment influences organizations in two ways: Benefiting more from employees because of their presence--they perform better and contribute more than individuals who are not committed, and not losing a such good employee.

Antecedents of organizational commitment

As organizational commitment became an important issue, more research was done to find the determinants of the phenomenon. Mowday, Porter and Steers (1982) defined these antecedents in terms of four components: personal characteristics, role related variables, work experiences and structural characteristics. Findings related to each of these components are summarized in the following sections.

Personal factors

Personal factors that relate to organizational commitment are stated to be age, sex, tenure, educational level, race, and personality traits. DeCotiis and Summers (1987), Hrebiniak (1974), Lee (1971), and Sheldon (1971) all found that age is an antecedent condition of organizational commitment. In the study conducted by Luthans, McCaul and Dodd (1985) age was found to have a consistent positive relation with organizational commitment, as in previous studies. Allen & Meyer (1993) found that affective commitment correlated positively with age and the reasons suggested for this relation were that older employees are more mature, they have better explanations for the experiences lived; also generational differences were posited. In China, Mobley and Hwang (1982) and Near (1989) found that the stronger predictors of organizational commitment are age and sex, and in Japan both Lincoln and Kalleberg (1985) and Near (1989) found the same results. A contradictory finding that age correlates significantly negatively with organizational commitment is found by Marsh and Mannari (1977).

Steers (1977) found a negative correlation between education and organizational commitment and he suggested that this could be due to more educated people being harder to satisfy. Lincoln and Kalleberg (1985) who support this finding, add that more educated people have more expectations which can be harder to satisfy. The same result was found by Koch, and Steers (1978); Angle, and Perry (1981); Morris, and Sherman (1981), and in Japan by Marsh and Mannari (1977).

There are two conflicting theories on the influence of gender on organizational commitment. The gender model suggests that women accept

house work as the main source of identity and therefore they have a different orientation towards work than men and they are less committed than men.

Aranya, Kusnir, and Valency (1986) found that women are less committed than men. A related finding that women leave work more (Marsh, & Mannari, 1977) could be due to this fact, although there are many other plausible explanations for women's turnover.

The job model suggests that since women suffer from discrimination they are more committed once at work. Alvi and Ahmed (1987) in their study in Pakistan found that women were more committed than men. Also Angle and Perry (1981) state that females enjoy less interorganizational mobility and therefore are more restricted to their present organization. This view says that gender alone has no effect but the work experience is the reason. Mowday et al. (1982) report four studies where women are more attitudinally committed.

In contradiction to these findings, Aven, Parker, and McEvoy (1993) found no gender differences with respect to attitudinal commitment. They suggested that if organizations provided equitable opportunities to both sexes they might have gotten similar degrees of commitment from both sexes. They also suggest that there may be moderators like job satisfaction, role states, leader behavior, organizational characteristics, and age. Burning and Syneder (1983), Cromie (1981), Fry and Grensfeld (1980), and Stevens, Beyer, and Trice (1987) also found that sex is not related to organizational commitment.

Tenure, the length of time in the job, has been found to have a consistent positive relation with organizational commitment (Hrebiniak, &

Alutto, 1973; Lee, 1971; Sheldon, 1971; Luthans, McCaul, & Dodd, 1985).

Allen & Meyer (1993) found that affective commitment correlated positively with tenure and they suggested that this effect may be due to attaining a better position in time, which satisfies the person, or maybe the less committed employees leave the organization and therefore people with longer tenure are more committed. In the same study it was also found that affective commitment declines after the first year and they reasoned that it could be due to having higher expectations after working for a certain period of time.

Buchanan (1974) following previous research, proposed a model of how tenure is related to forming organizational commitment. In his model, during the first year, the employee has the question of safety and adjusting to demands in mind. Therefore guiding and reassuring him is important. Other important factors that he presents are fulfilling the employees' expectations (Grusky, 1966), not making him feeling threatened, and stimulating and challenging work. The hypothesis that if an employee's first assigned work is unchallenging, the person develops an unfavorable attitude towards the organization and is less committed, is supported by Witt (1993).

In the second to fourth years, the employee is concerned with achievement and making a contribution to the organization to increase his or her organizational status, and he or she has a fear of failure. An expectation of loyalty to the organization from the organization increases the commitment. After the fifth year comes the maturity stage, where making organizational decisions increases organizational commitment.

Employees with short-term tenure are found to have more reward commitment and employees with long-term tenure have more norm-based commitment (Butler & Vodanovich 1993). In the same study it was also found that external commitment has a negative correlation with tenure.

Gregersen (1993) found that only people with a tenure of 2-8 years show a relation between organizational commitment and extrarole behavior, which is not a requirement of the job but an act on which the organization depends. Actions like employee suggestions to improve work environment or overtime to finish work are beneficial for organizations. These acts may be continuing after eight years, but probably it is not related to the individuals commitment anymore.

Identification (Begley & Czajka, 1993) and achievement motivation are other personality factors which highly positively correlate with organizational commitment (Morris & Syneder, 1979; Steers & Spencer, 1977). Another factor found by Brooke, Rousell, and Price (1987) is that family responsibility has a positive relation with organizational commitment.

Although there are contradictory findings, to sum up, it can be stated that age, sex, education, tenure, and personality traits are personal factors influencing the organizational commitment.

Role related factors

Role related variables like role ambiguity and role conflict correlate negatively with organizational commitment (Begley & Czajka, 1993; DeCotiis, and Summers, 1987; Hrebiniak & Alutto, 1972; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Stevens, Beyer, & Trice, 1978). Allen and Meyer (1990) found that role clarity and freedom from conflict correlate positively with organizational commitment,

and this finding is supported by Glison and Durick (1988); Morris and Syneder (1979) and Podsakoff, Williams, and Todor (1986). Hrebiniak and Alutto (1972) found that role stress is another factor relating negatively to organizational commitment and this finding is supported by Morris and Sherman (1981). A contradictory finding is that although indirect, role strain has a positive, and training within the company has a negative effect on organizational commitment (Mathieu, 1991).

In the light of the above findings, it can be concluded that role ambiguities, conflicts and the stress caused by these uncertainties influence the degree of organizational commitment.

Work experiences

Mathieu (1991) found that commitment reciprocally related with satisfaction and the effect of satisfaction on commitment was more than the reverse. Mathieu and Farr (1991) sampled different employee populations and found that satisfaction and commitment correlate highly. In many studies, like those by Hrebiniak and Alutto (1972); Porter, Steers, Mowday and Boulian (1974); Price and Mueller (1986); William and Hazer (1986); Mathieu (1988); Mathieu and Hamel (1989) it was found that job satisfaction precedes job commitment causally. However, Bateman and Strasser (1984) found that job satisfaction is a consequence of commitment. In Japan, Marsh and Mannari found that %11 of the variance in organizational commitment was explained by job satisfaction, employee cohesiveness, perceived job autonomy, and organizational status.

It has been suggested that employees have distinct commitments to top management, supervisors, coworkers and customers and that these

correlate positively with organizational commitment. Gregersen (1993) found that immediate supervisors, coworkers, and customers are sources of commitment after the first two years, while the relation with top management was not clear.

Mowday, Porter, and Steers (1982) found that the antecedents of commitment were the job itself, and work experiences measured by job scope and job stress and the treatment of employee measured by pay equity, supervisory quality, and social involvement. Begley and Czajka (1993) found that work experience like the degree of job challenge and side benefits were antecedents of commitment. Witt (1993) supported previous findings that early work experience relates to later commitment (Pierce & Dunham, 1987) and that fairness affects commitment (Konovsky, Folger, & Cropanzano, 1987). Morrow (1983) found that job attachment, job involvement, and career satisfaction relate to commitment.

As a summary, even though the direction of the relation is not clear, satisfaction; the job stress, job scope, the treatment of the employee and other characteristics of the job are closely related with organizational commitment.

Structural factors

The structural variables that are found to be positively related with organizational commitment are decentralization of decision making (Brook, Russel, & Price, 1988; Morris, & Steers, 1980) and formalization of policy and procedure (Morris & Steers, 1980; Podsakoff, Williams, & Todor, 1986).

DeCotiis and Summers (1987) supported the previous finding that centralization correlated negatively with organizational commitment. Steers

(1977) found that organizations which are perceived to be high in autonomy have higher levels of commitment.

Lincoln and Kalleberg (1985) suggest that organizational structure elicits organizational commitment, and that in organizations where there is highly differentiated authority and status hierarchy there will be more commitment because this feature creates promotion opportunities (Edwards, 1979; Nakane, 1970). This finding is supported by Marsh and Mannari (1977).

The type of control used on employees is related to organizational commitment (Etzioni, 1975; Salancik, 1977b; Salancik & Pfeffer, 1978). Mintzer (1968) found that employees from coercive organizations are least committed, those from utilitarian organizations are committed and those from normative organizations are the most committed. Etzioni (1975) supported that employees of utilitarian organizations are less committed than those of normative organizations.

To conclude from the above findings, making the employees feel more a part of the decisions and giving them more autonomy could lead to increased organizational commitment.

Cultural factors

As culture deeply influences management ideas and practice, studies were conducted in different countries with different cultures. In a meta-analysis of twenty-seven studies conducted in different countries (Randall, 1993), personal characteristics like age, tenure, sex, and education were found to be highly significant in determining organizational commitment in England and Israel, although they were insignificant in Canada. The relation

of participation and peer cohesion with commitment were consistent in all countries studied. The relation of job satisfaction and organizational commitment was inconsistent, since in some studies job satisfaction was found to be the antecedent of commitment while in others it was found to be the consequence of commitment. The type of organization and ownership of firm, role clarity and role ambiguity, employment opportunities, and attitude of family and friends were not found to determine organizational commitment.

Some studies conducted in this field studied cultural differences by means of Hofstede's Value Survey Model. This model studies culture in terms of power distance, uncertainty avoidance, masculinity versus femininity, and collectivism versus individualism. Power distance indicates how equality and inequality are perceived in the society. Uncertainty avoidance is the lack of tolerance for ambiguity and uncertainty, and taking action to reduce them. Masculinity means emphasis on goals like assertiveness, recognition, and earnings. Individualism signifies emotional independence from the organization and collectivism signifies owing loyalty to the organization.

Individualism and collectivism are relevant to organizational commitment because cultural values influence individual values. It may be that employees from collectivistic cultures have more commitment to their organization due to their ties with managers, owners, or coworkers while employees from individualistic cultures have commitment due to their job or compensation (Boyacigiller, & Adler, 1991). Randall (1993) found that commitment is less in collectivistic cultures.

High uncertainty avoidance cultures have less tolerance for ambiguity and therefore organizations may try to decrease internal uncertainty by rules. In cultures with high uncertainty avoidance there may be high affective commitment because loyalty to the employer is seen as a virtue (Hofstede, 1980a). However Randall (1993) found that people with less uncertainty avoidance had higher commitment than in cultures with high uncertainty avoidance, which conflicts with Hofstede's predictions.

Although it was suggested that high masculinity leads to more calculational involvement due to an interest in earnings, advancement, and assertiveness, and high femininity leads to more affective commitment due to nurturance interests like cooperation, atmosphere and manager-subordinate relations, the relation of organizational commitment with masculinity and femininity was not clear in Randall's (1993) study.

In high power distance cultures, employees believe in inequality and superiors are seen as unattainable. The organization is more centralized and therefore there is less affective commitment. Randall (1993) also found that cultures with less power distance have higher commitment. This is parallel to previously mentioned studies of Brook, Russel, and Price (1988), Morris, and Steers (1980) and DeCotiis and Summers (1987).

The proposed research

In this research, employee commitment in Turkish banks is being studied. The banks differ from one another on several dimensions, most particularly in terms of whether they are publicly or privately owned, and whether they were founded before or after 1980. 1980 is the starting point of

economic liberalization in Turkey, which brought significant changes in organizational structure, regulations and work values. Stinchombe (1965), argues that, organizations can be classified in terms of ownership. This could be due to fact that the way the structure of the organization is formed is affected by the economical and managerial views which are influential at that period. The structure of the organization depends on the mentality of the owners and what they can provide their workers with and what they would expect in return.

Public organizations are estimated to have more power distance than private ones, and private companies established before 1980 have more power distance than the ones formed after 1980. Public organizations are also more bureaucratic and are expected to be more centralized compared with private ones. In addition to this, as public organizations are larger companies, there should be more formalization in public organizations. Tenure is expected to be longer in public organizations than in private organizations, and it should be longer in organizations formed before 1980 than the ones established after 1980. Following these, in this study organizations will be studied according to their ownership; public or private, and according to their establishment date being before or after 1980.

Considering the findings on the effects of culture on organizational commitment, power distance will be studied. Power distance is operationalized in terms of formalization and centralization of company as in Wong and Bimbaum-More's (1994) study. As they suggest, accepting unequal power distribution means accepting an authority's decision making and this can be through either centralized decision making of a few people--

centralization-- or through rules and procedures set by the organization-- formalization.

This study aims to find and analyze meaningful determinants of organizational commitment in Turkey and compare these with previous findings from other cultures. Apart from measures at the individual level, the comparative aspect of the study focuses on differences in organizational commitment according to the type of organization in which the employee is working. The degree of organizational commitment as a function of tenure, age, sex, education, power distance and the intention to leave the organization as a function of organizational commitment will be studied.

Referring to the preceding review, it is hypothesized that:

1. The longer the tenure of an individual in a company, the more committed he or she will be to the organization. This expectation is based on two assumptions. First, an employee with longer tenure has a greater chance of being a better position with which they are more satisfied, and second, less committed individuals would have left the organization. In addition to this, Lee (1971), Sheldon (1971), Hrebiniak and Alutto (1973), Luthans, McCaul, and Dodd (1985), and Allen and Meyer (1993) have all reported parallel findings.

2. The older an individual is, the more committed he or she will be to the organization. This is expected because maturity and previous experiences are influential in individuals' feelings. Also this relation has been found to be significant by Mobley and Hwang (1982), Lincoln and Kalleberg (1985), Near (1989), and Allen and Meyer (1993).

3. Women will be more committed to their organizations than men.

Previous findings about this issue are contradictory. The first view supporting this expectation is stated by Angle and Perry (1981), Mowday et al. (1982), and Alvi and Ahmed (1987). They explain this relation as being due to the fact that women have to prove themselves since they suffer from sex discrimination. The second view that women are less committed than men is based on the belief that women accept house work as the main source of identity (Aranya, Kusnir, & Valency, 1986). In contrast to both views, Fry and Grensfeld (1980), Cromie (1981), Burning and Syneder (1983), Stevens, Beyer, and Trice (1987), and Aven, Parker, and McEvoy (1993) found that sex is not related to organizational commitment. The reason of this hypothesis is the belief that women in Turkey, also, suffer from sex discrimination.

4. The higher the education of an individual, the less committed he or she will be to the organization. This is expected because more educated people may be harder to satisfy due to their high expectations and they may have an easier time finding alternative jobs. This hypothesis is also based on the previous findings of Marsh and Mannari (1977); Koch, and Steers (1978); Angle and Perry (1981); Morris and Sherman (1981); and Lincoln and Kalleberg (1985).

5. The higher the power distance of the organization, the less committed the individual will be to the organization. This expectation is due to previous findings of a negative relationship between the two variables (Randal, 1993) and Hofstede's (1980a) finding that Turkey belongs to the high power distance culture's group. According to a previous finding (Wong

and Bimbaum-More, 1993), there is a significant positive relation between formalization and power distance, and centralization and power distance. Therefore power distance is being measured through perceived formalization and perceived centralization in a company. Thus, it is hypothesized that first, the greater the formalization in the organization, the lower the individual's commitment will be and second, the greater the perceived centralization, the lower the individual' commitment will be. It has also been found that the higher the perceived centralization in a company the less committed the individuals will be (Brook, Russel, & Price, 1988; DeCotiis, & Summers, 1987; Morris, & Steers, 1980).

A related expectation is that the employees working in private banks established after 1980 will be the most committed, the employees working in private banks established before 1980 will be the second most committed and the employees working in public banks will be the least committed. The reason for this expectation is the assumption that the perceived formalization and perceived centralization will be greater for public than for private banks, and will be greater for private banks founded before 1980 than for private banks founded after 1980.

6. Employees working at the headquarters of a bank will be more committed than employees working at a branch office of the bank. Even though there is no previous finding supporting this, the influence of where the individual is working is analyzed assuming that factors like the work environment, work atmosphere, job stress, and supervisory quality differ. These factors are found to influence commitment (Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982).

7. The higher the position of the individual in the company, the more committed he or she will be. Even though there is no such previous finding, the effect of position is being investigated on the assumption that, having a higher position, the individual may be more satisfied and more committed than an employee at a lower position of the position.

8. The more the individual is committed to the organization, the less will be his

or her intention to leave. The expectation here is that if the individual is content where he or she is working, he or she will not look for alternative jobs. (Allen, & Meyer, 1990; Angle, & Perry, 1981; Arnold, & Feldman, 1982; Aven, Parker, & McEvoy, 1993; Begley, & Czajka, 1993; Koch, & Steers, 1976; Lee, & Mowday, 1987; Mathieu, & Zajac, 1990; Michaels, & Spector, 1982; Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982; Stumpf and Hartman, 1984; Reichers, 1985; Steers, 1977).

METHOD

Subjects

The subjects, as explained in the procedure part, were chosen among employees of eleven different banks. Four of the banks were private and established before 1980 (Akbank, Garanti Bankası, Pamukbank, Tütünbank); four of the banks were private and established after 1980 (Bank Express, Finansbank, İnterbank, Türkiye Ekonomi Bankası); and three of the banks were public, established before, 1980 (Emlak Bank, Halk Bank and Ziraat Bankası). The reason for having only three public banks is because no other public bank agreed to participate in the study and the reason for having only public banks established before 1980 is that no public banks have been established since 1980.

97 of the subjects were chosen among employees of private banks established before 1980, 94 of the subjects were chosen among employees of private banks established after 1980 and 92 of the subjects were chosen among employees of public banks. In all banks, employees were chosen both from the headquarters of the bank and from branches to see whether work conditions influence commitment (see Table 1). Also, employees of different ranks were selected in order to find out whether position of the individual affects organizational commitment (see Table 2). Table 3 presents the distribution of subjects according to their tenure in the organization.

Table 1: Frequency distribution of subjects by where they work

	Employees from private banks established before 1980	Employees from private banks established after 1980	Employees from public banks
Headquarter	% 40	% 29	% 32
Branch	% 60	% 71	% 68
N	97	90	92

* A total of 4 subjects working in private banks established after 1980 did not state whether they were working at the headquarter or branch.

Table 2: Frequency distribution of subjects by position

	Employees from private banks established before 1980	Employees from private banks established after 1980	Employees from public banks
Manager	%11	% 15	% 13
Vice manager	%24	% 20	% 19
Chief	%30	% 37	%14
Vice chief	%19	% 18	% 24
Employee	%16	% 10	%28
N	95	87	90

* A total of 11 subjects did not state their position in the bank

Table 3: Frequency distribution of subjects by their tenure

	Employees from private banks established before 1980	Employees from private banks established after 1980	Employees from public banks
10- 60 months	% 45	%72	% 15
60-120 months	% 32	%22	% 24
120-180 months	% 11	% 6	% 16
180-240 months	% 11		% 24
240-300 months	% .05		% 13
300-360 months	% .05		% 8
N	95	89	90
* A total of 9 subjects did not state their tenure in the bank			

The age range of the subjects is between 19 and 62, the mean being 33 years (standard deviation of 7.6). The distribution of subjects according to their sex is presented in Table 4 and the distribution of subjects according to their educational level is presented in Table 5.

Table 4: Frequency distribution of subjects by sex

	Employees from private banks established before 1980	Employees from private banks established after 1980	Employees from public banks
Men	% 35	%40	% 43
Women	% 65	%60	% 57
N	95	89	90
* A total of 9 subjects did not state their sex			

Table 5: Frequency distribution of subjects by educational level

	Employees from private banks established before 1980	Employees from private banks established after 1980	Employees from public banks
High school "	%30	% 24	% 60
Junior college	% 3	% 2	% 4
Undergraduate	%65	% 65	% 36
Graduate	% 2	% 10	
Total	96	89	90
* A total of 8 subjects did not report their educational level			

Instruments

Organizational commitment was measured by the Turkish translation of Organizational Commitment Questionnaire developed by Porter, Steers, Mowday and Boulian (1974) (See, Appendices A and B). The questionnaire consisted of fifteen items, with six of the items are reversed to decrease the response set bias. The responses are on a seven-point scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (7) . The Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient of the Turkish translation of the questionnaire was found to be 76 in the pilot study described in the next section.

Power distance was analyzed interms of centralization and formalization. Formalization was measured with a scale developed by Üsdiken (1979) and centralization was measured with a modified version (Sözen, 1985) of the Aston measure (Pugh, Hickson, Higgins, & Turner, 1968). The formalization scale consists of six items with a five-point response format scale (See Appendix C). The reliability and construct validity of this scale are satisfactory (Üsdiken, 1979). The modified version of the centralization scale consists of nine items with a four-point scale response format (See Appendix D).

The intention to leave the organization was measured by two questions asking whether they intend to remain in their organizations (Marsh, & Mannari, 1977) and whether they have the intention to search for alternatives (Arnold, & Feldman, 1982) (See Appendix E).

Tenure in the organization was a self-report measure of the number of months the employee had worked in the organization. Education was a self-

report measure on the degree the employee had. Age and sex were also self-report measures.

Procedure

Before the actual study, a pilot study was conducted with one hundred subjects to determine the reliability of the organizational commitment questionnaire and to get the subjects' comments on the questionnaires. Fifty of the participants were employees from Garanti Bankası and fifty of the subjects were employees of Phillips. All of the subjects were presented the questionnaire during their work hours and the questionnaire was collected a day after it was given to them. Their opinion about the questions, whether they make sense to them, whether they are understandable or not were asked. The format and the wording of the questionnaire were modified following their remarks.

The education and training department of each bank was contacted and the project was presented to each. Their advice on which branches to administer the questionnaires and who should be contacted in the management was taken. In all public banks, ten employees were chosen from the management, and five employees from each branch were selected. In all private banks ten employees from the management and fifteen employees from the branches were chosen, where these fifteen were chosen from three different branches of the bank. Two of the private banks preferred to send the questionnaires to their employees themselves, yet it was assured that the employees knew it was an academic project and not one of their bank's. For all of the rest of the banks, all of the employees were met in their bank during work hours, and the study was explained to them. Their names were not asked

to be put on the questionnaire to assure them that results would not be analyzed on an individual basis and their banks would not profit from the data.

The employees were chosen according to their ranks in the organization. Approximately 20 employees who did not agree to participate were replaced by other employees in similar ranks.

RESULTS

After recoding the reverse-scored items of the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (items 3, 7, 9, 11, 12, 15) the total organizational commitment score was computed for each subject. The maximum total score for organizational commitment was found to be 105, the minimum score was 18, and the mean score was 72.13 with a standard deviation of 15.88

The total score of centralization was computed after recoding the items according to their weights. Every response for first level of management was weighted 3 points, every response to the second level of management weighted 2 points and every response to the third level weighted 1 point. The average of these responses was calculated for each item and these were added to compute the total score. The maximum score was found to be 20.66, the minimum was 6.667, and the mean score was 11.985 with a standard deviation of 2.77.

The total formalization score was obtained by adding all the scores obtained from the given responses. The maximum formalization score was 23, the minimum was 11, and the mean score was 17.52 with a standard deviation of 2.43.

In order to test Hypothesis 1,2,3,4,5,6 and 7, a multiple regression analysis was performed to analyze organizational commitment as a function of age, sex, position, education, tenure, formalization and centralization, type of bank, and type office in which the employee works in.

Doing stepwise analysis, 11 % of the variation in organizational commitment can be explained by the type of bank being public and not a

private one established before 1980 ($p < .001$). This shows a significant relation between public banks and commitment (see Table 6).

An additional 5 % of the variation can be explained by the age of the individual ($p < .001$). This indicates a positive relationship between age and organizational commitment (see Table 6).

A further 5 % of the variation in organizational commitment can be explained by the formalization of the company ($p < .001$). This shows a significant negative relationship between the formalization of the bank and organizational commitment (see Table 6).

Table 6 Multiple Regression Analysis of Organizational Commitment

Variables in the equation	Beta	Standard Error of B	t	P
Public bank	-14.965	1.971	-7.647	.001
Age	.524	.120	4.062	.001
Formalization	- 1.4415	.355	-4.351	.001

The sex, education level, tenure and the position of the individual, the centralization of the organization, and the office in which the individual works--a branch or the headquarter of the bank-- do not explain a significant amount of the variation in organizational commitment.

In order to corroborate the results of the regression analyses, and to look for further possible interactions, an analysis of variance was performed to analyze organizational commitment as a function of banks and the types of office in which the employees work. The two-way interaction effect of type of bank and type of office was not significant ($F(2,278)=2.14, p>.05$) showing that the type of bank and the office in which the employee works do not jointly have an influence on organizational commitment. The main effect of type of office was not significant ($F(1,278)=.064, p>.05$) showing that employees working in a branch office or working in the management of the bank have similar organizational commitment. The main effect of type of bank was significant ($F(2,278)=16.42, p<.001$) showing that working in a private bank established before 1980, or a private bank established after 1980 or a public bank makes a difference in organizational commitment where employees of private banks established after 1980 are the most committed, employees of private banks established before 1980 are second most committed and employees of public banks are the least committed.

In order to study hypothesis five further, the following analyses were done. A one-way analysis of variance was performed to analyze the organizational commitment score as a function of the type of bank. The organizational commitment score significantly varies according to the type of bank ($F(2,280)=17.05, p<.001$), where employees of private banks established after 1980 are the most committed, employees of private banks established before 1980 are the second most committed and employees of public banks are the least committed. A Tukey's test was conducted in order to make a pairwise comparison of the bank types. The organizational

commitment of employees from private banks established after 1980 and the private banks established before 1980 are significantly different than the organizational commitment of employees from public banks ($p < .05$), however the organizational commitment of employees from private banks established after 1980 and before 1980 do not differ significantly. The means and standard deviations of organizational commitment scores according to type of bank are presented in Table 7.

Table 7 Means and Standard Deviations of Organizational Commitment Scores According to the Type of Bank

	Public banks	Private banks established before 1980	Private banks established after 1980
Mean	64.66	74.92	76.55
Sd	16.65	15.89	12.24
N	92	97	94

A oneway analysis of variance was performed to analyze the perceived centralization of the organizations as a function of the type of bank. The centralization score of the organization significantly varies according to the type of bank ($F(2,281)=9.55$, $p < .001$), where private banks established after 1980 are the most centralized, private banks established before 1980 are the second most centralized and public banks are the least centralized. A Tukey's test was conducted in order to make a pairwise comparison of the bank types. The perceived centralization of private banks established after

1980 is significantly different than the perceived centralization of private banks established before 1980 and from public banks ($p < .05$), however the perceived centralization in private banks established before 1980 and public banks do not differ significantly. The means and standard deviations of centralization scores according to bank types are presented in Table 8.

Table 8 Means and Standard Deviations of Centralization Scores According to the Type of Bank

	Public banks	Private banks established before 1980	Private banks established after 1980
Mean	11.16	11.91	12.88
Sd	1.69	2.72	3.39
N	92	97	93

A one-way analysis of variance was performed on perceived formalization scores as a function of the type of bank. Even though marginally significant, there is a trend for the formalization score of the organization to vary according to the type of bank, where private banks established after 1980 are the most formalized, private banks established before 1980 are the second most formalized and public banks are the least formalized ($F(2,280)=2.78$, $p < .07$). However, the result of the Tukey's test which was conducted to make pairwise comparisons was not significant ($p > .05$). The means and standard deviations formalization scores according to bank types are presented in Table 9.

Table 9 Means and Standard Deviations of Formalization According to the Type of Bank

	Public banks	Private banks established before 1980	Private banks established after 1980
Mean	17.14	17.45	17.97
Sd	2.43	2.52	2.30
N	92	97	94

In order to test hypothesis eight, a logistic regression analysis was performed to analyze the intention to leave the organization as a function of organizational commitment. The relation of age, sex, education, tenure, position in the bank, the type of bank, the office in which worked, the formalization and the centralization of the company with the intention to leave the organization were also investigated within this analysis.

Doing stepwise analysis, 16 % of the variation in the intention to leave an organization can be explained by the organizational commitment of the individuals ($p < .001$). This shows that organizational commitment is a significant correlate of the intention to leave the organization (see Table 10). The negative relation between the variables show that the greater the organizational commitment the less there is an intention to leave the organization.

An additional 1% of the variation in the intention to leave an organization can be explained by the tenure of the individuals. This shows

that the number of years spent in the organization is a significant correlate of the intention to leave the organization (see Table 10). Even though it is a weak relation, the more the years spent in an organization the more there is an intention to leave the organization.

Table 10 Logistic Regression Analysis of the Intention to Leave the Organization

Variables in the equation	Beta	Standard Error of B	Wald	P
Organizational commitment	-0.1011	0.0198	25.9315	.001
Tenure	0.0054	0.0028	3.8283	.05

The other variables at the individual level, the sex, age, education level and the position of the individual do not explain a significant amount of the variation in the intention to leave the organization. That is, these variables do not significantly influence the intention to leave the organization.

The structural variables, the centralization and the formalization of the bank do not explain a significant amount of the variation in the individuals' intention to leave and in parallel with this finding, the type of bank and the office in which the individual works--a branch or the headquarter of the bank--do not explain a significant amount of the variation in the intention to leave the organization.

In order to study hypothesis eight further, a logistic regression analysis was performed to analyze the intention to look for alternative jobs as a function of organizational commitment. The relation of age, sex, education, tenure, position in the bank, the type of bank, the office in which worked, the formalization and the centralization of the company with the intention to look for alternative jobs were also investigated within this analysis.

Doing stepwise analysis, 16 % of the variation in the intention to look for alternative jobs can be explained by the organizational commitment of the individuals ($p < .001$). This shows that organizational commitment is a significant correlate of the intention to leave the organization (see Table 11). The negative relation between the variables show that the greater the organizational commitment the less there is an intention to look for alternative jobs.

An additional 1% of the variation in the intention to look for alternative jobs can be explained by the education level of the individual ($p < .05$). This shows that the educational level of the individual is a significant antecedent of the intention to leave the organization, and that the higher the educational level the more the individual has the intention to look for alternative jobs (see Table 14).

Further, 0.5% of the variation in the intention to look for alternative jobs can be explained by the perceived centralization of the company ($p < .05$). Although there is a minimal negative relation, the perceived centralization of the organization is a significant antecedent of the intention to leave the organization, and the more the organization is perceived to be centralized, the less the employee will look for alternative jobs (see Table 11).

Table 11 Logistic Regression Analysis of the Intention to Look for Alternative Jobs

Variables in the equation	Beta	Standard Error of B	Wald	P
Organizational commitment	-0.1076	0.0148	52.6436	.001
Education	0.3923	0.1778	4.8654	.03
Centralization	-0.1364	0.0704	3.7557	.05

The sex, age, tenure and the position of the individual do not explain a significant amount of the variation in the intention to look for alternative jobs. That is, these variables do not significantly influence the intention to look for alternative jobs.

The type of bank, the office in which the individual works--a branch or the headquarter of the bank-- and the perceived formalization of the organization do not explain the variation in the intention to look for alternative jobs.

The implications of the above results are discussed in the next section.

DISCUSSION

The first hypothesis that the longer the tenure of an individual the more committed he will be was not supported. Even though tenure has been found to be a significant antecedent in other countries, it was not found to be a significant determinant in Turkey. The reason for this may be the economic situation and the unemployment in Turkey. That is, long tenure in an organization may not be due to being content or being committed to the organization, but it may be because the employee has no other choice of work.

The second hypothesis, that the older the age of the employee the more committed he will be, was supported. This result is consistent with previous findings of DeCotiis and Summers (1987), Hrebiniak (1974), Lee (1971), Lincoln and Kalleberg (1985), Luthans, McCaul and Dodd (1985), Mobley and Hwang (1982), Near (1989) and Sheldon (1971). Reasons for this relationship which have been offered include increasing maturity, more accurate perception of one's work experiences, and generational differences. Another reason could be that older people are attached or get attached to their belongings more and therefore they could also be more committed to their organizations if they identify with it.

The third hypothesis that women will be more committed was not supported and sex was not found to be a significant antecedent. Previous findings that whether sex is an antecedent of organizational commitment or not and if it is an antecedent, which sex is more committed was a matter of discussion. The basis for this hypothesis was the belief that since women suffer from discrimination they are more committed once at work, which was

an idea supported by Alvi and Ahmed (1987), Angle & Perry (1981) and Mowday et.al. (1982). On the other hand, Burning and Syneder (1983), Cromie (1981), Fry and Grensfeld (1980), and Stevens, Beyer, and Trice (1987) found that sex is not related to organizational commitment. Recently, Aven, Parker, and McEvoy (1993) found no gender difference in explaining organizational commitment. Their explanation of this situation is that if organizations provide equitable opportunities to both sexes they may receive similar degrees of commitment from both sexes. They also suggest that there may be moderators like job satisfaction, role states, leader behavior, organizational characteristics, and age. The work experiences of the individual could be another factor influencing the employee.

The fourth hypothesis that the greater the education of the individual the less committed the individual will be was not supported and the educational level of the individual was not found to be a significant determinant of organizational commitment. Education level was not found to be a significant determinant of organizational commitment in Canada either (Randall, 1993). This brings up the issue that cultural and national differences should be taken into consideration before generalizing results.

The fifth hypothesis, that the higher the power distance, the less committed the individual will be to the organization was partially supported. Power distance has been measured through perceived formalization and perceived centralization. The expectation that, the higher the perceived formalization of the company the less the organizational commitment will be, was supported. This, similar to Steers's (1977) finding that organizations which are perceived to be high in autonomy have higher levels of

commitment, shows that the higher the authority exhibited in an organization the less the employees will be autonomous and the less they will be committed. However, the expectation that the higher the perceived centralization, the less the organizational commitment will be, was not supported. Although the relation was not significant, when further analysis was conducted to investigate the trend of the relationship, it was observed that the greater the perceived centralization of the organization, the more the employees were committed. This finding contradicts previous findings that, first, decentralization of decision making is positively related with organizational commitment (Brook, Russel & Price, 1988; Morris & Steers, 1980; Randall, 1993), second DeCotiis and Summers' (1987) statement that centralization correlates negatively with organizational commitment and third that cultures with less power distance have higher commitment (Randall, 1993). The reason for this finding could be that although employees prefer to be autonomous and not have very strict rules, they may prefer to have centralized decision making because they are afraid to take responsibility. Another important point which should be taken into consideration is the operationalization of power distance through formalization and centralization. Even if Wong and Bimbaum-More (1993) found a significant positive relation between formalization and power distance, and centralization and power distance, this definition may not be suitable, and may need to be analysed further.

In addition to this, the expectation that the organizational commitment of the employees from different types of banks will vary, was partially supported. The organizational commitment of employees from private banks

established after 1980 and the private banks established before 1980 are significantly different than the organizational commitment of employees from public banks, however the organizational commitment of employees from private banks established after 1980 and before 1980 do not differ significantly. The trend is that, private banks established after 1980 are the most committed, private banks established before 1980 are the second most committed and public banks are the least committed. When this relation was investigated through perceived centralization and perceived formalization, the differences obtained were, partially significant. The perceived centralization of private banks established after 1980 is significantly different than the perceived centralization of private banks established before 1980 and from public banks, however the perceived centralization in private banks established before 1980 and public banks do not differ significantly. Still, the comparison is such that private banks established after 1980 are the most centralized, private banks established before 1980 are the second most centralized and public banks are the least centralized. Then, although there is a difference in the formalization scores according to bank type, so that the formalization score of the organization varies according to the type of bank where private banks established after 1980 are the most formalized, private banks established before 1980 are the second most formalized and public banks are the least formalized, the difference is not very significant. This points out that the differences of organizational commitment in different bank types may be due to other structural factors besides perceived formalization and centralization.

The sixth hypothesis, that the higher the position of the individual, the more committed he or she will be, was not supported. Even though there was no such previous finding, the effect of position was investigated thinking that, having a higher position, the individual may be more satisfied and more committed than an employee at a lower position.

The seventh hypothesis, that the employees working at the headquarter of a bank will be more committed than employees working at a branch office of the bank, was not supported. Even though there was no previous finding supporting this, the influence of where the individual is working was analyzed assuming that factors like the work environment, work atmosphere, job stress, and supervisory quality differ and that these factors would influence commitment (Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982). The reason for not finding a significant relation between commitment and the type of office could be that this difference is not significant.

The eighth hypothesis, that the greater the organizational commitment the less the intention to leave will be was supported. This reinforces the finding of Steers (1977) that organizational commitment is an antecedent of the intention to leave and the finding that a negative relationship between organizational commitment and intention to leave exist (Begley, & Czajka ,1993; Lee, & Mowday, 1987; Marsh, & Mannari, 1977; Michels, & Spector 1982; Stumpf, & Hartman, 1984). A supporting finding is also the negative relationship between the intention to look for alternative jobs and organizational commitment. The more the person is committed to the organization, the less he or she feels the need to change where he works. This finding was previously stated by Arnold and Feldman (1982).

A secondary analysis of the other variables than organizational commitment was performed to see their effect on the intention to leave the organization and the intention to look for alternative jobs. Even though minimal, the tenure of the individual influences his or her intention to leave the organization positively. This probably is due to the fact that the longer one works in the organization, the more he or she has the chance to reach a certain position in the organization. If the individual reaches the maximum position, there is no more chance to promote. Therefore the individual may want to find an alternative job where he can continue with a higher position. Another reason could be that as years pass, the individual expects promotion or better conditions, but if these are not provided, he or she intends to leave the organization. A further explanation could be that within the first years employees will try to work and try to adapt to the organization. It is only after some time that an individual would start thinking that he can not work in the organization and he or she starts looking for alternative jobs. The education level of the individual influences his or her intention to look for alternative jobs such that the higher the educational level of the individual the more he or she intends to look for alternative jobs. This may be due to the fact that people with higher educational degrees are harder to satisfy due to their high level of expectations and secondly, it may be that individuals with higher educational degrees can find alternative jobs easily than individuals with low levels of education.

Concluding from the above, even though some of the previously internationally found antecedents of organizational commitment were found to be significant determinants in Turkey, some differences with other nations are

encountered. This could be due to the difference of culture, the national wealth and the economic situation of Turkey. As Child (1981) has found, the level of industrialization and the national wealth may influence the organizational commitment level of the individual.

In addition to this, some of the methodological restrictions have to be taken into consideration. This research has been done in only in one city, Istanbul, and generalizing these results to all Turkey is not appropriate because Turkey is a very heterogeneous country population and culture wise. A second point is that, even though the sampling size was appropriate all of the respondents were employees of the banking sector.

In this study it was found that Turkish bank employees' organizational commitment varied more according to organizational factors than personal factors. The formalization of the company, the type of the bank in which they work and the age of the individual are found to be significant determinants of organizational commitment. The sex, educational level and the tenure of the individual, the perceived centralization of the company, although previously in other countries found to be as antecedents of commitment, were not significant determinants of organizational commitment for the Turkish employees. Similar to previous findings, organizational commitment significantly related to the intention to look for alternative jobs and to the intention to leave the organization. Further research is needed to investigate how perceived centralization and perceived formalization relate to each other and to power distance in order to find out their relationship with organizational commitment.

REFERENCES

- Allen, N. J. & Meyer, J. P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance, and normative commitment. Journal of Occupational Psychology, 63, 1-18.
- Allen, N. J. & Meyer, J. P. (1993). Organizational commitment: Evidence of career stage effects? Journal of Business Research, 26(1), 49-62.
- Alvi, S. A. & Ahmed, S. W. (1987). Assessing organizational commitment in a developing country: Pakistan. A case study. Human Relations, 40, 267- 280.
- Angle, H. L. & Lawson, M. B. (1993). Changes in affective and continuance commitment in times of relocation. Journal of Business Research, 26(1), 3-15.
- Angle, H. L. & Perry, J. L. (1981). An empirical assessment of organizational effectiveness. Administrative Sciences Quarterly, 26, 1-13. Cited in J. P. Meyer, S. V. Paunonen, I. R. Gellatly, R. D. Goffin & D. N. Jackson, (1989). Organizational commitment and job performance: It is the nature of the commitment that counts. Journal of Applied Psychology, 74(1), 152-156.
- Aranya, N., Kushnir, T. & Valency, A. (1986). Organizational commitment in a male dominated profession. Human Relations, 39(5), 433-448.
- Arnold, H. J. & Feldman, D. C. (1982). A multivariate analysis of determinants of job turnover. Journal of Applied Psychology, 67, 350-360.

- Aven, A. F., Parker, B. & McEvoy, G. M. (1993). Gender and attitudinal commitment of organizations: A meta-analysis. Journal of Business Research, 26(1), 63-74.
- Bateman, T. S. & Strasser, S. (1984). A longitudinal analysis of the antecedents of organizational commitment. Academy of Management Journal, 27, 95-112. Cited in A. E Reichers, 1985. A review and the conceptualization of organizational commitment. Academy of Management Review, 10(3), 465-476.
- Begley, T. M. & Czajka, J. M. (1993). Panel analysis of the moderating effects of commitment on job satisfaction, intent to quit, and health following organizational change. Journal of Applied Psychology, 78(4), 552-556.
- Blau, G. J. (1986). Job involvement and organizational commitment as interactive predictors of tardiness and absenteeism. Journal of Management, 15, 115-127. Cited in A. Cohen, (1993). Work commitment in relation to withdrawal intentions and union effectiveness. Journal of Business Research, 26(1), 75-90.
- Boyacigiller, N. & Adler, N. J. (1991). The parochial dinosaur: Organizational science in a global context. Academy of Management Review, 16, 262-290.
- Brooke, P. P., Russell, D. W. & Price, J. L. (1987). Discriminant validation of measures of job satisfaction, job involvement, and organizational commitment. Journal of Applied Psychology, 73(2), 139-145.

- Buchanan, B. (1974). Building organizational commitment: The socialization of managers in work conditions. Administrative Sciences Quarterly, 19, 533-546.
- Burning, N. S. & Syneder, R. A. (1983). Sex and position as predictors of organizational commitment. Academy of Management Journal, 26, 485-491. Cited in N. Aranya, T. Kushnir & A. Valency (1986). Organizational commitment in a male dominated profession. Human Relations, 39(5), 433-448.
- Butler, G. & Vodanovich, S. J. (1991). The relation between work values and normative and instrumental commitment. The Journal of Psychology, 126 (2), 139-146.
- Child, J. (1981). Culture, contingency, and capitalism in the cross-national study of organizations. Cited in B. M. Staw & L. L. Cummings (Eds.), Research in organizational behavior, vol. 3: 303-356. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press. Cited in N. Boyacıgiller & N. J. Adler (1991). The parochial dinosaur: Organizational science in a global context. Academy of Management Review, 16, 262-290.
- Cohen, A. (1993). Work commitment in relation to withdrawal intentions and union effectiveness. Journal of Business Research, 26(1), 75-90.
- Cromie, S. (1981). Women as managers in Northern Ireland. Journal of Occupational Psychology, 54, 87-91. Cited in N. Aranya, T. Kushnir & A. Valency (1986). Organizational commitment in a male dominated profession. Human Relations, 39(5), 433-448.

- DeCotiis, T. A. & Summers, T. P. (1987). A path analysis of the antecedents and consequences of organizational commitment. Human Relations, 40, 445-470.
- Edwards, R. T. Contested terrain. 1979. New York: Basic Books. In J. R. Lincoln, & A. L. Kalleberg, (1985). Work organization and workforce commitment: A study of plants and employees in the U.S. and Japan. American Sociological Review, 50, 738-760.
- Etzioni, A. (1975). A comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations. New York: Free Press. Cited in J. P. Meyer & N. J. Allen (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. Human Resource Management Review, 1, 61-98.
- Fry, L. W. & Grensfield, S. (1980). An examination of attitudinal differences between policewoman and policemen. Cited in N. Aranya, T. Kushnir, & A. Valency (1986). Organizational commitment in a male dominated profession. Human Relations, 39(5), 433-448.
- Glison, C. & Durick, M. (1988). Predictors of job satisfaction and organizational commitment in human service organizations. Administrative Sciences Quarterly, 33, 61-81.
- Gouldner, A. W. (1958). Cosmopolitans and locals: Toward an analysis of latent social roles. Administrative Sciences Quarterly, 2, 444-480. Cited in A. E. Reichers (1985). A review and reconceptualization of organizational commitment. Academy of Management Review, 10(3), 465-476.

- Gregersen, H. B. (1993). Multiple commitments at work and extrarole behavior during three stages of organizational tenure. Journal of Business Research, 26(1), 31-48.
- Grusky, O. (1966). Career mobility and organizational commitment. Administrative Sciences Quarterly, 10, 488-503.
- Hall, D. T. & Nougaim, K. E. (1968). An examination of Maslow's need hierarchy in an organizational setting. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 3, 12-35. Cited in B. Buchanan, (1974). Building organizational commitment: The socialization of managers in work conditions. Administrative Sciences Quarterly, 19, 533-546.
- Hofstede, G. (1980a). Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values. Sage, Beverly Hills. Cited in D. M. Randall (1993). Cross-cultural research on organizational commitment: A review and application of Hofstede's Value Survey Module. Journal of Business Research, 26(1), 91-110.
- Hrebiniak, L. G. (1974). Effects of job level and participation on employee attitudes and perceptions of influence. Academy of Management Journal, 17, 649-662. In R. M. Steers (1977). Antecedents and outcomes of organizational commitment. Administrative Sciences Quarterly, 22, 46-56.
- Hrebiniak, L. G. & Alutto, J. A. (1972). Personal and role-related factors in the development of organizational commitment. Administrative Sciences Quarterly, 17, 555-572. Cited in A. E. Reichers (1985). A review and reconceptualization of organizational commitment. Academy of Management Review, 10(3), 465-476.

- Jaush, L. R., Glueck, W. F. & Osborn, R. N. (1978). Organizational loyalty, professional commitment, and academic research productivity. Academy of Management Journal, 21, 84-92. Cited in N. Aranya, T. Kushnir & A. Valency (1986). Organizational commitment in a male dominated profession. Human Relations, 39(5), 433-448.
- Kabasakal, H. E., Sözen, Z. & Üsdiken, B. (1988). Organizational context, structural attributes, and management systems in construction firms. Construction Management and Economics, 7, 347-356.
- Koch, J. L., & Steers, R. M. (1976). Job attachment, satisfaction and turnover among public employees. Technical Report, No. 6, Office of Naval Research, University of Oregon. Cited in R. M. Steers, (1977). Antecedents and outcomes of organizational commitment. Administrative Sciences Quarterly, 22, 46-56.
- Konovsky, M., Folger, R. & Cropanzano, R. (1987). Relative effects of procedural and distributive justice on employee attitudes. Representative Research in Social Psychology, 17, 15-24. Cited in L. A. Witt (1993). Reactions to work assignment as predictors of occupational commitment: The moderating effect of occupational identification. Journal of Business Research, 26(1), 17-30.
- Lee, J. M. (1971). An empirical analysis of organizational identification. Academy of Management Journal, 14, 213-226. Cited in R. M. Steers (1977). Antecedents and outcomes of organizational commitment. Administrative Sciences Quarterly, 22, 46-56.

- Lee, T. W. & Mowday, R. T. (1987). Voluntarily leaving an organization: An empirical investigation of Steers and Mowday's model of turnover. Academy of Management Journal , 30(4), 721-743.
- Lincoln, J. R. & Kalleberg, A. L. (1985). Work organization and workforce commitment: A study of plants and employees in U.S. and Japan. American Sociological Review, 50, 738-760.
- 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.
- Marsh, J. & Simon, H. (1958). Organizations. New York: Wiley. Cited in A. E. Reichers (1985). A review and reconceptualization of organizational commitment. Academy of Management Review, 10(3), 465-476.
- Marsh, R. M. & Mannari, H. (1977). Organizational commitment and turnover: A prediction study. Administrative Sciences Quarterly, 22, 57-75. Cited in F. Luthans, H. S. McCaul & N. G. Dodd (1985). Organizational commitment: A comparison of American, Japanese, and Korean employees. Academy of Management Journal ,28(1), 213-219.
- Mathieu, J. E. (1988). A causal model of organizational commitment in a military training environment. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 32, 321-335. Cited in J. E. Mathieu (1991). A cross-level nonrecursive model of the antecedents of organizational commitment and satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 76(5), 607-618.

Mathieu, J. E. (1991). A cross-level nonrecursive model of the antecedents of organizational commitment and satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 76(5), 607-618.

Mathieu, J. E. & Farr, J. L. (1991). Further evidence for the discriminant validity of measures of organizational commitment, job involvement, and job satisfaction. Cited in J. E. Mathieu (1991). A cross-level nonrecursive model of the antecedents of organizational commitment and satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 76(5), 607-618.

Mathieu, J. E. & Hamel, (1989). A causal model of the antecedents of organizational commitment among professionals and nonprofessionals. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 34, 299-317. Cited in J. E. Mathieu (1991). A cross-level nonrecursive model of the antecedents of organizational commitment and satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 76(5), 607-618.

Mathieu, J. E. & Zajac, D. M. (1990). A review of and meta-analysis of the antecedents, correlates, and consequences of organizational commitment. Psychological Bulletin, 108, 171-194. Cited in H. L. Angle & M. B. Lawson, (1993). Changes in affective and continuance commitment in times of relocation. Journal of Business Research, 26(1), 3-15.

Meyer, J. P. & Allen, N. J. (1984). Testing the side-bet theory of organizational commitment: Some methodological considerations. Journal of Applied Psychology, 69, 372-378.

- Meyer, J. P. & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. Human Resource Management Review, 1, 61-98. Cited in J. P. Meyer, N. J. Allen, & C. A. Smith (1993). Commitment to the organizations and occupations: Extension and test of a three-component conceptualization. Journal of Applied Psychology, 78, 538-551.
- Meyer, J. P., Allen, N. J. & Smith, C. A. (1993). Commitment to the organizations and occupations: Extension and test of a three-component conceptualization. Journal of Applied Psychology, 78, 538-551.
- Meyer, J. P., Paunonen, S. V., Gellatly, I. R., Goffin, R. D. & Jackson, D. N. (1989). Organizational commitment and job performance: It is the nature of the commitment that counts. Journal of Applied Psychology, 74(1), 152-156.
- Michaels, C. E., & Spector, P. E. (1982). Causes of employee turnover: A test of the Mobley, Griffith, Hand and Meglino model. Journal of Applied Psychology, 67, 53-59. Cited in T. W., Lee & R. T., Mowday (1987). Voluntarily leaving an organization: An empirical investigation of Steers and Mowday's model of turnover. Academy of Management Journal, 30(4), 721-743.
- Mintzer, M. (1968). An investigation of the relationship of prestige, compliance patterns and dogmatism to interpersonal perception of esteem in the chain of command of a formal organization. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Emory University. Cited in T. A. DeCotiis & T. P.

- Summers (1987). A path analysis of the antecedents and consequences of organizational commitment. Human Relations, 40, 445-470.
- Mobley, W .H., & Hwang, K. K. (1982). Personal, role, structural, alternative, and affective correlates of organizational commitment. ONR Technical Report No. 2, Department of Management. College Station: Texas AM University. Cited in F. Luthans, H. S. McCaul, & N .G. Dodd (1985). Organizational commitment: A comparison of American, Japanese, and Korean employees. Academy of Management Journal, 28(1), 213-219.
- Morris, J. H. & Sherman, J. D. (1981). Generalizability of an organizational commitment model. Academy of Management Journal, 24, 512-526.
- Morris, J. H., & Steers, R. M. (1980). Structural influence on organizational commitment. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 17, 50-57.
- Morris, J. H., & Syneder, R. A.(1979). A second look at the need for achievement and the need for autonomy as moderators of role perception-outcome relations. Journal of Applied Psychology, 64,173-178. Cited in J. E. Mathieu (1991). A cross-level nonrecursive model of the antecedents of organizational commitment and satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 76(5), 607-618.
- Morrow, P.C. (1983). Concept redundancy in organizational research: the case of work commitment. Academy of Management Review, 8, 486.-500. Cited in A. E. Reichers (1985). A review and reconceptualization of organizational commitment. Academy of Management Review, 10(3), 465-476.

- Morrow, P. C. & McElroy, J. C. (1987). Work commitment and job satisfaction over three career stages. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 30, 330-346.
- Mowday, R. T., Porter, L. W. & Dubin, R. (1974). Unit performance, situational factors, and employee attitudes in spatially separated work units. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 12, 231-248.
- Mowday, R. T., Porter, L. W. & Steers, R. M. (1982). Employee organization - linkages: The psychology of commitment, absenteeism, and turnover. San Diego, CA: Academic Press. Cited in A. E. Reichers (1985). A review and reconceptualization of organizational commitment. Academy of Management Review, 10(3), 465-476.
- Nakane, C. (1970). Japanese Society. Berkeley: University of California Press. Cited in J. R. Lincoln, & A. L. Kalleberg (1985). Work organization and workforce commitment: A study of plants and employees in the U.S. and Japan. American Sociological Review, 50, 738-760.
- Near, J. P. (1989). Organizational commitment among Japanese and U.S. workers. Organization Studies, 10(3), 281-300.
- O'Reilly, C. A. & Caldwell, D. F. (1980). The commitment and job tenure of employees: Some evidence of post-decisional justification. Administrative Sciences Quarterly, 26, 597-616. Cited in A. E. Reichers (1985). A review and reconceptualization of organizational commitment. Academy of Management Review, 10(3), 465-476.
- Ostroff, C. (1992). Relationship between satisfaction attitude and performance: An organizational level analysis. Journal of Applied Psychology, 77 (6), 963-974.

- Pierce, J. L & Dunham, R. B. (1987). Organizational commitment: Preemployment propensity and initial work experiences. Journal of Management, 13, 163-178. Cited in L. A. Witt (1993). Reactions to work assignment as predictors of occupational commitment: The moderating effect of occupational identification. Journal of Business Research, 26(1), 17-30.
- Podsakoff, P. M., Williams, L. J. & Todor, W. D. (1986). Effects of organizational formalization alienation among professionals and nonprofessionals. Academy of Management Journal, 29, 820-831.
- Porter, L. W. & Smith, F. J. (1970). The etiology of commitment and managerial turnover. Unpublished manuscript. University of California at Irvine. Cited in H. L. Angle & M. B. Lawson (1993). Changes in affective and continuance commitment in times of relocation. Journal of Business Research, 26(1), 3-15.
- 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), 693-699.
- Price, J. L. & Mueller, C. W. (1986). Absenteeism and turnover among hospital employees. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press Inc. Cited in J. E. Mathieu (1991). A cross-level nonrecursive model of the antecedents of organizational commitment and satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 76(5), 607-618.
- Pugh, D. S., Hickson, D. J., Higgins, C. R. & Turner, C. (1968). Dimensions of organizational structure. Administrative Sciences Quarterly, 13, 65-91.

- Randall, D. M. (1993). Cross-cultural research on organizational commitment: A review and application of Hofstede's Value Survey Module. Journal of Business Research, 26(1), 91-110.
- Reichers, A. E. (1985). A review and reconceptualization of organizational commitment. Academy of Management Review, 10(3), 465-476.
- Salancik, G. R. (1977). Commitment and the control of organizational behavior and belief. In B. Staw and G. Salancik (Eds). New Directions in organizational behavior. Chicago: St. Clair Press, 1977, 1-59. Cited in A. E. Reichers (1985). A review and reconceptualization of organizational commitment. Academy of Management Review, 10(3), 465-476.
- Salancik, G. R. (1977b). Commitment is too easy' Organizational Dynamics, Summer, 62-70. Cited in T. A. DeCotiis & T. P. Summers (1987). A path analysis of the antecedents and consequences of organizational commitment. Human Relations, 40, 445-470.
- Salancik, G. R. & Pfeffer, J. A. (1978). A social information processing approach to job attitudes and task design. Administrative Sciences Quarterly, 23, 224-253. Cited in T. A. DeCotiis & T. P. Summers (1987). A path analysis of the antecedents and consequences of organizational commitment. Human Relations, 40, 445-470.
- Sheldon, M. E. (1971). Investments and involvements as mechanism producing commitment to the organization. Administrative Sciences Quarterly, 16, 143-150. Cited in R. M. Steers (1977). Antecedents and outcomes of organizational commitment. Administrative Sciences Quarterly, 22, 46-56.

- Sözen, Z. (1985). Size, technology, and aspects of structure in contractor firms in Turkey. Construction Management and Economics, 3 , 233-247. Cited in H. E. Kabasakal, Z. Sözen & B. Üsdiken (1988). Organizational context, structural attributes, and management systems in construction firms. Construction Management and Economics, 7, 347-356.
- Steers, R. M.(1977).Antecedents and outcomes of organizational commitment. Administrative Sciences Quarterly, 22, 46-56.
- Steers, R. M., Spencer, D. G. (1977). The role of achievement motivation in job design. Journal of Applied Psychology, 62, 472-479. Cited in J. E. Mathieu (1991). A cross-level nonrecursive model of the antecedents of organizational commitment and satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 76(5), 607-618.
- Stevens, J. M., Beyer, J. M., & Trice, H. M. (1978). Assessing personal role and organizational predictors of managerial commitment. Academy of Management Journal, 21, 380-396. Cited in N. Aranya, T. Kushnir & A. Valency (1986). Organizational commitment in a male dominated profession. Human Relations, 39(5), 433-448.
- Stinchombe, A. L. (1965). Social structure and organizations. In J. G. March (Ed) Handbook of organizations. Rand McNally & Company, Chicago, 1965, 142-193.
- Stumpf, S. A. & Hartman, K. (1984). Individual exploration to organizational commitment withdrawal. Academy of Management Journal, 27, 308-329.

- Üsdiken, B. (1979). Büyükölük, teknoloji, çevre, ve örgütsel yapı. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, İstanbul University. Cited in H. E. Kabasakal, Z. Sözen, & B. Üsdiken, (1988). Organizational context, structural attributes, and management systems in construction firms. Construction Management and Economics, 7, 347-356.
- Wiener, Y. (1982). Commitment in organizations: A Normative View. Academy of Management Review, 7(3), 418-428.
- Wiener, Y. & Vardi, Y. (1980). Relationships between job, organization, and career commitments and work outcomes. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 26, 81-96. Cited in A. Cohen, (1993). Work commitment in relation to withdrawal intentions and union effectiveness. Journal of Business Research, 26(1), 75-90.
- Williams, L. J. & Hazer, J. T. (1986). antecedents and consequences of satisfaction and commitment in turnover models: A reanalysis using latent variable structural equation methods. Journal of Applied Psychology. Cited in J. E. Mathieu, (1991). A cross-level nonrecursive model of the antecedents of organizational commitment and satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 76(5), 607-618.
- Witt, L. A. (1993). Reactions to work assignment as predictors of occupational commitment: The moderating effect of occupational identification. Journal of Business Research, 26(1), 17-30.
- Wong, G. Y. Y., Bimbaum-More, P. H. (1994). Culture, context, and structure: A test on Hong Kong Banks. Organization Studies, 1, 99-125.

Appendix A

English Version of the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire

1. I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help this organization be successful.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly disagree	Moderately disagree	Slightly disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Slightly agree	Moderately agree	Strongly agree

2. I talk up this organization to my friends as a great organization to work for.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly disagree	Moderately disagree	Slightly disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Slightly agree	Moderately agree	Strongly agree

3. I feel very little loyalty to this organization.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly disagree	Moderately disagree	Slightly disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Slightly agree	Moderately agree	Strongly agree

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
Strongly disagree	Moderately disagree	Slightly disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Slightly agree	Moderately agree	Strongly agree

5. I find that my values and the organization's values are very similar.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly disagree	Moderately disagree	Slightly disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Slightly agree	Moderately agree	Strongly agree

6. I am proud to tell others that I am a part of this organization.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly disagree	Moderately disagree	Slightly disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Slightly agree	Moderately agree	Strongly agree

7. I could just as well be working for a different organization as long as the type of work were similar.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly disagree	Moderately disagree	Slightly disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Slightly agree	Moderately agree	Strongly agree

8. This organization really inspires the very best in me in the way of job performance.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly disagree	Moderately disagree	Slightly disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Slightly agree	Moderately agree	Strongly agree

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
Strongly disagree	Moderately disagree	Slightly disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Slightly agree	Moderately agree	Strongly agree

10. I am extremely glad that I chose this organization to work for, over others I was considering at the time I joined.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly disagree	Moderately disagree	Slightly disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Slightly agree	Moderately agree	Strongly agree

agree

11. there is not too much to be gained by sticking with this organization indefinitely.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly disagree	Moderately disagree	Slightly disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Slightly agree	Moderately agree	Strongly agree

agree

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
Strongly disagree	Moderately disagree	Slightly disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Slightly agree	Moderately agree	Strongly agree

agree

13. I really care about the fate of this organization.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly disagree	Moderately disagree	Slightly disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Slightly agree	Moderately agree	Strongly agree

agree

14. For me this is the best of all possible organizations for which to work.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly disagree	Moderately disagree	Slightly disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Slightly agree	Moderately agree	Strongly agree

15. Deciding to work for this organization was a definite mistake on my part.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly disagree	Moderately disagree	Slightly disagree	Neither disagree nor agree	Slightly agree	Moderately agree	Strongly agree

Appendix B

Turkish Version of the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire

İşikte bulunan anket, çalışanların, kuruluşlarının yapısını nasıl algıladıklarını ve kuruluşlarına karşı neler hissettiklerini araştırmaktadır. Bu anket sadece kişisel bir araştırma (master tezi) için olup, kuruluşlara kesinlikle çalışanlar hakkında bireysel bilgi verilmeyecektir. Ancak araştırma sonucu, bir genelleme olarak çalışmanın yapıldığı kuruluşlar ile paylaşılacaktır. Sizlerden ricam, mümkün olduğunca dürüst cevaplar vererek, sağlıklı bir araştırma yapmama yardımcı olmanızdır.

Bana ayırdığınız vakit ve yardımlarınız için şimdiden çok teşekkürler.

Bu bölümde bireylerin çalıştıkları şirket ve kuruluşlar için olası hislerini belirten ifadeler bulunmaktadır. Çalıştığınız şirket veya kuruluşa karşı hissettiklerinize göre, aşağıdaki ifadelere ne derece katıldığınızı veya katılmadığınızı, lütfen yedi seçenekten birini işaretleyerek belirtiniz.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum Pek fazla Ne katılıyorum ne Biraz Katılıyorum Tamamen
katılmıyorum katılmıyorum de katılmıyorum katılıyorum katılıyorum

1. Bu kuruluşun başarılı olması için normalde beklenenin çok üstünde çaba göstermeye hazırım.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum Pek fazla Ne katılıyorum ne Biraz Katılıyorum Tamamen
katılmıyorum katılmıyorum de katılmıyorum katılıyorum katılıyorum

2. Arkadaşlarıma bu kuruluştan, çalışması çok zevkli bir işyeri olarak söz ediyorum.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum Pek fazla Ne katılıyorum ne Biraz Katılıyorum Tamamen katılmıyorum katılmıyorum de katılmıyorum katılıyorum katılıyorum

3. Bu kuruluşa karşı çok az bir bağlılık hissi taşıyorum.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum Pek fazla Ne katılıyorum ne Biraz Katılıyorum Tamamen katılmıyorum katılmıyorum de katılmıyorum katılıyorum katılıyorum

4. Bu kuruluşta çalışmayı sürdürmek için hemen her tür görevi kabul ederdim.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum Pek fazla Ne katılıyorum ne Biraz Katılıyorum Tamamen katılmıyorum katılmıyorum de katılmıyorum katılıyorum katılıyorum

5. Benim değerlerimle, kuruluşun değerlerini çok benzer buluyorum.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum Pek fazla Ne katılıyorum ne Biraz Katılıyorum Tamamen katılmıyorum katılmıyorum de katılmıyorum katılıyorum katılıyorum

6. Bu kuruluşun bir parçası olduğumu başkalarına anlatmaktan gurur duyuyorum.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum		Pek fazla katılmıyorum	Ne katılıyorum ne de katılmıyorum	Biraz katılıyorum		Tamamen katılıyorum

7. Aynı iş türü olduğu sürece, değişik bir kuruluşta da çalışabilirim.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum		Pek fazla katılmıyorum	Ne katılıyorum ne de katılmıyorum	Biraz katılıyorum		Tamamen katılıyorum

8. İş performansı açısından, bu kuruluş benim en iyi çabamı ortaya koymam için bana ilham veriyor.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum		Pek fazla katılmıyorum	Ne katılıyorum ne de katılmıyorum	Biraz katılıyorum		Tamamen katılıyorum

9. Şimdiki şartlarımda bu kuruluştan ayrılmam için az bir değişiklik yeter.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum		Pek fazla katılmıyorum	Ne katılıyorum ne de katılmıyorum	Biraz katılıyorum		Tamamen katılıyorum

10. Bu kuruluşa katıldığım sırada başka seçeneklerim de olmasına karşın, bu kuruluşu seçtiğim için çok memnunum.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum Pek fazla Ne katılıyorum ne Biraz Katılıyorum Tamamen
katılmıyorum katılmıyorum de katılmıyorum katılıyorum katılıyorum

11. Bu kuruluşta sonsuza dek kalmakla kazanılacak fazla bir yarar yok.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum Pek fazla Ne katılıyorum ne Biraz Katılıyorum Tamamen
katılmıyorum katılmıyorum de katılmıyorum katılıyorum katılıyorum

12. Çoğu kez, bu kuruluşun kendi çalışanlarına ilişkin önemli konulardaki politikasına katılmakta güçlük çekiyorum.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum Pek fazla Ne katılıyorum ne Biraz Katılıyorum Tamamen
katılmıyorum katılmıyorum de katılmıyorum katılıyorum katılıyorum

13. Bu kuruluşun geleceği ile gerçekten ilgileniyorum.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum Pek fazla Ne katılıyorum ne Biraz Katılıyorum Tamamen
katılmıyorum katılmıyorum de katılmıyorum katılıyorum katılıyorum

14. Benim için bu kuruluş tüm çalışılacak olasılıkların arasında çalışılması en iyi yer.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum	Katılmıyorum	Pek fazla katılmıyorum	Ne katılıyorum ne de katılmıyorum	Biraz katılıyorum	Katılıyorum	Tamamen katılıyorum

15. Bu kuruluşta çalışmaya karar vermem, kesinlikle bir hata idi.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum	Katılmıyorum	Pek fazla katılmıyorum	Ne katılıyorum ne de katılmıyorum	Biraz katılıyorum	Katılıyorum	Tamamen katılıyorum

Appendix C

The Formalization Scale

Aşağıdaki sorular işletmenin yapısal özellikleri (organizasyonu) ile ilgilidir. Cevaplarınızın olmasını arzuladığınız durumu değil, halen uygulamada geçerli olan durumu yansıtması beklenmektedir.

1. İşletmedeki elemanların (müdür, şef, memur) ne kadarının görevleri, yetki ve sorumlulukları yazılı iş tanımlarıyla belirtilmiştir?

- 1 Tümünün 2 Büyük 3 Yaklaşık 4 Az sayıda 5 Hiçbirinin
bölümünün yarısının elemanın

2. Bölüm yöneticilerinin üst yönetimle bilgi alışverişi ve ilişkileri ne ölçüde yazılı olarak yürütülür?

- 1 Hemen hemen 2 Nadiren 3 Bazen 4 Çoğunlukla 5 Hemen hemen
hiçbir zaman her zaman

3. Bölümlerarası bilgi alışverişi ve ilişkiler ne derece yazılı olarak yürütülür?

- 1 Hemen hemen 2 Nadiren 3 Bazen 4 Çoğunlukla 5 Hemen hemen
hiçbir zaman her zaman

4. İşletmede, hangi konularda kimin(lerin) karar alacağı, diğer bir deyişle yetki hiyerarşisi ne ölçüde belirlenmiştir?

- 1 Büyük 2 Oldukça 3 Bir 4 Sınırlı 5 Hemen hemen
ölçüde ölçüde ölçüde ölçüde hiç

5. Yetki hiyerarşisi yazılı kurallarla mı belirlenmiştir, yoksa zaman içinde oluşmuş teamüllere mi dayalıdır?

1 Hemen hemen tümüyle teamüllere dayalı
2 Çoğunlukla yazılı
3 Kısmen yazılı
4 Çoğunlukla yazılı
5 Hemen hemen tümüyle yazılı

6. Bölümlerin ortaya koyduğu performans ne ölçüde formel (resmi/yazılı) ve önceden belirlenmiş kriterlere ve yöntemlere göre değerlendirilir?

1 Hemen hemen tümüyle
2 Çoğunlukla
3 Kısmen
4 Sınırlı ölçüde
5 Hemen hemen hiç

Appendix D

The Centralization Scale

İşletmede aşağıda belirtilen konularda kararlar hangi kademedede verilir?

- Kademeler
- a)Alt kademe (memurlar)
 - b)Birinci kademe yönetim (servis şefleri, şef yardımcıları)
 - c)İkinci kademe yönetim (müdürler, müdür yardımcıları)
 - d)Üst yönetim (genel müdürler,genel müdür yardımcıları)

Kararda en çok söz sahibi olan kademeyi işaretleyiniz. Birlikte verilen kararlarda birden fazla kademeyi işaretleyebilirsiniz.

KARAR KONUSU

ALT BİRİNCİ İKİNCİ ÜST

1. İşgücü ihtiyacı
- 2.Memurların işe alınması ve atamaları
- 3.Memurların terfii
- 4.Memurların işten çıkarılması
- 5.Şef sayısı
- 6.Şeflerin işten çıkarılması
- 7.Bütçe dışı planlanmamış harcamalar
8. Kullanılacak makina ve malzeme seçimi
- 9.Gerekli makinaların satın alınması
- 10.İş programında değişikliklerle ilgili önemli kararlar
- 11.Kuruluştaki yeni kısımlar açılması

Appendix E

Questions about the Intention To Leave

1.Şu an çalıştığınız kuruluşta çalışmaya devam etmeyi düşünüyor musunuz?

----Evet

---Hayır

2.Başka iş alternatifleri aramayı düşünüyor musunuz?

----Evet

---Hayır