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Individuals with different personal demographics and job-based factors have different attitudes and behaviors, which can influence their levels of commitment to their organizations. These differences in organizational commitment increase as their cultural backgrounds differ significantly. Personal demographics and job-related factors are reliable predictors of employees' commitment to their employing organizations. The researcher conducted a cross-national comparison of Arab and non-Arab employees in Saudi petrochemical companies in Jubail Industrial City in Saudi Arabia. The purpose of this study was to empirically investigate if there is a difference in the level of employees' commitment to Saudi petrochemical companies on the basis of differences in their personal demographics and job-related factors. Employees in this study comprise six nationalities, which represent Arab and non-Arab ethnicities.

A mail questionnaire was used to collect data from a random sample of 690 employees representing six nationalities and two ethnicities in Saudi petrochemical companies. The subjects that participated in this study returned 565 questionnaires, of which 520 were completed; thus, the effective response rate is 75.4 percent. Also, some data about employees' commitment were collected from participating companies' records. Some employees participated in a short interview pertaining to their personal demographics, job-based variables, commitment, and commitment-related issues. Cronbach's alpha, Spearman's coefficient, and Pearson's correlation were used to test the
reliability of the pilot study. Also, Cronbach’s alpha was used to test the reliability of the study itself.

The researcher examined the hypotheses using the factor score ranking with One-Way-ANOVA. All hypotheses pertaining to job-related factors were accepted. Personal demographics hypotheses, with the exception of those related to nationality, were accepted. Nationality did not predict significant differences in commitment among employees. Generally, the findings showed that employees’ commitment to Saudi petrochemical companies differs as their demographics and job-based factors vary. Also, the results showed that one group of employees had a higher level of commitment than the other. Employees born in Saudi Arabia reported a higher level of commitment to Saudi petrochemical companies than employees born in other countries. Arab employees showed a higher level of commitment than non-Arab employees. Employees with low level of education, long tenure, managerial jobs, lifetime employment (non-contract), high pay, reported a higher level of commitment than those with high level of education, short tenure, non-managerial jobs, contract employment, and low pay, respectively. Older employees reported a higher level of commitment than younger employees.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this empirical study is to investigate if there is a difference in the levels of organizational commitment between Arab and non-Arab employees working in Saudi petrochemical companies in Jubail Industrial City in Saudi Arabia. Additionally, this study is to investigate if there is a difference in the levels of organizational commitment of employees on the basis of their demographics and job-related factors. The site of this study is Saudi petrochemical companies, which are affiliates of the Saudi Basic Industries Corporation, the promising future of Saudi Arabia.

Despite the fact that Saudi Arabian petrochemical companies are major employers of Saudis and expatriates, little attention has been paid to cross-national studies that investigate the differences between local and international employees with regard to their work-related attitudes and behaviors toward Saudi companies. Saudi Arabia is the largest supplier of oil and petrochemicals to many industrial countries. One must acknowledge that expatriates' skills and experiences are crucial for the Saudi economy. Expatriates working in Saudi organizations include other Arab and non-Arab employees.

Although planners and policy makers of human resources in Saudi Arabia have recognized the shortage of well-trained Saudis, training and development programs have not significantly reduced the dependence on foreign labor, especially in the private sector.
More than a decade ago, Sirageldin, Sherbiny, and Serageldin (1982) reported that the demand for foreign labor in Saudi Arabia will continue because of these reasons: (1) the acceleration of growth and structural change; (2) Saudi Arabia's small population; and (3) the lack of skilled and semiskilled labor. Edwards's (1994) report on Saudi Arabia indicated that expatriates comprise about 5 million of Saudi Arabia's 17 million people, which is about 27 percent of the country's population. The dependence on expatriates in Saudi Arabia will continue for a long time as the above researchers indicated in their studies.

Statistics on expatriates in Saudi Arabia revealed the fact that top management and personnel in Saudi organizations are challenged by the diversity of the workforce. Also, to global managers, globalization of business has added challenging responsibilities, which include the management of international employees. Management in Saudi petrochemical companies must understand the differences in the level of organizational commitment between domestic and international employees because knowing these differences can help management choose the most effective methods to increase employees' commitment to their companies. This is because commitment of employees to their companies plays an important role in their well-being.

Because expatriates come to Saudi Arabia from different countries with different beliefs, different work attitudes, and different work values, their commitment to Saudi petrochemical companies may vary. Near (1989) and Randall (1993) emphasized the influence of culture on the organizational commitment of employees while Peterson (1972) believed that culture plays a major role in determining the difference in attitudes of
individuals toward an organization and its management. Attitudes and values employees hold with respect to an organization are, to a large extent, culturally determined.

Arab employees come from collectivist societies while non-Arab (Western) employees come from individualistic countries. The difference in the levels of commitment of Arabs and Westerners is based on cultural, personal, and job-related factors. The difference in the level of organizational commitment may be understood when we examine the differences between the two cultural dimensions, collectivism-individualism, of Arab and non-Arab societies (Western cultures). Allen, Miller, and Nath (1988) noted that employees with collectivist orientation are committed to their organizations for moral reasons while employees with individualistic orientation are committed to their organizations for calculative reasons. These two cultural dimensions (individualism versus collectivism) may have particular relevance for the differences in the levels of organizational commitment of Arab and non-Arab employees. By understanding the attitudes and behaviors of domestic and international employees toward Saudi organizations, management and personnel can enhance and motivate acceptable work-related commitment, which contributes to better performance and lower turnover. Consistently, researchers in organizational behavior and industrial and applied psychology have shown that commitment is an important factor in understanding work-related behaviors of employees.

For these reasons, researchers should put more effort into exploring organizational research that can be used to guide management in Saudi organizations toward more effective strategies to help retain committed employees. Furthermore, empirical studies such as organizational commitment research on workforce diversity in Saudi Arabia are
useful for the purpose of cross-national comparison of the levels of commitment among employees from different countries. Randall (1993) encouraged this type of cross cultural studies.

Generally, it is believed that highly committed employees have great levels of attachment, high levels of involvement, high levels of productivity, high levels of willingness to stay with the organization and maintain its membership, and high levels of willingness to accept organizational goals, values, and responsibilities. Putti, Aryee, and Liang (1989) contended that the interest in organizational commitment comes from its important linkage with such work-related behaviors as absenteeism, retention, turnover, and performance of employees. Additionally, Sussmann and Vecchio (1982) argued that commitment also has been linked to intentions to engage in a variety of work behaviors.

The great majority of researchers, including Becker and Billings (1993), Cohen (1993), Cohen and Gattiker (1992), Meyer, Bobocel, and Allen (1991), Mowday, Steers, and Porter (1979), Mueller and Price (1990), and Somers (1995), concluded in their studies that job satisfaction is not a reliable predictor of the commitment, turnover, and attachment of employees to their organizations. However, Mowday, Steers, and Porter (1979) indicated that organizational commitment is a more reliable predictor of employees' intentions to leave their organizations than job satisfaction, for the following reasons: (1) commitment is believed to be a more global response to the organization as a whole than job satisfaction, which focuses on the response to one's job; (2) commitment emphasizes an employee's attachment to the entire employing organization, while job satisfaction
emphasizes the specific environment around the individual's specific job; and (3) organizational commitment of employees is more stable over time than job satisfaction.

In summary, employees from different cultures may have different levels of commitment to Saudi petrochemical companies. This applies to Arab and non-Arab employees working in Saudi organizations. The variation in the level of organizational commitment may be influenced by personal demographics and job differences as well as cultural beliefs and values that employees bring with them when they join Saudi organizations.

Purpose of the Study

The objective of this study was to empirically investigate whether there are differences between Arab and non-Arab employees with regard to their levels of commitment to Saudi petrochemical companies. Specifically, the investigator examined differences in the levels of commitment to Saudi petrochemical companies between the two groups of employees on the basis of their personal characteristics, which include ethnicity, place of birth, nationality, education, and age. This empirical study also included the investigation of the difference in the levels of commitment between the two groups of employees on the basis of their job-related variables, which included managerial versus non-managerial position, contract versus non-contract employment, job pay, and organizational tenure.

Finally, the researcher investigated the differences in the levels of commitment to Saudi petrochemical companies between any two selected nationalities in this study. For example, the researcher investigated the difference in the levels of commitment of Saudis
and other Arab nationalities working in Saudi petrochemical companies. Also, the researcher investigated the difference in the levels of organizational commitment between some other Arab nationalities (excluding Saudis) and Western nationalities working in Saudi petrochemical companies in Jubail Industrial City.

Scope of the Study

The major thrust of this study is based on demographic and job-related variables as predictors of employees' commitment to Saudi petrochemical companies. Also, this study focused on attitudinal commitment rather than behavioral commitment and demographic and job-related variables rather than organizational variables to compare domestic and expatriate employees' commitment to Saudi petrochemical companies. In this study, the researcher included some literature to explain the linkage between organizational commitment and demographics and job-related variables. The justification of the use of personal demographic and job-related variables in this study was discussed. Additionally, the investigator explained the importance of attitudes in predicting the intentional behavior as well as the actual behavior of employees. Careful interpretation of such attitudes and behaviors may lead management to determine whether an employee may leave or stay in the organization.

In this study, the researcher also included a cross-national comparison of commitment to Saudi petrochemical companies on the basis of personal demographics and job-related variables. Literature on cross-national commitment has provided theoretical foundations for this study. Primarily, the model of organizational commitment developed by Steers (1977) and the definition of organizational commitment and measurement
instrument developed by Porter, Steers, Mowday, and Boulian (1974) are the basis of this study. With respect to the attitudes of employees that can predict their work-related behaviors, this study covered some literature pertaining to how employees' attitudes influence their behaviors to leave or stay in the organization. Researchers have established theoretical bases that explained the linkage between attitudinal commitment and some personal demographics and job-related variables.

This study included archival data as well as interview data. Archival data included performance, absenteeism, and the actual turnover of employees of interest in Saudi petrochemical companies. Archival data were obtained from the participating companies' records. Voluntary short interviews with personnel, managers, and supervisors were conducted to collect data about participating employees' commitment-related attitudes and behaviors in Saudi petrochemical companies. Also, interviews and companies' records provided the researcher with a second source of personal demographics and job-related factors. In selecting the appropriate measurement of organizational commitment, the investigator discussed some of the advantages that the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) developed by Porter et al. (1974) has over other organizational commitment scales. Thus, justification of the use of Porter et al.'s (1974) Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) included significant studies in which researchers used and validated this instrument.

Statement of the Problem

Recently, cross-national management has been extended to the area of organizational commitment. Thus, some researchers, such as Boyacigiller and Adler
Lincoln and Kalleberg (1985), Luthans, McCaul, and Dodd (1985), Marsh and Mannari (1977), and Near (1989) argued that there have been some cross-cultural studies on organizational commitment in the United States and abroad, but Randall (1993) argued that only a few researchers have adopted comparative perspectives. These studies focused on advanced industrial societies such as Japan, Canada, and the United States. However, the findings of studies in other countries, particularly Western countries, cannot be generalized to Saudi Arabia because of cultural differences. Hofstede (1993) believed that the lack of success in economic development of other countries should be sufficient indication of the inappropriateness of Western management theories in non-Western countries.

Although cross-national studies have been conducted in Saudi Arabia by Al-Meer (1989), At-Twaijri (1989), and Yavas, Luqmani, and Quraeshi (1990), they were limited in their coverage to some personal demographics and nationalities. Moreover, these studies included Saudi and some non-Arab nationalities in multinational corporations and then generalized the results to all Arab and non-Arab nationalities working in Saudi organizations. Researchers should be careful about such generalization to other cultures.

Researchers must consider that there are some problems associated with this generalization: (1) Wetzel and Gallagher (1990) concluded in their comparative study of organizational commitment among workers in the cooperative and private sectors that the type of ownership of a company may become an influencing variable when researchers investigate the commitment of employees to their organizations; (2) Palich, Horn, and Griffeth (1995) argued the validity of the globalization of American theory, practice, and
findings to other cultures; and (3) Ali and Al-Shakhs (1985) asserted that researchers should be careful about generalizing complete validity to any theoretical and personal observations that might assume a similarity of Arab values in various Arab countries. These studies imply that there are cultural differences between Arab and non-Arab cultures, as well as within Arab cultures. These differences could influence the attitudes and behaviors of employees toward their organizations. Certainly, these attitudes and behaviors include the attitudinal commitment of employees toward their organizations.

Although non-Saudi Arab employees constitute a great percentage of the workforce in Saudi Arabia and contribute significantly to the economic development in Saudi Arabia, they have been ignored by many organizational behavior researchers. Thus, Al-Meer (1989) suggested that studying the commitment of Arab employees in Saudi Arabia would be enlightening in accepting or refuting the generalizability of results obtained from Saudi, Asian, and Western employees working in Saudi organizations. In support of Al-Meer's (1989) recommendation, Randall (1993), Yavas, Luqmani, and Quraeshi (1990), and Ronen (1986) believed that there is strong evidence for the presence of Anglo, Germanic, Nordic, Latin European, and Latin American cross-cultural studies, while more research appears to be needed on Arabs. Yavas, Luqmani, and Quraeshi (1990) suggested the investigation of Arab employees' commitment to establish the cross-validity of management theories and concepts in the Arab world. Cohen and Gattiker (1992) contended that cross-national studies would facilitate future cross-national comparisons concerning the concept of organizational commitment.
The research questions addressed in this study are: (1) Is there a difference in the level of commitment to Saudi petrochemical companies between Arab and non-Arab employees? and (2) Is there a difference in the level of commitment between employees working in Saudi petrochemical companies on the basis of their demographic and job-related variables? These two questions are followed by hypotheses at the end of the literature chapter II, the literature review chapter, to examine if there are differences in the level of commitment between these groups of employees on the basis of their demographics and job-related variables. In summary, a review of literature revealed that there is a need for the investigation of the organizational commitment of Arab and non-Arab employees working in Saudi organizations.

Significance of the Study

This study may contribute to the growing body of literature in the areas of comparative management research and international management. Cross-national studies on commitment are helpful in building effective organizational recruitment on the basis of the level of commitment of both domestic and international employees to Saudi organizations. This is because commitment relates to organizational effectiveness, turnover, involvement, and organizational performance. Globally, this research can be useful for a practical purpose as well as a theoretical one. This implies that global human resource managers as well as academicians can benefit from the findings of this study by increasing their knowledge concerning attitudes and behaviors of domestic and expatriate employees in Saudi organizations. Additionally, cross-national research on organizational commitment in Saudi Arabia can increase our knowledge toward building a theory of
commitment because it must explain not only the presence of commitment in some individuals but its absence in others, as stated by Scott (1971). This leads to the necessity of investigating cross-national differences. Also, the findings of this study can help practitioners and researchers predict differences in employees’ organizational commitment through a general theory of commitment.

Although the researcher conducted this study in the area of organizational commitment, the findings can help management to select the appropriate organizational motivation approach that increases the level of commitment of both domestic and international employees. For personnel, this study may contribute to the selection process by focusing effort on personal demographics and job-related variables and their relationships to organizational commitment. Personnel may link the reward system to the levels of organizational commitment of individuals seeking employment. Also, organizations may choose to keep committed employees regardless of their nationalities and ethnicities because their commitment, a major concern, is linked to organizational effectiveness.

For international managers in Saudi organizations, learning how to facilitate the commitment process of international employees is important to help them overcome cultural barriers that may affect their performance and eventually their intentions to leave the organization. With regard to recruitment, the commitment of employees to the organization can influence them to contribute to the organization’s effectiveness; thus, management and personnel may focus in their recruitment policy on highly committed employees. This implies that organizations may pay employees according to their levels of commitment and
involvement in their organizations. The personal demographics of an employee can guide personnel in recruiting the right employee for the organization. For example, the nationality and ethnicity of an employee may tell us about his or her level of commitment to the organization.

This study can be helpful in understanding cultural differences of employees because they play a major role in employees' commitment to their organizations. To see how commitment may differ from one culture to another, Hofstede (1980) found that the commitment of individuals to their organizations is primarily moral in non-Western countries while it is primarily calculative in Western countries. He also argued that organizational policies are based on the loyalty of an employee in non-Western countries. Since productivity is a major factor in the success of an organization, it is important to focus on the recruitment of highly committed employees who contribute to its achievement.

The results of this study are significant to the field of organizational development by identifying highly committed employees who accept and believe in organizational changes that are meant to increase the effectiveness of the organization. Employees committed to the goals of an organization are more likely to accept organizational change than those who are not committed to them. Understanding the demographics of committed employees may make it much easier for the management of an organization to appoint them to positions critical to facilitating the organizational change process.

The contributions of this study may go beyond organizational effectiveness and organizational development to include strategic management. Planners of organizational strategies may benefit from the results of this cross-national study by allocating highly
committed employees to plan and implement organizational strategies effectively.

Efficiency is an important factor in global organizational competitiveness; thus, highly committed employees become an important issue in sustaining the marketing position of an organization. Globally, highly committed employees are considered a sustainable competitive advantage that gives a company the lead in the marketplace over others.

Definitions and Operationalizations of Constructs

Organizational Commitment

The topic of organizational commitment has been defined by researchers in many different ways, but this study focuses on attitudinal and behavioral definitions, with more emphasis on the former. Some researchers have focused on the attitudinal approach of organizational commitment, while others have directed attentions toward the behavioral approach to explain employees' commitment to their organizations. The simplicity and easiness of applying the attitudinal approach have encouraged many researchers to use it.

The integration of the two approaches has been suggested by DeCotiis and Summers (1987), Kalleberg and Berg (1987), Mowday, Porter, and Steers (1982), Steers (1977), and Yoon, Baker, and Ko (1994), who viewed commitment as the degree to which an employee identifies with the goals and values of the organization and is willing to exert effort to help it succeed. Therefore, the investment of effort in the organization involves attitudes and intentional behaviors that lead to the achievement of organizational goals. These two approaches to commitment imply five major characteristics of committed employees: (1) internalization of the values and goals of the organization, (2) desire to stay
in the organization over an extended period of time, (3) involvement in an organizational role, (4) willingness to exert effort in the interest of the organization's goals and values, and (5) loyalty to the organization.

Recently, McCaul, Hinsz, and McCaul (1995) suggested that organizational commitment may be defined as a global attitude that employees have toward the organization. Therefore, attitudinal commitment goes far beyond passive loyalty to the organization. Specifically, it represents a state in which an individual identifies with a particular organization and its goals and wishes to maintain its membership in order to achieve these goals. It also involves an active relationship with the organization such that employees are willing to exert extra effort in order to contribute to the organization's overall well-being.

One of the classical definitions of organizational commitment was by Buchanan (1974), who viewed it attitudinally and defined it as a partisan, affective attachment to the goals and values of an organization, to one's role in relation to goals and values, and to the organization for its own sake, apart from its purely instrumental worth. These views of organizational commitment focused on affective and evaluative reaction toward the organization. Zaccaro and Dobbins (1989) argued that most definitions of organizational commitment stressed the psychological bindings of employees to the entire organization.

Concerning behavioral commitment, researchers such as Wiener and Gechman (1977) defined organizational commitment as socially accepted behaviors that exceed formal and/or normative expectations relevant to the object of commitment. In an early conceptualization, Becker (1960) described commitment, in a general view, as a disposition
to engage in consistent lines of activity as a result of the accumulation of side bets that would be lost if the activities were discontinued. He referred these side bets to personal investments such as effort, time, friendship, tenure, promotion, career, and financial gain. Similarly, Hrebiniak and Alutto (1972) defined commitment as a structural phenomenon that occurs as a result of individual-organizational transactions and alteration in side bets over time. Salanick (1977) believed that commitment is a state of being in which an individual becomes bound by his or her actions. Thus, these actions and activities require the individual's own involvement to sustain them.

For Ferris and Aranya (1983), the attitudes that seem to tap the moral development of commitment include (1) identification with the organization, such as acceptance of its goals; (2) involvement in organizational activities; and (3) loyalty to the organization. On the other hand, the behavioral intention variables include (1) a willingness to exert effort and (2) a desire to remain in the organization. Regarding commitment as an attachment, Redding, Norman, and Schlander (1994) used the term to signify the psychological state of the relationship between an individual and an organization. It is intended to subsume the notion of commitment within it, the latter being seen as more specific and limited in its application.

The classical attitudinal/intentional behavior definition by Porter et al. (1974) focused on organizational commitment as the strength of an individual's identification with and involvement in a particular organization. They suggested that the concept has at least three major components: (1) a strong belief in and acceptance of the organization's goals and values; (2) a willingness to invest considerable effort on behalf of the organization; and
(3) a strong desire to remain in and maintain identification with the organization. The review of literature on the definitions of organizational commitment focused on these major issues: (1) exertion of extra effort beyond that expected from employees (extraordinary effort), (2) pride in the organization, (3) desire to stay in the organization, (4) internalization with the values and goals of the organization, (5) willingness to accept any job in the organization in order to keep its membership, (6) loyalty to the organization, and (7) considering the organization the best of all organizations.

This study used the definition and the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire developed by Porter et al. (1974) to define and measure employees’ commitment to their organizations because they are more related to the construct than other definitions and scales some researchers used. The definition and measure developed by Porter et al. (1974) have been used by the majority of organizational commitment studies. Table 1 shows the definitions of constructs as well as their operational definitions.

**Personal Demographics**

These are the different personal demographics that identify one person from another, which employees bring with them to the employing organization. These different demographics are more attached to the person than to the job. For this study, these personal demographics include place of birth, nationality, ethnicity, education, and age of an employee.

Place of birth refers to the country in which an employee was born while nationality refers to the citizenship of a particular country an employee may hold. In this study, there are two groups of employees on the basis of their place of birth. These two groups are
employees born in Saudi Arabia and employees born in other countries. Ethnicity of an employee pertains to whether he or she is an Arab or non-Arab. In this study, age refers to the human life in years from the day an employee was born to the time he or she was surveyed.

**Job-related Factors**

These are job-based factors that are linked to the job itself. Some of these factors are job pay, job type, tenure, and employment type. Type of job refers to whether an employee has a managerial job or non-managerial job. Non-managerial job employees include those who perform managerial support functions and/or technical support activities. Organizational tenure is the length of time an employee has been with the company when he or she completed the survey. Type of employment refers to whether an employee has a contract employment or lifetime employment (non-contract). According to Saudi petrochemical companies, annual low pay is about $40,000 and below while annual high pay is $50,000 and above. This study is not concerned with investigating employees with middle pay. Western employees are paid much more than the Saudi employees because they do not have some of the benefits that Saudis have such as housing program ownership. Most of other Arab employees are paid less than Western or Saudi employees.

**Table 1. Constructs, Definitions of Constructs, and Operational Definitions of Constructs.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Definition of Construct</th>
<th>Operational Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Commitment</td>
<td>The strength of an individual’s identification with and involvement in a particular organization (Porter, Steers, Mowday, and Boulian, 1974)</td>
<td>OCQ developed by Porter et al. (1974) which contains items that measure the global commitment of employees to their organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>Definition of Construct</th>
<th>Operational Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OCQ items include: (1) a strong belief in and acceptance of the organization's goals and values; (2) extra involvement; (3) pride; (4) loyalty; (5) intent to leave the organization; (6) compliance with the organizational policies; (7) little to gain from the organization; (8) inspiration; (9) desire to stay in the organization; (10) care about the organization; (11) acceptance of any job assignment; (12) great organization; (13) best of all possible organizations; (14) right employment choice; and (15) seeking employment in another organization</td>
<td>Participant can express agreement or disagreement on a seven-point Likert scale, ranging from &quot;strongly disagree&quot; to &quot;strongly agree&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Personal Demographics | These are characteristics that identify one person from another | Participants were asked to respond to some of these personal demographics that are the focus of this study |

| Place of Birth | “Please state the country of your birth” | Employees born in Saudi Arabia = 1 and employees born in other countries = 2 |

<p>| Nationality | “Please state your nationality” | Saudis = 1, Palestinians = 2, Egyptians = 3, British = 4, Sudanese = 5, and Americans = 6 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>Definition of Construct</th>
<th>Operational Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>“Please state your ethnicity”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Arabs = 1 and non-Arabs (Westerners) = 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>“Please state your level of education”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High school and below = 1 and college degree and above = 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>“Please state your age”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Young employees (40 years and under) = 1 and old employees (41 years and more) = 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job-related</td>
<td>These are characteristics linked to the job such as pay, job type, tenure, and type of employment</td>
<td>Subjects were asked to respond to questions pertaining to their jobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Job</td>
<td>“Please state whether you have a managerial or non-managerial job</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Managerial job</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-managerial job</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Managerial employees = 1 and non-managerial employees = 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>“Please state your length of service in this organization” (You may state service less than one year)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>Definition of Construct</th>
<th>Operational Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>_ Short tenure employee (6 years and less)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>_ Long tenure employee (7 years and more)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Employment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Please state your employment type&quot;</td>
<td>Contract = 1 and non-contract = 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Contract employee = 1 and non-contract employee = 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pay (Optional)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Please state your job pay&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low pay employees ($40,000 and below) = 1 and high pay employees ($50,000 and above) = 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Theoretical Model

Steers (1977) developed a model that explains the relationship between commitment and its antecedents. Also, the model explains the relationship between commitment and its consequences. Thus, this model provides the theoretical framework for this study. It consists of two parts: (1) antecedents of commitment and (2) outcomes of commitment. The first three parts of the model are called organizational commitment antecedents or predictors while the second part is called organizational commitment consequences (outcomes).
The first component of the model suggests that personal characteristics, job
characteristics, and work experiences can influence organizational commitment. The
second component suggests that organizational commitment can influence organizational
outcomes, which include performance, retention, attendance, and desire and intent to
remain in the organization. The model was designed primarily to test the antecedents and
consequences of organizational commitment and it proved to be relevant and useful for this
study. Numerous studies have examined the effects of personal demographics and job-
related factors on organizational commitment using Steers's (1977) model.

For a theoretical purpose, the researcher integrated the model developed by Steers
(1977) with Fishbein and Ajzen’s (1975) attitude-behavior model, which explains the
influence of beliefs and attitudes on the organizational commitment and its outcomes. This
attitude-behavior model is helpful in predicting employees’ organizational commitment.
Also, this theoretical model explains how we can predict the behaviors of individuals from
their attitudes. In general, the model has more advantages over other organizational
commitment models. The simplicity of Steers’s (1977) model is one of its greatest
advantages over other organizational commitment models.

The research model, as explained in chapter II in the theoretical framework under
the research model of organizational commitment, focuses on the relationship between
organizational commitment and its predictors, personal demographics and job-related
factors. Figure 1 shows the theoretical models of Steers (1977) and Ajzen and Fishbien
(1980) combined. The portion of the theoretical model inside the dotted rectangle is the
research model, which is the focus of this study.
Figure 1. A theoretical model of antecedents and outcomes of organizational commitment
Porter, Steers, Mowday, and Boulian's (1974) commitment model is applicable to test the hypotheses of this study. It contains the items defined by many researchers who referred to it as the psychological model. The model predicted employees' commitment to their organization in previous studies with high reliability and validity. The model states that employees who are committed to their organization are characterized by the following: (1) a willingness to exert extra effort on behalf of the organization, (2) a definite desire to maintain organizational membership, and (3) a strong belief in and acceptance of the organization's values and goals. Furthermore, Porter et al. (1974) included these items in their Organizational Commitment Questionnaire scale that are useful, meaningful, and instrumental in measuring employees' organizational commitment.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Cross-national commitment comparison is helpful in developing a global theory about employees' commitment. The literature review of this study is organized into fifteen sections. Section one concerns the development of organizational commitment. Section two covers antecedents of organizational commitment. Section three focuses on the consequences of organizational commitment. Section four concerns building organizational commitment. Section five is about cross-national studies on commitment. Section six is a comparison of attitudinal commitment and behavioral commitment approaches. Section seven covers the literature on personal demographics as a predictor of organizational commitment. Section eight is a discussion of important job-related factors as a predictor of organizational commitment. Section nine is about the significance of relationships between recruitment, commitment, and the demographics of employees. Section ten sheds light on Saudi Basic Industries and their petrochemical companies in Jubail Industrial City, the site of this study. Section eleven focuses on the organizational commitment research model. The research model was basically driven from the theoretical model developed by Steers (1977). The research model contains some of the components of the theoretical model with the focus on personal demographics and job-related factors to explain their influence on organizational commitment. Section twelve is a discussion of the relationship between
commitment and each of the personal demographics variables. Section thirteen is about the relationship between commitment and each of the job-based variables. Section fourteen covers the hypotheses that were developed for investigation. Section fifteen is a short summary of this chapter.

Development of Organizational Commitment

It is important to understand two major theoretical approaches that have emerged from previous literature about the development of organizational commitment. These two major approaches have been discussed by Mowday, Porter, and Steers (1982) as follows: First, commitment has been viewed by researchers and practitioners as an attitude of attachment to the employing organization that leads to particular job-related behaviors. Second, literature on organizational commitment has emerged with a focus on the implications of certain types of behavior for subsequent attitudes. Respectively, the first approach emphasizes the influence of the individual's attitudes on behavior, while the second approach focuses on the influence of the individual's behaviors on attitudes to shape his or her commitment to the organization. An acceptable explanation of the second approach, as Salanick (1977) contended, is that employees who freely choose to behave in a certain way and find their decisions difficult to change become committed to the chosen behavior and develop attitudes that match their choices.

Mowday, Porter, and Steers (1982) identified three stages in the development of organizational commitment: (1) pre-entry or pre-employment, called the anticipation period; (2) early employment, called the initiation period; and (3) middle- and late-career employment, called the entrenchment period. The pre-employment period is characterized
by employees' anticipation of certain things from the employing organization. This means that different goals, values, and expectations of new employees can influence their initial commitment to the organization. New employees may have goals and values they need to fulfill through employment. Therefore, congruence between an employee's values and the employing organization's values must exist in order for the employee to satisfy his or her needs and values without jeopardizing organizational interests.

Early employment, or the initiation stage is characterized mainly by personal influences, which include the demographics and expectations of employees. Mowday and McDade (1980) found first-day commitment to be related to commitment after one month. This explains the notion that employees who enter the organization with high levels of commitment are likely to put forth extra effort and to engage in behaviors that are productive and congruent with the members of the organization.

Finally, post-employment, or the entrenchment stage, is characterized by the increase in organizational tenure, or length of service. The greater the length of service, the more likely the employee will stay with the organization. Becker's (1960) side-bet theory demonstrates that commitment increases as the size and number of side bets increase. Side bets refer to an employee's personal investment in the organization, which includes time, effort, promotion, pay, friendships, position, and tenure. Clearly, this theory explains how organizational tenure can increase employees' commitment as their investment increases.
The Traditional Antecedents of Organizational Commitment

The review of literature showed that researchers used four kinds of organizational commitment antecedents: personal demographics/personal characteristics, job characteristics, work experiences, and organizational characteristics. The focus of this study is on personal demographics and job-related factors as antecedents of organizational commitment. In his investigation of antecedents and outcomes of organizational commitment, Steers (1977) concluded that personal characteristics include those variables that define the individual demographically. He provided a conceptual explanation for the apparent relationship between demographic variables and commitment by suggesting that commitment operates as a form of exchange. These demographic characteristics are significantly related to organizational commitment. Some of the most common personal characteristics and job-related factors are age, education, tenure, and pay.

Steers (1977) strongly argued that the ability to replicate the findings across other studies suggests that these variables may represent relatively stable antecedents of organizational commitment. His findings showed that commitment is positively and significantly associated with some of the demographic variables, while it is negatively and significantly associated with others. In this line of literature, Al-Meer (1989), Cohen (1993), Cohen and Gattiker (1992), DeCotiis and Summers (1987), Hunt and Morgan (1994), Oliver (1990), Salanick (1977), and Steers (1977) found a positive relationship between age of employees and the level of commitment to their organizations. Becker (1960) provided an explanation for the positive relationship between an employee's commitment and age by hypothesizing that when employees grow older, they have
investment in their organizations, so their commitment becomes calculative by evaluating
the costs and benefits associated with leaving or staying with the organization. Another
alternative explanation was provided by March and Simon (1958), who noted that, as age
increases, the employee's opportunities for alternative employment become more limited.
These limited opportunities decrease the individual's degree of freedom and mobility to
look for alternatives, which in turn increases his or her psychological attachment to the
employing organization.

On the other hand, the findings of Angle and Perry (1983), Glisson and Durick (1988), Mottaz (1989), and Sager and Johnston (1989) showed a negative relationship
between the level of education and the organizational commitment of employees. Ritzer
and Trice (1969) provided a logical explanation for the negative relationship between the
level of education of employees and their commitment. They believed that employees with
a low level of education have fewer opportunities outside their organizations. Therefore,
they tend to stay with their current organizations, and eventually their levels of commitment
increase. However, employees with a high level of education have many employment
alternatives that can influence their psychological attachment to the organization.
Eventually, their intentions to leave the organization increase. Mowday, Porter, and Steers
(1982) provided another explanation by stating that more highly educated employees have
expectations that the organization may be unable to fulfill, and therefore they leave it.

Job pay is considered one of the most investigated antecedents of organizational
commitment. Pay is a predictor of employees' commitment as found by Cohen and
Gattiker (1994) and Sager (1991). Many researchers agreed that difference in employees'
pay means a difference in the levels of their organizational commitment. Employees with high pay may report higher levels of organizational commitment than employees with low pay. According to Becker's (1960) side-bet theory, pay is viewed as a personal investment by an employee; thus, high pay employees may have a higher level of intentions to stay with their organizations than low pay employees. To maintain and increase their high pay status, employees stay with their organizations.

Tsui, Egan, and O'Reilly (1992) showed that difference in tenure is associated with the attachment variables. Difference in the length of employees' tenure may influence their levels of organizational commitment. The greater the difference in tenure, the more the individual becomes psychologically committed to his or her organization. The length of service of an employee has influence on his or her intention to stay with the organization. In short, the difference in tenure of employees can influence the difference in their levels of organizational commitment.

In summary, the findings of Lee, Ashford, Walsh, and Mowday (1992) and Randall (1993) supported the notion that the personal characteristics individuals bring to organizations help shape subsequent work attitudes and behaviors during organizational entry. They explained how personal demographics affect subsequent work attitudes and behaviors. Also, the difference in job-based variables of employees plays a major role in their levels of commitment to their organization.

The Consequences of Organizational Commitment

There is a significant relationship between organizational commitment and each of its consequences. DeCotiis and Summers (1987), Ferris and Aranya (1983), Jaros,
Jermier, Kohler, and Sincich (1993), Marsh and Mannari (1977), McNeilly and Russ (1992), Pierce and Dunham (1987), Russ and McNeilly (1995), and Somers (1995) investigated the effect of organizational commitment on different work-related behaviors of individuals such as turnover, absenteeism, and performance. They found a significant relationship between commitment and each of these individual behaviors.

As a consequence of organizational commitment, Clegg (1983), Cotton and Tuttle (1986), and Hackett, Bycio, and Hausdorf (1991) found absenteeism to be negatively and significantly correlated with organizational commitment of employees. The higher the level of commitment of employees to their work organization, the less they are absent from their work. Bluedorn (1982), Halaby and Weakliem (1989), and Price and Mueller (1986) believed that a high level of commitment is more likely to reduce turnover. This is why some researchers, including Koch and Steers (1978) and Steers (1977), believed that organizational commitment is a better predictor of the turnover of employees than is job satisfaction, which has been found to be a less reliable predictor of turnover. Clearly and consistently, the findings of Porter et al. (1974) revealed that organizational commitment of employees decreases prior to their turnover.

Recently, a study by Somers (1995) indicated that there is a significant negative relationship between organizational commitment and each of turnover and absenteeism. Commitment is strongly related to leaving the organization and withdrawal intentions. These findings are consistent with prior studies such as Jaros et al. (1993), Mathieu and Zajac (1990), and Randall’s (1990). On the other hand, Angle and Perry (1981), Blau (1986), Chelte and Tausky (1986), DeCotiis and Summers (1987), Jenner (1984),
O'Reilly and Chatman (1986), and Zahra (1984) showed that extra-role prosocial behavior, dollar amount pledged, attendance, participation, quality and quantity of work, tardiness, effort, hours worked, organizational effectiveness, and even operating expenses are outcomes of organizational commitment.

Angle and Perry (1981) found a significant positive relationship between overall organizational commitment and organizational effectiveness. In their study, organizational effectiveness was measured by operating expenses as an indicator of effectiveness. Additionally, they argued that organizational commitment is significantly and positively related to organizational adaptability. Verma and McKersie's (1987) findings showed a strong relationship between organizational commitment and employees' productivity improvement. That is, employees' high levels of organizational commitment increase their organizational productivity.

According to Angle and Perry (1981) and Blau (1986), tardiness is negatively correlated with commitment. Meyer, Paunonen, Gellatly, Goffin, and Jackson (1989) found that employees who are effectively committed to the organization are performing at a higher level than those who are not. Some investigators, such as Mathieu and Zajac (1990) and Randall (1990), have found a significant linkage between organizational commitment and the performance of employees. Similarly, Brown (1969) indicated that there is a positive relationship between organizational identification, which is considered one of the dimensions of commitment by many researchers, and the performance of employees. The higher the level of the employees' organizational commitment, the higher their performance in the organization. Finally, Chow (1994) suggested that commitment leads to the desire to
stay in the organization, reduction in absenteeism, increase in performance, increase in organizational membership and identity, and intent to be involved in the organization. Consistently, researchers found that organizational commitment is a reliable predictor of work outcomes such as turnover, absenteeism, and performance.

In summary, these studies showed that organizational commitment of employees is positively and strongly associated with their performance, output quantity and quality, and organizational membership and identity. It is also negatively and strongly associated with voluntary turnover, absenteeism, and tardiness. Generally, organizational commitment is associated with many organizational outcomes.

Building Organizational Commitment

Recently, according to Walton (1991), many manufacturing companies, particularly in the United States, have shifted from the traditional approach to managing their workforce to a commitment-strategy approach. This approach focuses on broader job design that enhances employees' commitment to the organization. Teamwork and participation by employees in the planning and implementation of organizational strategy are encouraged by top management to tie employees to their organizations. Walton concluded that hierarchical levels have been removed or reduced in some successful companies and that many organizational activities have been combined at lower organizational levels. Walton added that some companies adopted the relatively new approaches of stock ownership and profit sharing of their economic gains with their employees. These new trends are designed to build employees' commitment to the organization.
The benefits of the commitment-oriented approach as discussed by Walton (1991) can be observed in a low turnover of employees, reduction in operating and support personnel costs, and the development of human skills and individual self-esteem. Another way to improve employees' commitment to the organization was suggested by Elliott and Hall (1994), who believed that through the formalization of work activities an organization can build commitment. Formalization of activities includes rules, procedures, and policies to the extent that the mission, goals, and values of the company are clearly explicit. Elliott and Hall (1994) suggested that management should effectively define, communicate, institutionalize, and reward employees' organizational ethical values and desirable work behaviors.

Some researchers, including Lahiry (1994), have suggested the integration of organizational commitment into the culture of the organization in order to build it in employees. Researchers believed that the employees' culture(s) can influence their attitudes and behaviors toward organizational culture. Thus, employees' commitment to their organizations may be affected by their culture(s) too. Experts on organizational development must be able to predict certain attitudes and behaviors based on the patterns of organizational culture so that attitudes and behaviors that identify employees with their organization can be enhanced through organizational culture. This can be achieved by making the desirable attitudes and behaviors the core principle in the business mission of an organization.

Caldwell, Chatman, and O'Reilly (1990), Kanter (1968), Pascale (1985), and Van Maanen and Schein (1979) believed that commitment to an organization may be affected
positively by specific socialization practices. They all agreed that socialization processes can foster better understanding of organizational values, norms, and objectives and, subsequently, increase commitment. Pascale (1985) provided a useful approach by incorporating both recruitment and socialization issues into content and process issues. Pascale argued that organizations with effective recruitment and socialization programs use a specific set of techniques. Overall, the importance of recruitment and socialization stems from their significant influence on organizational commitment.

Buchanan (1974) argued that the social interaction of an employee with coworkers and superiors is important to building their commitment to the organization. He identified years of service in the organization and social interaction with peers or superiors as crucial commitment-relevant experiences. Managers have a great responsibility for enhancing the level of commitment of employees through different motivational methods. Buchanan (1974) argued that the commitment of managers is essential for the survival and effectiveness of large work organizations because the fundamental responsibility of management is to maintain the organization in a healthy state.

Organizational Commitment in Cross-national Studies

In the last two decades, many researchers, both Arabs and non-Arabs, have become interested in Saudi Arabia because of its vital role in the world's economy and peace stability. Also, Saudi Arabia has gained the attention of both individuals seeking employment and international investors looking for business opportunities. However, organizational behavior research in Saudi Arabia, particularly organizational commitment,
has received little attention by scholars. Specifically, commitment studies have been limited to traditional variables such as age, education, and tenure.

Ali's (1989) study about managerial beliefs in Saudi Arabia and Iraq, Ali and Al-Shakhs' (1985) study about managerial values in Saudi Arabia, and Yavas, Luqmani, and Quraeshi's (1990) comparative study on organizational commitment and the job satisfaction of Saudi and expatriate managers are examples of studies that included such limitations. Empirically, At-Twaijri (1989) investigated and compared the managerial values of American and Saudi employees in U.S.-related firms in Saudi Arabia. The study did not include employees from Saudi-owned organizations because the organization's nationality or ownership may influence the managerial values of domestic and expatriate managers toward it. This means that the match between both the nationality of an employee and the nationality of an organization may influence his or her level of commitment to it. Arab nationalities working in Saudi companies and U.S. firms are absent in At-Twaijri's study.

Similarly, Al-Meer (1989) examined the levels of organizational commitment of Saudis, Asians, and Westerners on a limited number of personal variables such as age, tenure, and education. Al-Meer's study did not investigate the levels of organizational commitment of other Arab nationalities in Saudi organizations, but it suggested exploring organizational commitment of Arab nationalities in future research. The study also focused on clusters of cultures such as Saudi, Asian, and Western and used these cultures as if they were representative of nationalities.

In Al-Meer's (1989) study, only Saudi employees can be categorized as a nationality group. The term Asian workers includes Koreans, Filipinos, Taiwanese, Thai,
and other Asian nationalities. Classifying one ethnic group, such as Asians, under one nationalitiy would be misleading in the final analysis of the study if it was meant to investigate nationality as a variable in the investigation of organizational commitment differences among different nationalities. Arabs as an ethnic term includes many nationalities, such as Egyptians, Jordanians, Lebanese, Saudis, Sudanese, Palestinians, and others.

Recently, Yavas, Luqmani, and Quraeshi (1990) examined and compared the levels of commitment between Saudi and expatriate managers, including general managers, assistant general managers, and department heads in Saudi organizations. Since the term expatriates does not identify who they are, one can see that nationality and ethnicity are not examined in their study. Therefore, in their study, expatriates is a generic term that includes all foreign labor in Saudi Arabia. Thus, their findings may not give sufficient and accurate information about the level of organizational commitment of a specific nationality that may have been included in their study.

Researchers interested in cross-national organizational commitment studies may include expatriates by country of origin, nationality, and ethnicity if they are trying to investigate the differences between two groups of employees, domestic and international. Therefore, ignoring nationality in cross-national studies as a predictor of organizational commitment is one of the major mistakes made by researchers. Similarly, ethnicity and place of birth, type of position, and type of employment of an employee can influence his or her level of commitment to the employing organization. These variables and others are thoroughly discussed in the theoretical framework section. Some of these variables have
not been studied by researchers who conducted commitment studies in Saudi organizations. Two important job-based factors, type of job and type of employment, as new predictors of organizational commitment in Saudi organizations may influence employees' commitment to those organizations.

**Attitudinal Commitment versus Behavioral Commitment**

The majority of researchers focused on attitudinal commitment to investigate the organizational commitment of employees to their organizations. Knoop (1995) concluded in his study of organizational commitment and job satisfaction that the attitudes of employees, which should be given attention, are reflected in tendencies to be involved in their employing organization either favorably or unfavorably. McDermott, Laschinger, and Shamian (1996) believed that employees with a strong attitudinal commitment remain with the organization because they want to, in contrast to employees with calculative commitment, who remain with the organization because they feel they need to.

According to Ajzen and Fishbein (1980), most researchers simply work on the assumption that the beliefs and attitudes of individuals can predict their behaviors. The beliefs of individuals can influence certain attitudes toward an object, for example an organization. These attitudes may result in intentional behaviors that may influence individuals to act in certain ways. An employee who believes that the organization is not treating him or her fairly may develop a hostile attitude before he or she leaves it. Salanick and Pfeffer (1978) contended that commitment influences the creation of attitudes from behaviors that constrain how individuals make sense of their reactions to their environment. Thus, Kaldenberg, Becker, and Zvonkovic (1995) argued that empirical research on
organizational commitment often emphasizes the psychological bond of commitment such as identification, involvement, and the desire of employees to stay with their employing organization. This type of commitment is typically investigated by a response-to-attitude instrument with affective types of items.

Empirically, Ajzen and Fishbein (1980) argued that there is evidence that factors such as demographics and attitudes of employees toward an object are sometimes related to the behaviors of interest. Specifically, a person's attitude toward any object can be seen as a function of his or her beliefs about the event, object, or phenomenon and the evaluative aspects of those beliefs. Therefore, to predict a single behavior, we have to assess the attitude of an individual toward the behavior and not his or her attitude toward the target at which the behavior is directed. Fishbein and Ajzen (1975) provided a schematic model of this approach as illustrated in Figure 2 below.

![Figure 2](image)

**Figure 2.** A model of the relationships between beliefs, attitudes, intentions, and behaviors toward a given subject.

Adapted from Fishbein and Ajzen (1975).

Ajzen and Fishbein (1980) and Fishbein and Ajzen (1975) argued that researchers can predict the behaviors of individuals from their attitudes toward the object or event and
that the measure of attitudes corresponds to the measure of behaviors. They argued that beliefs about an object, phenomenon, or event influence attitudes, intentions, and behaviors of the individual. They believed that the totality of an individual's beliefs serves as a predictor of his or her attitudes, intentions, and behaviors.

According to Ajzen and Fishbein (1977), this argument is consistently supported by many researchers. Kuruvilla and Fiorito (1994) emphasized the importance of attitudinal commitment as a critical influence on the individual willingness to work on behalf of the organization. Ajzen and Fishbein (1977) and Kuruvilla and Fiorito (1994) argued that attitudinal commitment of employees toward their organization leads to behavioral intentions, but that behavioral intentions also are influenced by subjective norms. Thus, employees who often complain about their organization are more likely to leave it for another one when the opportunity arises. Their expressed feelings, beliefs, and intentions may give information that they will actually leave the organization.

Ajzen and Fishbein (1980) believed that intention is the immediate determinant of behavior. Intentions provide the most accurate predictor of behavior when the appropriate measure of intention is obtained. Specifically, they noted that intentions are assumed to be the immediate antecedents of actions. They argued that the relation between intentions and behaviors depends on two factors: (1) the measure of intention has to correspond to the behavioral criterion in action, and (2) although it is possible to measure intentions to achieve the outcome, the predictive validity of intentions depends on the extent to which they lead to the performance of behaviors that control the outcome.
Fishbein and Ajzen (1975) suggested that intentions cause behaviors, but behavior is constrained by a number of other factors as well. Furthermore, attitudes can influence intentions to behave in some manner relevant to the event. Thus, Kuruvilla and Fiorito (1994) believed that willingness to act rather than the actual act is consistent with the theoretical notions behind the concept of commitment and the measurement of intentions rather than the measurement of behaviors. Similarly, Kuruvilla and Sverke's (1993) findings supported the notion that willingness to act is a strong predictor of actual behavior. McShane (1986) supported this notion by showing that willingness to work for the union and actual work in the same union correlate very highly ($r = .54$, $p < .001$).

Overall, the view of attitudes as seen by Ajzen and Fishbein (1980) is accompanied by general agreement among researchers that attitudes, no matter how we assess them, are among the many factors that influence the behaviors of individuals. This applies to the positive or negative attitudes that influence the behaviors of individuals toward their employing organizations. As a result of this change in behavior, the performance of employees may be positively or negatively influenced by the levels of their organizational commitment. In the case of low commitment, employees tend to have low performance and high absenteeism.

The choice researchers can make between an attitude approach or a behavior approach in studying commitment of employees to their employing organizations depends on (1) the degree of relationship between each of these two approaches and organizational commitment antecedents such as personal characteristics, and (2) the sensitivity of the issue under study. Furthermore, researchers on organizational behavior such as Gunz and Gunz
(1994), Kuruvilla and Fiorito (1994), Lee et al. (1992), McCaul, Hinsz, and McCaul
(1995), Mowday, Steers, and Porter (1979), Porter et al. (1974), and Somers (1995) have
centered their attention on attitudinal commitment more than behavioral commitment.
Mottaz (1987) argued that, while the attitudinal perspective of organizational commitment is
more favored by many researchers than the behavioral perspective, consideration of the two
perspectives suggests more similarities than differences.

Globally, Randall's (1993) cross-national studies on organizational commitment
between 1977 and 1993 showed that twenty-two out of twenty-seven studies used the
attitudinal approach to commitment. The majority (15) of these studies reviewed by
Randall (1993) examined organizational commitment in a single nation or culture.
Furthermore, nineteen studies used the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire
developed by Porter et al. (1974). Table 2 shows the distribution of these studies by type
of journal, number of articles, and countries studied.

Table 2. Distribution of organizational commitment studies outside the United States.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Journal</th>
<th>Number of Studies</th>
<th>Countries Studied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Canada, Japan, United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Canada, Pakistan, Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Canada, Japan, South Korea, New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Israel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Canada, Singapore, Israel, Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Randall (1993).
One way to understand the importance of the focus on attitudinal commitment has been explained by Mottaz (1987), Porter et al. (1974), and Reichers (1985), who strongly believed that attitudinal commitment, which is influenced by personal characteristics, can predict behavioral commitment. Also, Putti, Aryee, and Phua (1990) commented that attitudinal commitment has a psychological bond between the individual and the employing organization. Specifically, Mottaz (1988) stressed that commitment of individuals to the organization is perceived as an affective response that results from an evaluation of the work situation, which links the employee to the organization.

Because one of the objectives of this study is to measure the organizational commitment of employees attitudinally, it is appropriate to include an instrument that contains items such as value acceptance, intentions to stay with the organization, intention to be involved in the organization's activities, loyalty, and willingness to exert effort on behalf of the organization. The measure of organizational commitment can best be found in the OCQ developed by Porter et al. (1974), which measures employees' global attitudes toward their organizations. This measure has been used in many cross-national studies.

In summary, attitudinal commitment is important in predicting the behavioral intentions of employees to leave their organizations. Attitudes of employees about their organization result from their beliefs about it, as suggested by Williams and Hazer (1986). Therefore, employees' beliefs about the organization build their favorable or unfavorable attitudes toward it, which can create a positive or negative behavior. Because the attitudes of an individual can predict his or her behaviors toward the organization, the OCQ measures such attitudes.
Personal Demographics and Organizational Commitment

The focus on personal demographics, job-related variables, and their linkage with attitudinal commitment is mainly for parsimony and simplicity reasons, as suggested by Dubin (1976), Kaplan (1964), Weick (1989), and Whetten (1989). These researchers agreed on the coherence and simplicity of a good theory. Thus, the inclusion of organizational variables in this study may negatively affect its quality, clarity, and plausibility.

According to a number of researchers, including Banai and Reisel (1993), Ferris and Aranya (1983), Glisson and Durick (1988), Lee (1971), Luthans et al. (1985), Meyer and Allen (1984), Meyer et al. (1989), Putti et al. (1989), Sheldon (1971), and Wetzel and Gallgher (1990), personal demographics of employees are better predictors of their organizational commitment than organizational characteristics. Further, in studies that focused on commitment, Glisson and Durick (1988), Porter et al. (1974), and Sager (1991) found that the characteristics of employees, including personal demographics, have played a significant role in their levels of commitment to their organizations. They added that, if it is assumed that characteristics of employees are linked to their feelings and beliefs about the organization, then these studies support the notion that such beliefs and feelings may account for more variation in commitment than do organizational variables and experiences in the job setting. Ferris and Aranya (1983) strongly argued that the findings of most major studies support the significant relationships between some of the personal demographic variables and organizational commitment.
The influence of personal characteristics on organizational attitudes has been investigated by Chapman (1989), Jones (1983), Schneider (1983), and Van Maanen and Schein (1979), who consistently agreed that the personal characteristics that employees bring to the organization influence their attitudes toward it. Schreiber (1979) noted that the relationship between demographic variables and employees' attitudes has been studied in industrial and organizational psychology. In comparison with organizational characteristics, Koch and Steers (1978) and Mottaz (1988) found that personal demographics of employees are reliable predictors of their commitment to the organizations. Additionally, the findings of Pierce and Dunham (1987) showed that demographics and personality accounted for 36 percent of the variance in organizational commitment propensity and that demographic variables alone produced an $R$ of .55, while the personality variables produced an $R$ of .34.

As leading investigators on organizational commitment and its predictors, Angle and Perry (1983), Koch and Steers (1978), Mowday et al. (1982), Pierce and Dunham (1987), Porter et al. (1974), and Steers (1977) also identified personal demographics as a strong and significant influence on employees' commitment. Putti, Aryee, and Liang (1989) contended that demographic variables are presumed to cause commitment because, through an employee's actions, he or she makes some penalty-producing arrangements. Hence, Becker (1960) believed that the results of such actions leave the employee committed to the organization.

The importance of personal characteristics is exemplified in the review of organizational commitment literature between 1986 and 1995. ABI Informat database
showed that 279 out of 409 studies in business journals focused on demographic variables as reliable predictors of employees' commitment to their organizations. Tsui, Egan, and O'Reilly (1992) believed that studies on commitment have focused on the effects of simple demographic variables because of their relevance, meaningfulness, and relationship with employees' commitment.

Being demographically different from other employees in the organization means to be attitudinally and behaviorally different from the same individuals in the same organization. Rousseau's (1978) findings on the relationship between the attitudes of employees toward the organization and each of the characteristics of departments, positions, and individuals showed that demographics of individuals are the best predictors of their behaviors toward the organization. Hence, Igbaria and Greenhaus (1992) and Pierce and Dunham (1987) believed that demographic variables are expected to have direct effects on work-related attitudes such as organizational commitment and turnover intentions.

Waldman and Avolio (1986) agreed that demographic characteristics such as age, education, and race have been related to work-related outcomes such as performance, which is influenced by commitment. Mobley, Horner, and Hollingsworth (1978) added that these demographic characteristics are related to employees' turnover. The Tsui, Egan, and O'Reilly (1992) findings showed that a low level of organizational attachment is one of many possible outcomes of demographic heterogeneity. DeCotiis and Summers (1987) and Lee et al. (1992) focused on personal demographics as a predictor of organizational commitment, stating that employees bring their individual differences with them to the
organization, or at least these differences are developed independent of their membership in any organization.

In summary, these findings show the importance and significance of personal characteristics variables, particularly demographic variables, in predicting employees' organizational commitment. Personal demographics of employees are better predictors of their commitment to the organization than organizational characteristics variables. Also, personal demographics differentiate between stayers and leavers, committed and non-committed employees.

Job-related Factors and Organizational Commitment

Job-related variables are those related to one's job and organization, such as job pay, type of organizational position (managerial vs. non-managerial), type of organizational employment (contract vs. non-contract), and organizational tenure. These variables also are called job-based factors. These job- and organizational-related variables are linked to work-related attitudes and behaviors, such as organizational commitment; thus, the findings of Chelte and Tausky (1986) and Hrebinjak and Alutto (1972) emphasized that job-related factors have great influence on organizational commitment.

One of the important predictors of employees' organizational commitment is the type of jobs they are holding in the employing organization. This study is concerned with whether an employee occupies a managerial or non-managerial job. Managerial employees have different prestigious responsibilities from those holding non-managerial jobs because the former are associated with activities and managerial decisions that affect the latter. Thus, individuals holding managerial jobs see that they have different personal investments
from individuals holding clerical, technical support, or technical jobs, so their level of commitment to the organization is different from that of those who hold non-managerial jobs. The linkage between the type of job an employee holds and his or her organizational commitment can be best understood in the side-bet theory developed by Becker (1960). Simply, this theory predicts that the more investments an employee has in the organization the more likely he or she becomes committed to the organization. Therefore, such personal investments would influence the individual to remain in the organization and maintain its membership.

Hrebiniak and Alutto (1972) suggested that commitment is an exchange and accrual phenomenon, dependent on an employee's side bets in the employing organization. One of these investments is length of service in the organization. Therefore, organizational tenure is a personal investment that influences employees' commitment to remain in the organization, comply with its policies, and serve its goals. Personal investments accumulate with the length of organizational tenure. Employees have different lengths of service in their organization, which may influence their levels of commitment to it.

With regard to the type of employment, some employees may have lifetime employment while others have contracts that specify the terms and duration of the employment agreement with the organization. In the case of Saudi organizations, Saudis are employed as long as they wish to remain with the organization while the majority of non-Saudis are on contracts that specify their benefits, length of employment, and other terms. Lifetime employment may be viewed by employees as an investment that they would maintain because leaving the organization may cost them the loss of their lifetime
employment in the organization. However, employees with a limited-term contract may have different levels of organizational commitment due to the psychological influence of the contract. This implies that contract employees may have different levels of organizational commitment from those with lifetime employment.

Pay is another job-related factor that can influence the levels of employees' organizational commitment. Logically, Mowday, Porter, and Steers (1982) argued that pay provides an important inducement for employees to remain members of the employing organization. According to Becker's (1960) side-bet theory, pay is a personal investment because it increases with promotion and service. Employees with different salaries may have different levels of organizational commitment. However, Salanick (1977) suggested that, when instrumental rewards for work are salient, it reduces the employees' felt responsibility toward the organization, which in turn reduces their organizational commitment. Also, Lawler (1990) argued that if the pay objectives and principles are not communicated effectively to employees, the desired attitudinal and behavioral commitment of employees toward their jobs and organizations may not be achieved. Thus, the commitment of employees to their organizations can be positively or negatively affected by the organization's actual reward system and employees' expectations, which play a major role in influencing the level of commitment of employees to the organization. Generally, Mowday, Porter, and Steers (1982) concluded that any reward system in which employees share some of the gains of the organization should enhance employees' commitment to the organization.
Recruitment, Commitment, and Demographic Linkages

In a study of salespeople's commitment, Sager and Johnston (1989) noted that certain personal characteristics have implications for commitment and offer potentially useful insights for motivating, recruiting, and training employees. Further, organizations that are interested in employing committed individuals must consider the demographics of employees because they are reliably associated with commitment. Employees with different personal demographics and job-based factors can have different levels of commitment to the employing organization, which in turn influences employees' outcomes.

Barge and Hough (1988), Drakeley and Herriot (1988), and Rothstein, Schmidt, Envin, Owens, and Sparks (1990) argued that personnel selection can benefit from the use of biodata measures, which predict a variety of job-related criteria such as turnover, which is linked to commitment. Fogarty (1994) believed that because demographic variables are of greater importance to organizational commitment, the action focus for practitioners and the agenda for researchers involves the recruiting process. Therefore, getting the correct composition of people to work for the organization and effectively to serve on critical work teams should be emphasized.

Saudi Basic Industries Corporation and Saudi Petrochemical Companies

According to the publications of the Royal Commission of Jubail and Yanbu (1996), Saudi Basic Industries was founded in 1976 by Royal Decree 2-66 to help diversify the national income of Saudi Arabia. The Saudi Basic Industries Corporation (SABIC) was established to operate primary industries and market their products. Thus, it founded the Saudi petrochemical companies, which employ Saudi nationals and
expatriates, in the industrial cities of Jubail and Yanbu. Now, SABIC has sixteen manufacturing affiliates in Saudi Arabia. Thirteen of these petrochemical companies are operating in Jubail Industrial City. In addition to the thirteen primary manufacturing plants, Jubail Industrial City has six secondary manufacturing plants and nineteen support and light manufacturing industries. Furthermore, the recent report by the Royal Commission (1996) estimated that more than ninety support industrial services are operating in Jubail Industrial City.

Today, Saudi petrochemical companies, affiliates of SABIC, are considered the driving force behind the industrial development of Saudi Arabia. These companies are contributing significantly to the national income of the country. Globally, SABIC is a respected, highly competitive player in petrochemical products. Although the Gulf War and the liberation of Kuwait cost the Saudi economy billions of dollars, SABIC's manufacturing and marketing activities continued to operate normally. SABIC's annual reports (1990; 1994) showed an increase in sales revenue from approximately $2.5 billion in 1990 to $4 billion in 1994.

According to Weinberger (1994), the demand for energy will increase by 50 percent by the year 2010. This indicates that the demand for energy will increase the demand for expatriates by Saudi petrochemical industries because of the shortage of skilled Saudi labor in Saudi Arabia. This expected demand for Saudi petrochemical products has encouraged SABIC's companies to expand their plants. SABIC is involved in the planning of the expansions carried out by Saudi petrochemical companies. Expansions by some of these companies include the addition of new product lines of petrochemicals that are
economically feasible to Saudi Arabia. The overall expansions are expected to increase their revenues by $5 to $6 billion a year.

Saudi petrochemical companies have established international offices to market their products and get closer to their customers. They also negotiated the tariffs and restrictions imposed by the European Community on their products. The challenge that faces Saudi petrochemical companies lies in the globalization of petrochemical companies and competing in the free market side by side with companies from industrial countries. Table 3 shows the percentage of sales of SABIC's products by geographic region.

Table 3. The percentage of SABIC's products' global sales by geographic region.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographic Regions</th>
<th>Chemicals</th>
<th>Fertilizers</th>
<th>Plastics</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Far East</td>
<td>20.97</td>
<td>23.03</td>
<td>12.96</td>
<td>00.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Asia</td>
<td>25.85</td>
<td>35.67</td>
<td>8.96</td>
<td>17.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>14.96</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>15.92</td>
<td>15.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Americas</td>
<td>16.90</td>
<td>10.62</td>
<td>00.00</td>
<td>00.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>19.67</td>
<td>25.80</td>
<td>32.65</td>
<td>59.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>18.61</td>
<td>7.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>10.90</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from SABIC's Annual Report (1994).

The Research Model of Organizational Commitment

The researcher of this study adapted the model developed by Steers (1977) to guide his research. This model is theoretically grounded and it explains the influence of the
antecedents of organizational commitment. Morris and Sherman (1981) compared Steers’s (1977) model with Stevens, Beyer, and Trice’s (1978) model and found that the former provided further evidence for its utility to guide researchers to identify potential influences on organizational commitment. In addition, the antecedents framework provided by Steers (1977) is specifically grounded in theoretical underpinnings of the Porter et al. (1974) Organizational Commitment Questionnaire instrument. Figure 3 shows the research model of this study.

The Research Model
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Figure 3. A research model of the influence of personal demographics and job-related factors on organizational commitment.

Adapted from Steers (1977).

This model simply shows how antecedents influence commitment, which in turn influences work-related outcomes. According to the model, antecedents of organizational commitment can be grouped into three major categories: personal characteristics, which include personal demographics, work experiences, and job characteristics, which include
job-related variables. Steers (1977) categorized these predictors of organizational commitment into three groups for parsimony purposes.

The researcher of this study considered each variable in each component in the research model and examined its linkage with the organizational commitment. For instance, age in the personal demographics component was considered for investigation with organizational commitment as one of its personal characteristics antecedents in the model. Also, the type of employment in the job-related component was investigated separately with organizational commitment as one of its job characteristics antecedents.

The research model suggests that personal demographics and job-related factors may influence employees' organizational commitment to some degree. The degree of influence of the antecedents on organizational commitment depends on the degree of the differences in each of the variables in the demographics and job-related factors components. Differences in the levels of organizational commitment increase with the differences in the cultures to which employees are associated. Steers (1977) found that these variables in the model are relatively stable antecedents of organizational commitment.

In summary, for the sake of parsimony, the research model of this study focused on two major antecedents of organizational commitment to investigate the differences in employees' commitment to their organizations. These antecedents are personal demographics and job-related factors. The researcher is interested in investigating the relationship between organizational commitment and each single variable in these two components of commitment predictors in Saudi petrochemical companies.
Commitment and Personal Demographics

Place of Birth of Employee

The relationship between place of birth and commitment of employees to the organizations has not been empirically studied cross-nationally. However, this does not mean that such a relationship may not exist, because the early period of employees' lives has an impact on their attachment and loyalty to the society in which they were born and raised. Possibly, attachment and loyalty to the place of birth may develop a lasting commitment to almost everything that the place of birth of an employee represents including one's employing organization. Certainly, people are shaped by their environment and the cultural values that are shared by all members of a particular society. Therefore, employees' place of birth may influence commitment to their employing organizations in that particular society.

Brim and Kagan (1980) contended that most current research and theory assume that the experiences of infancy and early childhood have a lasting effect on adult personality and behavior. This can be generalized to cultural experiences shared by other individuals in a society. Moreover, middle childhood has impressive stability. Thus, it may suggest that children born in a foreign country can experience stable behaviors regardless of their parents' place of birth. This does not ignore the influence that parents may have on their children during the early years, but we assume the neutrality of parents with respect to their children's interaction with the country of birth. Generally speaking, this means that employees born in a country that does not provide them with its citizenship may have different levels of commitment toward it from that of employees who were not born in that
country. The difference in the place of birth of employees may influence the difference in the levels of their organizational commitment.

Whiting and Child (1953) demonstrated that socialization practices affect the personality of adults, which, in turn, influence their beliefs toward a society. The social influence of the country of birth has some attitudinal and behavioral outcomes that can have a dramatic impact on the level and strength of interaction that takes place between individuals and the organization. Additionally, social events that occurred in one's early childhood will continue to play a role in one's attachment to the country of birth. Brim and Kagan (1980) believed that past cultural experiences and past cognition stay with the individual. Overall, these concomitant cues influence the attitudes and behaviors of individuals toward certain persons and objects, including organizations of the country of birth.

In summary, there is a difference in the level of organizational commitment between employees born in Saudi Arabia and employees born elsewhere. The difference in the level of organizational commitment between these two groups of employees is influenced by the environment (country) in which they were born. The environment includes the culture(s) of employees, which has been recognized as one of the most major influences on their commitment to the employing organization.

Ethnicity of Employee

Ethnicity of employees as a predictor of their commitment to Saudi organizations has not been investigated in Saudi petrochemical companies or any other organizations in Saudi Arabia. Ethnicity plays a major role in employees’ attitudes toward their employing
organizations. Ethnicity is simply the sense of differences, while race is the sense of biological differences of individuals, as defined by Wallman (1979). Conceptually, we have to be able to differentiate between race and ethnicity to clear the confusion created by some researchers who mixed these two concepts. Wallman referred to ethnicity as the perception of differences among groups and the social boundaries between some segments of a population. She stressed that ethnicity is not the same as culture or race.

The attitudes and behaviors of employees may be affected by some personal demographics such as ethnicity. Alderfer and Thomas (1988) noted that, despite the growing need for understanding the effects of ethnic heterogeneity on organizations, research on this issue is apparently limited. Therefore, this type of research becomes increasingly needed as the workforce becomes diversified in Saudi organizations.

Ethnically, Saudis are Arabs, with the exception of some immigrants from non-Arab Islamic countries who settled in Saudi Arabia and became influenced by the culture of their new homeland.

Cox (1990) suggested that organizational scholars should study the effects of ethnicity on organizational behavior. The common belief among researchers such as Bartol, Evans, and Stith (1978) is that ethnic factors affect the behaviors, attitudes, and performances of employees. Fenlon and Megargee (1971) and Richards and Jaffee (1972) found that ethnic factors affect the behaviors of subordinates toward leaders and that certain behaviors hinder the effectiveness of supervisors. This applies to employees from different ethnicities working in an organization with different work attitudes.
Surprisingly, Tajfel (1974) argued that, under social conditions, the minority group may act differently to increase its sense of psychological separateness in order to protect its valued social identity. Members of ethnic groups tend to socialize and be involved with each other in isolation from other ethnic groups in the same organization. They may tend to show that they are superior to other ethnic groups, especially in their work outcomes.

With regard to ethnicity as a predictor of the commitment of employees to their organizations, Luthans, McCaul, and Dodd (1985) found that Japanese employees scored different levels of commitment to their organizations than did American employees. Surprisingly, Japanese employees reported lower scores than did Americans. Rohlen (1974) explained these findings in cultural pressure and the desire of Japanese employees to avoid leaving their jobs even though they had low commitment to the organization. We have to know that Japanese culture does not appreciate employees dismissed by their employers for any reason or employees who leave their companies for another.

According to Randall (1993), employees from masculine cultures express more calculative commitment to the organization, whereas those from feminine cultures reflect stronger affective commitment to the organization. Hofstede (1980) identified Western cultures as masculine cultures in his studies. However, Bjerke and Al-Meer (1993) identified Arab cultures, including Saudis, as feminine cultures. Because the Arab culture differs significantly from the Western culture, it is likely that employees from these two cultures may have different attitudes toward the employing organization. According to Bjerke and Al-Meer (1993), Saudis and other Arabs were identified as high collectivists
who prefer a tight social relationship in organizational and institutional life. For an Arab employee, family and social friends come before work and organization.

Randall (1993) argued that one would anticipate greater affective commitment of an individual (a sense of loyalty and attachment) to institutions in collectivist societies, and greater calculative commitment to institutions in individualistic societies. Boyacigiller and Adler (1991) argued that the commitment of employees with collectivist culture orientation may arise from attachment with management, co-workers, and business owners, whereas the commitment of employees with individualistic values may be linked to the compensation system or the job itself. According to Wagner (1995), individuals from Western societies focus on their personal interests with less attention to group interests. This implies that Arab and Western employees may have different attitudes toward their organizations, which include the individual’s commitment to the employing organization.

These studies showed that there are cultural differences between individuals with individualistic values and those with collectivist values. These differences may influence the attitudinal commitment of employees toward their organizations, which in turn can influence employees’ commitment to the organization. Arabs as an ethnic group are influenced by their collectivist culture, whereas Westerners as an ethnic group are shaped by their individualistic cultures. The assumption that Westerners were treated as one ethnic group in this study is based on the fact that they have similar cultures, and they may feel that they are a minority in an Arab country so they group together.

In summary, the difference in employees’ ethnicities may influence their levels of organizational commitment. This difference in the levels of commitment is due to the
differences in employees' cultures. Because Arabs come from collectivist culture, they may have different levels of commitment from those who come from individualistic culture.

**Nationality of Employee**

The nationality of an employee refers to his or her current citizenship while working in Saudi organizations when he or she responded to the survey. The importance of nationality as a predictor of employees' commitment to their employing organizations lies in its linkage to one's identity and patriotism. The revival of regionalism, patriotism, and nationalism has some influence on employees' attitudes and behaviors toward their employing organizations. A good example of such a trend would be the European Community, which emerged as a regional economic power. Collectively, these countries established strict standards and regulations against products that may be imported from non-European Community countries.

The difference in employees' nationalities can influence their levels of commitment to the employing organization. Furthermore, Hofstede (1983) believed that nationality is important to management for at least three reasons: (1) nations are political units; (2) nationality has a symbolic meaning to nationals; and (3) nationality is important for psychological reasons. In a study to investigate managerial roles in cross-cultural settings, Torbiorn (1983) found that the national identity of expatriate managers is enhanced by cultural attachments and shared social relationships that create a sense of belonging and eventually commitment to the employing organization of their native country. Near (1989) indicated the importance of nationality and emphasized that the use of a cross-national comparison does allow comparison of differences and similarities by nationality.
Bhagat and McQuaid (1982) argued that culture often has served as a synonym for nation; thus, national differences found in the characteristics of organizations or their members have been viewed as cultural differences. The researchers assumed that national differences among members of a particular country represent cultural differences. Also, nationality has become a patriotic slogan in many countries, including Western countries, because it contains the identity as well as the cultural personality of a nation. Some researchers such as Laurent (1981) found that organizational culture does not reduce the influence of national cultural differences. Rather, Laurent found that organizational culture maintains and enhances national culture.

Surprisingly, Cole (1979) and Luthans, McCaul, and Dodd (1985) indicated that Japanese employees as a homogeneous nationality have low levels of commitment than their American counterparts. The latter study showed that Korean nationals had lower levels of organizational commitment than did their American counterparts. Japanese and Korean employees scored similar levels of commitment to their organizations. The similarity of these findings is not surprising, because Japanese and Korean cultures have more similarities than differences in the family structure and homogeneity of society.

In Saudi Arabia, Al-Meer (1989) found that Saudi nationals differ in their level of commitment from Asian nationalities included in his study. As a nationality group, Asian employees significantly reported different levels of commitment to Saudi organizations from that of Saudi or Western employees. Surprisingly, Asian employees reported a higher level of commitment than did Saudi or Western employees. Al-Meer (1989) explained the reasons Asians showed higher commitment than Westerners or Saudis as
follows: (1) most of the workers come from poor countries, and their pay in Saudi organizations is six to eight times higher than that for counterparts in their native countries; and (2) the majority of Asian workers are Moslems, who consider employment in Saudi Arabia as a great opportunity to visit the holy places. Yavas, Luqmani, and Quraeshi (1990) found that Saudi nationals felt that they could be working for another organization offering similar work; thus, these attitudes showed by Saudi nationals reflect the flexibility and the degree of mobility they have, which can affect their commitment to Saudi organizations. Contrary, expatriates did not feel so because of contractual obligations. The two groups of employees had different levels of commitment to Saudi organizations. Egyptian employees as expatriates may report a different level of commitment to Saudi petrochemical companies from their Saudi coworkers. This difference in the levels of commitment to Saudi petrochemical companies may be the result of the nationality of the employers and/or the ownership of the employing companies.

The studies on organizational commitment showed that nationality may have influence on the levels of employees’ commitment to their organizations. Also, some nationalities may feel more attached to the employing organization than other nationalities. This attachment may be due to the nationality and ownership of the employing organization and/or shared goals and values. The difference in employees’ nationalities may influence the difference in their levels of commitment to Saudi petrochemical companies.

Education of Employee

The results of a study by O'Reilly and Caldwell (1981) suggested that highly educated workers hold beliefs regarding work alternatives that strengthen the levels of their
organizational commitment. However, researchers believed that the higher the level of education of an employee, the more likely that he or she leaves his current organization for another one. Thus, an employee who has unmet expectations may seek an alternative job in the labor market. The demand for highly educated employees is greater than the demand for less educated employees. This may encourage employees with high education to seek alternative jobs outside their current organizations. Highly educated employees have greater investments in themselves and they may always look for better returns; thus, they move from one organization to another to fulfill their different needs. On the contrary, Morris and Sherman’s (1981) findings showed that less educated employees had higher levels of organizational commitment than did highly educated employees. This is because less educated employees had fewer opportunities in the labor market because of their low levels of education. Therefore, they stayed with their current organizations.

There have been some cross-national studies in less developed countries such as Al-Meer’s (1989) in Saudi Arabia and Alvi and Ahmed’s (1987) in Pakistan. In Saudi Arabia, for example, the results of Al-Meer’s (1989) study indicated a significant and negative relationship between the level of organizational commitment and education of Asian employees. This inverse relationship between the organizational commitment and education of Asian employees may be due to the fact that most Asian employees work in manual jobs that do not require a high level of education. However, for Western employees, the findings of Al-Meer’s (1989) study revealed a significant positive relationship between the level of organizational commitment and education. The same
study did not indicate the significance and the type of relationship between organizational commitment and the level of education of Saudi employees.

Overall, the difference in the level of education between highly educated employees and less educated employees may result in different levels of commitment to Saudi petrochemical companies. This study is concerned with investigating whether there is a difference in the levels of organizational commitment as a result of the difference in the level of education between two groups of employees, the highly educated and less educated, on the basis of their levels of education. Researchers explained the difference in employees’ commitment to the employing organization in terms of difference in their levels of education, which in turn influences their expectations. Generally, employees with high levels of education have higher expectations than those with low level of education.

Age of Employee

The findings of Banai and Reisel (1993), Glisson and Durick (1988), Hunt, Chonko, and Wood (1985), Igabaria and Guimaraes (1993), Oliver (1990), and Pierce and Dunham (1987) indicated that age has been a reliable predictor of employees’ organizational commitment. They consistently agreed that age is significantly and positively related to organizational commitment. This means that the older the employees, the higher their levels of commitment to the organization. O'Reilly and Caldwell (1981) found that old employees were likely to express their commitment in terms of involvement while Bar-Hayim and Berman (1992) found that young employees were more likely to express their commitment in terms of loyalty and identification with the organization.
Banai and Reisel (1993) found that loyalty to and involvement in the organization are two major dimensions of organizational commitment. This study is concerned with one underlying construct, that is organizational commitment. These two terms, loyalty and involvement, are some of the items that measure commitment. They are useful in explaining the development of commitment because in most situations loyalty and involvement come before commitment. If employees express their loyalty and involvement in the organization, it is best to say they are intentionally committed to it. It may be true, to some extent, that employees who are loyal to the organization and involved in its activities have intentions to remain with it and maintain its continuity and membership.

Employees' commitment to their organizations grow as they age. This positive relationship between age and organizational commitment is explained by the rationale that as age increases so do the years of experience in the organization. Furthermore, age also may be seen to explain the psychological attachment that individuals may make by remaining with their organizations. Thus, the age of an employee is related to economic rationale and psychological attachments to the organization. Colarelli and Bishop (1990) and Gottfredson (1977) argued that as people get older, they become occupationally stable and career-oriented. Employees become bound by their efforts, promotions, and other investments in the organization, so they settle into a career and close other career options. Also, as employees get older they have fewer employment opportunities in the labor market so they may decide to remain with their current organizations.

The results of Al-Meer's (1989) study indicated a significant positive relationship between organizational commitment and the age of Saudi and Western employees working
for Saudi organizations. Banai and Reisel (1993) found that the age of an expatriate
manager was a major antecedent of the organizational commitment (beta = .34, p < .01).
Age was correlated positively with the overall items of organizational commitment (r = .23,
p < .001).

It is clear from previous studies that difference in age may influence the difference
in the levels of organizational commitment of old and young employees. The researcher
suggests that there is a difference in the level of organizational commitment between the
two groups of employees working in Saudi petrochemical companies. The two groups of
employees the researcher refers to in this study are old employees as one group and young
employees as another group. Employees within different age groups may have different
priorities; thus, they may have different levels of commitment to their organizations.

Commitment and Job-related Factors

Managerial versus Non-Managerial Job

According to Tannenbaum (1966), hierarchy is the basic organizational
characteristic that has the most profound psychological implications for employees of an
organization. This psychological implication may result from the perception of employees
toward managerial and non-managerial jobs. Generally, employees with managerial jobs
are paid more than employees with non-managerial jobs. Psychologically, managerial
employees are looked upon with high prestige by non-managerial employees and others
outside the organization. These financial and psychological differences may create different
commitment-related attitudes by employees toward the organization, which can affect their
intentions to stay in it. Tannenbaum (1966) argued that superiors are more likely than their subordinates to identify with the organization and to support it psychologically. This support of managerial employees includes acceptance of the organization’s policies pertaining to its productivity standard. Tannenbaum added that because of such differences some employees give more to the organization in the intensity of their involvement and efforts.

Mottaz (1987) believed that organizational rank is considered a personal investment, as explained by Becker’s (1960) side-bet theory, because it tends to cause restraints on individuals' options and to bind them to the organization. Generally, managerial employees have greater personal investments in their employing organization than do non-managerial employees. Hence, they have more to lose when they leave their current employing organization for another. This implies that employees holding managerial jobs may report different levels of commitment to the organization from employees holding non-managerial jobs. Job type is considered an investment by employees; thus, those who have managerial jobs commit themselves to the organization to maintain their job status. Therefore, they have different levels of commitment from those who do not have managerial jobs.

Generally, managerial employees have more involvement in the decision making of their organizations with regard to other employees and organizational activities. Thus, they have more investment in the organization than non-managerial employees, which commit them to their organizations. They may decide to stay with the organization because of such personal investments. There are many reasons to believe that managerial employees have
different levels of commitment to their organizations than non-managerial employees. First, managerial-job employees have more influence and involvement in the organizational decision-making process. Second, managerial jobs are more appealing to many employees than non-managerial jobs.

According to Grusky (1966) and Wiener and Vardi (1980), managerial employees tend to be more committed to their organizations than non-managerial employees because of their prestigious jobs and the high pay associated with them. Cohen and Gattiker (1994) argued that supervisory jobs are a reward from the employing organization, providing supervisors with more autonomy and a higher quality of life. They also argued that rewards may be considered as important determinants of organizational commitment for non-managerial employees because their pay and occupational status are lower than those of managerial employees. Salanick (1977) concluded that some positions or jobs simply carry more responsibility; thus, employees with managerial jobs tend to be more committed to their organization than employees with non-managerial jobs.

The findings of a study in the West Bank by Abboushi (1990) showed that Arab employees holding managerial jobs had different levels of commitment to the organization than Arab employees holding non-managerial jobs. According to Abboushi (1990), Arab employees, irrespective of nationality, preferred managerial jobs over non-managerial jobs. Abboushi’s (1990) findings imply that Arab employees with managerial jobs reported higher levels of organizational commitment than did those holding non-managerial jobs.

From the studies reviewed, it was found that the type of job (managerial vs non-managerial) had an effect on employees’ commitment to their organization. This means
that the two groups of employees (managerial and non-managerial) may have different organizational commitment levels. Furthermore, managerial employees have higher levels of commitment to the employing organization than did employees with non-managerial jobs.

**Organizational Tenure of Employee**

According to Aranya, Kushnir, and Valency (1986), organizational tenure is simply measured by the length of time an employee has been with his or her organization. Consistently, Igbaria and Guimaraes (1993), Luthans, McCaul, and Dodd (1985), and Mowday, Porter, and Steers (1982) showed that organizational tenure is a reliable predictor of the organizational commitment of employees. It is believed that the longer an employee has been with an organization, the more likely he or she is committed to it and will stay with it and maintain its membership. Becker (1960), Cohen and Gattiker (1992), and Cohen and Lowenberg (1990) suggested that this is because of employees’ personal investments in their organizations.

A study conducted by Igbaria and Siegel (1992) showed that intention to leave the organization is negatively correlated with organizational tenure. This means that the longer an employee has been with the organization, the lower his or her intention to leave the employing organization. The length of service of an employee increases his or her personal investments in the organization, which in turn increase his or her commitment to the organization. Thus, length of service increases an employee’s commitment to the organization. Figure 4 illustrates the relationship between organizational tenure, personal investment, and organizational commitment of an employee.
For Westerners working in Saudi organizations, Al-Meer (1989) found a significant positive relationship between their levels of organizational commitment and organizational tenure. However, the study did not show a significant relationship between organizational commitment and tenure of Asian employees. The same study indicated a significant relationship between the level of organizational commitment and the tenure of Saudi employees.

The difference in the length of employees’ tenure may influence the levels of their organizational commitment. The greater the difference in the employees’ tenure the greater the difference in the levels of their organizational commitment. Employees working in Saudi petrochemical companies may report different levels of commitment because of different lengths of organizational tenure. This study investigated the difference in employees’ levels of organizational commitment as their service with Saudi petrochemical companies differs.

**Type of Employment**

In this study, the type of employment refers to contract and non-contract employment in Saudi petrochemical companies. Non-contract employment is a lifetime employment for some employees in Saudi petrochemical companies. Farnsworth (1982),
Murray (1974), and Rousseau (1989) argued that contracts are obligating promises made in exchange for some compensation and are enforced and recognized in law. Rousseau (1990) stated that there are two types of contracts: (1) transactional contracts which involve specific monetizable exchanges between employers and employees over a specific period of time as in the case of temporary employment; and (2) relational contracts which involve open-ended agreements to establish and maintain a relationship involving both monetizable and non-monetizable exchanges such as hard work, commitment, and loyalty to the employer.

A contract is a mainstay in employment relations between employees and employers, establishing contributions and payments basic to membership in an organization, as stated by Barnard (1938). Rousseau (1989) argued that such relationship-based agreements commit the parties involved to maintaining the relationship and provide for some form of exchange. This exchange may be in the form of performance and/or commitment to one's employing organization. However, Robinson and Rousseau (1994) argued that violation of the contract by the employer may cause employees to reduce the quantity and/or quality of their performance and then leave the employing organization.

Generally, an employment contract includes employment duration, which is the length of employment an employee may stay with the employer. The majority of Saudi organizations hire professional and non-professional expatriates for a limited period of time, which is agreed upon by both parties. The contract can be renewed based on the need of the employer and the performance of the employee, that is a mutual agreement of both
Non-contract employment in this study implies lifetime employment, which is applied to Saudi employees by Saudi organizations that hire potential Saudis permanently after they successfully complete the trial period. Furthermore, unlike expatriates who include other Arab and non-Arab nationalities, Saudis become permanent employees after a successful ninety-day trial period, which is in accordance with the Saudi employment law. Thus, there is no time limit or expiration date of employment contract after a Saudi employee completes the trial period successfully. Al-Meer (1989) stated in his study of organizational commitment of Saudis, Asians, and Westerners in Saudi organizations that more than 90 percent of Saudi employees had a lifetime employment.

Lober, Kirk, Kirschner, and Handorf (1984) concluded that lifetime employment creates the public image of a stable employer. Additionally, Leonard (1983) and Lober et al. (1984) believed that permanent employment can send a message of reciprocal obligations to employees and can strengthen the relationship between the organizations and employees. Rousseau (1989) argued that commitment does not explicitly address the issues of obligations and reciprocity, but it simultaneously involves the acceptance and internalization of the organization's values that need to be part of a psychological contract. Pearce (1993) believed that organizational membership may not necessarily lead to organizational involvement, but it has a great influence on the employees' loyalty, which may in turn influence commitment at a later stage of employment. Marsh and Mannari.
(1977) stressed the fact that lifetime employment increases the level of employees’ lifetime commitment.

Rousseau and Anton (1988; 1991) believed that long-term employment helps both employees and employers to develop mutual obligations of loyalty and commitment. This requires employees to work hard in the interest of the employer, and it obligates the employer to keep employees whenever possible and provide for them when it is not. Rousseau (1989) argued that the longer the relationship endures, with repeated cycles of contribution and reciprocity, the deeper the relationship the employee perceives and the broader the dimensions of contributions and attractive rewards that might be involved. Williamson (1979) contended that the psychological influence of the employment contract and mutual interests of both employer and employees bind them to respect the terms of the contract.

On the other hand, Williamson (1975) explained why some organizations hire permanent employees rather than contract employees, by stating that lifetime employees have greater moral involvement and a sense of moral obligation to the organization than do contract employees whose involvement tends to be calculative. A study by Luthans, McCaul, and Dodd (1985) showed that lifetime Japanese and Korean employees reported a higher level of commitment than did American employees with contract. This leads to the belief that the type of employment can influence the level of employees’ commitment to their organizations.

Lack of commitment by contract employees may be a result of the low level of trust they have in their organizations. Pearce (1993) found that a lower level of trust by
employees is related to reduced cooperation on their part. Thus, contract employees may show a low level of commitment to their organizations. Also, Organ (1988) found that distrust caused by the type of contract may lead to the desire of employees to leave the organization. A contract employee may perceive his or her contract unfair when it limits him or her to certain organizational positions, specific employment terms, and limited compensation. The psychological effects of contracts on expatriates can influence their commitment to Saudi organizations.

Yavas, Luqmani, and Quraeshi (1990) found that Saudis and expatriates had different levels of commitment to Saudi organizations. This difference in the levels of commitment may be explained by the nature of lifetime employment and contracts offered to Saudis and expatriates in Saudi organizations. Expatriates are normally hired in their home countries by a Saudi sponsor to work only for that organization, so it is difficult for an expatriate to move from one organization to another. To leave a Saudi organization for another is a long process, which requires an employee to be released by his or her employer and then be approved by the Saudi government. This is a very difficult process in most cases.

It is clear that the type of employment has influence on the levels of employees’ commitment to their organization. Hence, the researcher suggests that there is a difference in the level of commitment between contract employees and non-contract (lifetime) employees. This study is concerned with the difference in the levels of commitment between the two groups of employees, contract and lifetime.
Job Pay

The rationale for including job pay as an antecedent of organizational commitment is that employees with high pay have more to lose; thus, according to Ritzer and Trice (1969), they are less likely to leave their employing organization. Consistently, Angle and Perry (1983) and Baba and Knoop (1987) stated that one can expect employees with high salaries to have different levels of commitment to their employing organization from those with low salaries. The majority of researchers found that employees with high pay scored higher levels of commitment than did employees with low pay.

The results of recent studies by Byington and Johnston (1991), Cohen and Gattiker (1994), Sager (1991), and Summers and Hendrix (1991) showed that there is a positive and significant relationship between pay and organizational commitment. The higher the job pay, the more committed an employee becomes to the organization. Cohen and Gattiker (1994) indicated that pay predicts the level of organizational commitment of employees in private organizations (r = .45). The difference in pay may result in great differences in the levels of employees' commitment to the employing organization.

In Saudi Arabia, although Al-Meer (1989) attempted to explain the reason why Asian employees with low pay were more committed to Saudi organizations than Saudi or Western employees with high pay, he did not support it empirically. Al-Meer (1989) related Asian employees' high level of commitment to Saudi organizations to the perceptions of their relatively high salaries in Saudi Arabia with what they can earn for the same work in their native countries. Employees tend to compare their pay in their employing organization with the pay of those in other organizations. Saudi petrochemical
companies have different pay policies for different nationalities, which may create tension in employees who are underpaid. According to Adam's (1963) equity theory, perceived inequity creates tension in individuals; thus, low pay employees and high pay employees may demonstrate different levels of commitment to the employing organization.

From the studies reviewed, it appeared that there was a difference in the level of employees' commitment to their organizations as a result of the difference in their salary levels. Therefore, employees working in Saudi petrochemical companies may report different levels of commitment to them as a result of differences in their pay. Employees with high pay may have a higher level of commitment to Saudi petrochemical companies than those with low pay.

Hypotheses

H1: There is a difference in the level of organizational commitment between all employees born in Saudi Arabia and those born in other countries.

H1a: There is a difference in the level of organizational commitment between Arab employees born in Saudi Arabia and those born in other countries.

H2: There is a difference in the level of organizational commitment between all Arab employees as one ethnic group and non-Arab employees (Westerners) as another ethnic group.

H3: There is a difference in the level of organizational commitment between Saudi nationals and Western nationalities.

H3a: There is a difference in the level of organizational commitment between Saudi employees and Egyptian employees.

H4: There is a difference in the level of organizational commitment between highly educated employees and less educated employees.

H5: There is a difference in the level of organizational commitment between managerial employees and non-managerial employees.

H6: There is a difference in the level of organizational commitment between long tenure employees and short tenure employees.
H7: There is a difference in the level of organizational commitment between older employees and younger employees.

H8: There is a difference in the level of organizational commitment between contract employees and non-contract employees.

H9: There is a difference in the level of organizational commitment between high pay employees and low pay employees.

Chapter Summary

The review of literature reveals some facts about organizational commitment and its predictors. Organizational commitment can be viewed as an attitudinal commitment that an employee has toward his or her organization. Although some of the organizational commitment studies included both individual and organizational variables, the focus of the majority of these studies was on job-related factors and demographics of employees. It is believed that employees bring their demographic differences with them to the workplace. These personal demographics can influence their attitudes toward their employing organizations positively or negatively. Because employees working in Saudi organizations have different demographics and job-related characteristics, they may have different levels of commitment to Saudi organizations.

To measure the organizational commitment of employees, an appropriate instrument must be carefully selected to include all items pertaining to the variables. The highly reliable and valid instrument developed by Porter et al. (1974) has been chosen to measure commitment in this study. The items in this instrument are related to the construct, as many researchers tested it in different cultures.
Organizational behavior literature has focused on industrialized nations with little or no attention to exploring less industrialized countries. Although Saudi Arabia is a mecca of many nationalities seeking employment, it is ignored by many organizational commitment researchers. Saudi Arabia plays a major role in world peace and economy; thus, there is a need to investigate the levels of domestic and international employees' commitment to Saudi petrochemical companies. The results of such studies can help management to enhance motivational methods that may commit employees to their organizations.
CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This chapter consists of twelve sections. Section one covers the research design the researcher used in this study. Section two includes the selection of companies and the selection of participants. Section three presents the power analysis to calculate the appropriate sample size. Section four focuses on the measures, which include organizational commitment as a dependent variable and job-related factors and personal demographics as predictors of organizational commitment. Section five covers the instrument, which includes the reliability and validity of the instrument. Section six covers the translation and back translation of the instrument. Section seven focuses on the scaling. Section eight is about the pilot study. Section nine sheds the light on nonresponse bias in a mail survey. Section ten explains the data collection procedure. Section eleven focuses on the data analysis techniques that were used to analyze the data. Section twelve is a summary of the chapter.

Research Design

Research design as explained by Kerlinger (1986) is the plan and structure of investigation so conceived as to obtain answers to research questions. There are two types of research design: (1) experimental, which is characterized by more control over extraneous variables; and (2) non-experimental, which is characterized by lack of random
assignment and less control of independent variables. The selection of a particular research
design depends on the sensitivity of the question to be answered and the hypothesis to be
tested. Schwenck (1982) argued that the appropriateness of a particular research
methodology is determined not only by the overall development of a field or laboratory
setting but by the particular research question asked and the purpose of the research
problem.

Some topics are extremely sensitive; thus, experimental design may not be
appropriate in investigating the relationship between the variables of interest. Ellsworth
(1977) suggested that researchers may not be able to test hypotheses that involve social
desirability in a laboratory setting without the bias of subjects, which is concomitant in
research questions that involve sensitive issues. Ellsworth stated that, if the study concerns
powerful or highly arousing events or strong feelings, the psychological laboratory is not
the appropriate test setting. This leads to the fact that subjects may attempt to look
favorable to the researcher by giving positive images of themselves instead of giving their
true opinion about a particular phenomenon.

In experimental design, identities of employees may not be as confidential as in a
mail survey; thus, employees may not reveal their true negative feelings about their
employing organizations because of the fear of retaliation by management and/or they may
want to give a positive image about themselves. However, in a real field setting where
subjects are not under experimental controls, they tend to give more real responses because
they are not placed under pressure. This also may imply that individuals in mail surveys
give real responses that are relatively free from social desirability bias. Kidder and Judd
(1986) argued that a mail questionnaire allows for anonymity in situations that involve sensitive issues.

In this study, the researcher used a mail questionnaire; company records (archival data); and voluntary short interviews with managers, supervisors, and personnel who have relevant data about employees' commitment and work-related issues. The anonymity of subjects and confidentiality of employees' responses were assured to all participants by both the researcher and the participating companies; this is important in getting the employees' cooperation, high response rate, and honest responses. Data about employees' commitment, demographics, job-based factors, and commitment-related issues were collected from the mail survey, companies' records, and interviews with employees and management. Furthermore, commitment-related data obtained from companies' records include performance, attendance, turnover, job-related factors, and personal demographics of employees. Personal demographics as well as job-based data obtained from companies' records are all consistent with that gathered from the mail questionnaire and short interviews.

The researcher asked managers, personnel, and supervisors to participate in a voluntary short interview about the performance and commitment of their employees and other work-related issues. The objective of the voluntary interview was to support the data collected from the mail questionnaire and companies' records. The same items used in the mail questionnaire were reordered and used to collect data from employees who participated in the voluntary interview. Podsakoff and Organ (1986) suggested reordering the instrument to reduce the threat of social desirability and consistency motif. With regard to
employees' demographics and other job-based factors, data collected from the mail
questionnaire and interview about employees are consistent. They also are consistent with
the data collected from companies’ records.

Obtaining data about employees’ commitment and work-related attitudes and
behaviors through interviews and companies’ records is essential to reduce possible threats
of common method variance, which may result from obtaining information about
organizational phenomena from one source. The demographics and job-based variables of
subjects were collected through a mail questionnaire and examined for accuracy by
matching them with the data collected from companies’ records and interviews.
Employees’ responses to the organizational commitment questionnaires in an experimental
design may be influenced by social desirability because of the sensitivity of the issue; thus,
it may be reduced by using confidential and anonymous mail surveys.

The term social desirability, as suggested by Ganster, Hennessey, and Luthans
(1983), refers to the tendency of an individual to present himself or herself in a favorable
positive way with regard to culturally derived norms and standards. Fisher (1993) believed
that social desirability is simply the unwillingness or inability of a respondent to report
accurately on sensitive topics for ego-defensive or impression management reasons.
Fortunately, Ganster, Hennessey, and Luthans (1983) reported that social desirability
contamination effects do not seem very widespread. Fisher (1993) believed that social
desirability cannot always distort self-report measures of personal outcomes because this
type of outcome is based on internalized values that are independent of social
considerations. Researchers can reduce the threat of social desirability by ensuring the
confidentiality of the responses and anonymity of participants to all employees and by using a mail questionnaire. This is exactly what the researcher of this study did for all subjects in the sample.

Podsakoff and Organ (1986) stressed that social desirability, the consistency motif, and common method variance are major problems associated with self-report, which many researchers use to gather data in organizational research. To reduce the problem associated with self-report, Glick, Jenkins, and Gupta (1986), Podsakoff and Organ (1986), Schmitt and Stults (1986), and Widaman (1985) suggested the use of multiple sources to gather the data necessary for the problem at hand. Also, Jick (1979) and Denzin (1978) recommended the use of triangulation of data sources and data collection methods because these complementary methods are generally thought to increase the reliability and validity of the study.

In summary, collecting data about the phenomenon from multiple sources with multiple methods can reduce the effects of common method variance, social desirability, and consistency motif. The selection of a particular research design depends on the sensitivity of the issue, the type of question to be answered, and the hypotheses to be tested. This study used a mail questionnaire distributed in the mailroom of the participating Saudi petrochemical companies, archival data obtained from the companies' records, and voluntary short interviews with personnel, management, and employees. Employees' records showed their personal demographics, job-related factors, and some issues that are related to their commitment to Saudi petrochemical companies.
Selection of Companies and Participants

Selection of Companies

Saudi petrochemical companies, affiliates of Saudi Basic Industries Corporation, have the highest growth in Saudi Arabia. Thus, they have become the largest employers for Saudis and expatriates, which make them the best prospect for this cross-national study on organizational commitment. Saudi petrochemical companies are expanding continuously because of the global increase in demand for petrochemical products, which in turn increases the demand for skilled employees. However, the Saudi labor market may not be capable of providing skilled employees in the short run.

There are thirteen major petrochemical companies in Jubail Industrial City, six of which agreed to participate in this study. The researcher sent three letters from King Faisal University, the Saudi Cultural Mission, and the researcher himself to the selected Saudi petrochemical companies asking for their participation and cooperation in this study. Also, the researcher contacted these companies by letter and telephone and used a facsimile for follow-ups.

Saudi petrochemical companies were selected for this study because they typically have a large number of expatriates and Saudis. The selection of participating companies is largely based on the representation of the nationalities of interest and the cooperation of employees and management. Only organizations that had a statistically significant number of pertinent nationalities were contacted to participate in this study. Follow-ups were made to increase the number of participating companies. Six Saudi petrochemical companies participated in this study.
Selection of Participants

The population of this study referred to all employees of particular nationalities and ethnicities working in the Saudi petrochemical companies that participated in this study. These nationalities represent the two groups of employees, Arabs and non-Arabs, which are the focus of this study. Nationalities of interest are: Saudis, Palestinians, Egyptians, Americans, Sudanese, and British. These nationalities constitute about 89 percent of the workforce in Saudi petrochemical companies. The issue of concern in this study was the representation of Arab and non-Arab employees as well as the representation of the six nationalities under investigation.

According to the Royal Commission Annual Report on Jubail and Yanbu in 1996, Saudi Basic Industries (i.e. all petrochemical companies) employ about 10,056 employees representing many nationalities in Jubail Industrial City. There are 3060 employees working in the six companies that participated in this study. The sample of this study was systematically and randomly drawn from the target population of participating companies with the consideration of including the nationalities of interest and the availability of a large sample that comprises all groups. Saudi petrochemical companies are homogeneous in their operations, managerial style, pay structure, work policies, and work environment, which reduces the potential sources of variation. The use of a large sample of employees gives randomness the chance to work and the nationalities of interest a chance to be represented. Also, the larger the sample size, the smaller the sampling error.

The researcher requested that participating companies provide him with a list of nationalities of interest, their departments, jobs, and the numbers of their mailboxes in each
company mailroom. A total of 2988 employees representing the nationalities of interest was obtained from the target population. Employees were grouped by their nationalities for the purpose of getting an equal number of nationality representation in the total sample. The researcher considered the smallest number of employees representing any nationality. After checking the lists of employees, the researcher found that one nationality had the smallest number of employees, 345 employees.

To achieve an equal size of nationality representation in the total sample, a random elimination of employees was followed for the other five nationalities. After reaching an equal number of subjects in each nationality group, it was determined that a systematic and random drawing of every third employee from each nationality would result in the desired number of employees for the mail questionnaire and voluntary interviews. A systematic random sample was drawn, and a serial number was assigned to each questionnaire for distribution purposes only. The purpose of the serial number was to match the data obtained from the questionnaire with that obtained from the short interview of employees and companies’ records. The total number of employees representing six nationalities is 690. Therefore, each one of the six nationalities is represented by 115 employees. Sample determination is explained in the power analysis section.

The Power Analysis

Hamburg (1987) emphasized that any investigator should answer two important questions to decide the appropriate sample size. These two questions are related to the degree of precision desired and the probability attached to the desired precision. A very large sample would be a waste of available resources, while a small sample may not serve
the objective of the study. Thus, calculation of the appropriate sample size is an important starting point.

Cohen (1988) suggested that researchers use power analyses to strengthen their statistical validity and calculate the appropriate sample size. Mazen, Graf, Kellogg, and Hemmasi (1987) argued that calculating a test a priori ensures that a study's results can be statistically significant if difference occurs. In this study, the use of power analyses was important to determine the appropriate sample size at an acceptable power level. Cohen (1988) listed three parameters involved in calculating the power of a study: (1) the significance level known as alpha, which is the risk of committing a Type I error, (2) sample size or number of subjects, which has an inverse relationship with the effect size, and (3) effect size, which represents the amount of difference in the means of groups that can be detected with the given values of alpha, beta, and sample size.

According to Cohen (1988), a Type I error is four times as serious as a Type II error. Thus, researchers set beta at .20 when alpha was set at a conventional level of .05. In their G.Power analyses program developed for the Macintosh computers (version 2.1.1), Buchner, Faul, and Erdfelder (1992) defined a small $f$ to be 0.10, a medium $f$ to be 0.25, and a large $f$ to be 0.40 for the F-Test ANOVA. Their definitions of these three levels of effect size were based on Cohen's (1988) assumptions. Buchner, Faul, and Erdfelder (1992) and Cohen (1988) recommended the use of the above levels of effect size to calculate the sample size for two groups or more.

Buchner, Faul, and Erdfelder (1992) recommended that users of the G.Power should be familiar with Cohen's (1988) three levels of effect size. The G.Power has three
important advantages: (1) a high level of precision, which is important for statistical power analyses, (2) flexibility, and (2) speed in computing effect size measures from basic parameters defining the alternative hypotheses. Furthermore, users of the G.Power may benefit from the graphs that show the relation between any two of the variables under investigation. The G.Power can provide users with a protocol table and a graph of the results using either an accuracy mode or high speed mode for computing a priori, post hoc, or compromise power. Accuracy mode is recommended by the developers of the G.Power software. Additionally, Erdfelder, Faul, and Buchner (1996) provided a detailed guideline on how to use this software and how to interpret the results.

Researchers should know that the larger the effect size the smaller the sample size and vice versa. The researcher of this study is aware of the relationship between the sample size and the effect size. There is a risk in increasing the effect size because the sample size decreases, which in turn increases the sampling error. This issue was considered when selecting the appropriate sample size of this study. Because the researcher’s objective is also to compare the levels of commitment of two different groups of employees to Saudi petrochemical companies on the basis of their personal demographics and job-related variables, it is very useful to have a large sample that could be reached in a reasonable time and with reasonable costs. A large sample size is important to reduce the sampling error that may occur. Also, the representation of the six nationalities under investigation was considered.

In this study, a priori test power analysis was conducted using the G.Power developed by Buchner, Faul, and Erdfelder (1992) to compute the sample size that should
represent the two groups of employees (Arabs and non-Arabs), the six nationalities, and other personal demographics and job-related variables. The researcher used standard alpha levels of .01, .05, and .10, a power of .80, and effect sizes of .10, .25, and .40 to calculate the sample size. The results of the power analyses are presented in Appendix B.

For the two groups of employees, with an alpha level of .05 as recommended by Cohen (1988), and a small effect size of .10 (approximately), a sample of 788 subjects would be needed to reach an acceptable power (1-β) level of .80. With a medium effect size of .25 and an alpha level of .05, a sample of 128 subjects would be needed to reach an acceptable power level of .80. However, with an alpha level of .05 and a large effect size of .40, a sample of approximately 52 would be needed to reach an acceptable power level.

A sample of 788 subjects is too large to reach considering cost and time. On the other hand, a sample of 128 or 52 subjects is too small considering the representation of six nationalities and the power of the tests. For the six nationalities, with a large sample size of 510 subjects, an alpha level of .05, and a power level of .80, the difference in the levels of organizational commitment between the two groups of employees can be detected at an effect size of approximately .16. When the researcher decreased the effect size to .15 without changing alpha level (.05) and the power level (.80) the sample size increased to 576 subjects.

The calculations and graphs in Appendix B showed that at a power level of .80, an alpha of .05, and an effect size range of .15 to .16 resulted in a sample range between 510 and 576 subjects. Thus, considering the six nationalities under investigation, a sample of 510 to 576 subjects was reasonable to test the hypotheses related to the variables of
interest. This reasonable sample size would give the researcher the opportunity to detect the effect size with at least a power level of .80. Because the nationalities of employees is of important interest in this study, the researcher tried to obtain an equal number of employees to represent each nationality.

The purpose of nationality representation was to detect the difference in the levels of organizational commitment between any two selected nationalities or groups of nationalities under investigation. A total sample of 690 employees representing the six nationalities was obtained from Saudi petrochemical companies’ records. They were mailed the questionnaire and asked to participate in a short interview voluntarily.

Assuming a high response rate, a sample size in the range of 510 to 576 employees is large enough to examine the differences between the two groups of employees and between each two selected nationalities or a group of nationalities. The assumption of high returns was based on the support and cooperation of the Saudi Cultural Mission in the United States, the researcher’s employer (King Faisal University), and the management of Saudi petrochemical companies. The Saudi Cultural Mission to the United States and King Faisal University provided the researcher with full support. They provided the researcher with letters to submit them to SABIC and their affiliates, the Saudi petrochemical companies.

A post-hoc power analysis for ANOVA procedure was performed after the number of observations was known to compute the power for a medium effect size. For the two groups of employees in the total sample on the basis of their personal demographics (excluding nationality) and job-based factors, the results show that with a sample size of
520, an alpha level of .05, and an effect size of .15 (medium) the power is approximately .93. For the six groups of nationalities, the results show that with a sample size of 520, an alpha level of .05, and an effect size of .16 (medium) the power is approximately .81. The power level for each of the two groups of employees and six groups of nationalities is above that suggested by Cohen (1988).

Measures

The definitions of the measures (constructs) were introduced in chapter I in Table 1. Also, the operationalizations of these variables, both dependent and independent, were included in the section of definitions in the same chapter. This section of this chapter sheds light on both the dependent variable (commitment) and independent variables as well. For the dependent variable, it covers the items in the instrument used to measure organizational commitment. For the independent variables, it contains personal demographics and job-based variables.

Dependent Variable: Organizational Commitment

A fifteen-item Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) developed by Porter et al. (1974) was used to assess employees’ organizational commitment. The items in this instrument measured the global organizational commitment of employees across nations. These items included in the OCQ are: (1) extra organizational involvement, (2) pride in the organization, (3) loyalty to the organization, (4) intent to stay with the organization, (5) desire to stay in the organization, (6) care about the organization, (7) inspiration by the organization, (8) match of goals and values, (9) seeking alternative
employment, (10) right employment choice, (11) best job preference, (12) difficulty to agree with policies regarding employees, (13) a definite mistake regarding the joining of this organization, (14) a great organization to work for, and (15) compliance with organizational policies.

The majority of researchers who used the OCQ to measure commitment summed and averaged the scores of the fifteen items. Angle and Perry (1981), Kinicki and Vecchio (1994), Meyer and Allen (1988), Mottaz (1988), Porter et al. (1974), Reed, Kratchman, and Strawser (1994), and Steers (1977) used the average score of the fifteen items of the OCQ as a total scale score for each respondent. The purpose of summing and averaging the score of response is to create a single measure of the individual’s commitment to the organization. Factor scores can also be used to obtain a measure of the construct. Since this is a viable approach, the researcher of this study used it. The ranking of the factor scores with One-Way ANOVA was used to test the hypotheses.

**Independent Variables: Personal Demographics and Job-related Variables**

Personal demographics in this study include place of birth, nationality, ethnicity, education, and age, while job-related variables comprise type of job (managerial versus non-managerial), type of employment (contract versus non-contract), organizational tenure, and job pay. The measure of place of birth was based on the country where the employee was born. The nationality variable determined the country of citizenship regardless of the place of birth and ethnicity of employees. Also, the ethnicity variable measured the ethnicity of employees by groups regardless of the nationality and place of birth of the employee. Education was measured by the level of education of an employee. These
levels are high school and less, and college degree and above. Organizational tenure showed the length of time in years an employee has been with the organization. The construct definitions and operational definitions are all included in Table 1 of chapter I.

Measurement Instrument

Angle and Lawson (1993), Cohen and Lowenberg (1990), Mathieu and Zajac (1990), Randall (1993), and Reichers (1985) emphasized that Porter et al.'s (1974) OCQ has been the most used measurement choice for many researchers. Mathieu and Zajac (1990) added that, in terms of its psychometric properties, this instrument is one of the best measures in the field of organizational behavior. Further, at least ninety published studies on organizational commitment used this instrument as a reliable and valid scale.

In support of this, Randall (1993) found in her review of cross-cultural commitment studies outside the United States that of the twenty-seven studies reviewed, seventeen studies used the OCQ developed by Porter et al. in 1974. The OCQ scale was compared with other organizational commitment scales to examine the reliability and validity. Ferris and Aranya (1983) compared the OCQ instrument developed by Porter et al. (1974) with Hrebinak and Alutto's (1972) organizational commitment instrument on reliability and validity issues. The findings of Ferris and Aranya (1983) showed that the Pearson's correlation between the two scales was 0.39 (p < 0.001). Their overall results suggested that the scale developed by Porter et al. (1974) produced a more efficient measure of employees' commitment to their organization. Furthermore, this scale was found to be internally valid and had greater predictive ability with respect to intent-to-leave the organization, which is the essence of organizational commitment.
The data of this study were collected from the subjects, using the OCQ. Respondents were asked to fully respond to fifteen questions by stating their agreement or disagreement with organizational commitment issues such as loyalty, membership, identification, involvement, and attachment. In addition to this, the researcher asked the subjects to respond to demographic questions that included nationality, place of birth, ethnicity, education, and age of employees. They were asked to respond to four job-based factors that include type of job, tenure, type of employment, and job pay.

The instrument used in the interviews of managers, supervisors, personnel, and employees has items developed from the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire. The items of the OCQ were reordered and used for the short interviews of employees who voluntarily participated in the interviews. Also, the demographics and job-related variables were included in the interviews along with the OCQ instrument. Data relevant to the independent variables were collected from more than one source and by more than one method. Data sources include supervisors, managers, personnel, and employees while methods include interviews, archival records, and mail survey.

Measurement Instrument Reliability

Nunnally (1967) and Nunnally and Bernstein (1994) defined reliability as the extent to which measurements are repeatable, and they noted that any random influence that tends to make measurements differ from occasion to occasion is a source of measurement error. Kerlinger (1986) defined reliability as the consistency, predictability, precision, dependability, and stability of the instrument to yield the same score when repeated on the
same set of subjects. More often researchers refer the reliability of an instrument to its stability and precision.

Ferris and Aranya (1983) compared the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) with Hrebiniaj and Alutto’s (1972) commitment instrument. Their findings showed that the reliability coefficient is 0.92 for the OCQ and 0.88 for Hrebiniaj and Alutto’s (1972) commitment instrument. Furthermore, Vandenberg, Self, and Seo (1994) compared the OCQ instrument with O'Reilly and Chatman’s (1986) compliance, identification, and internalization instruments, and their findings showed that the OCQ was more reliable and valid than other commitment instruments. Mowday, Porter, and Steers (1982) stated that the estimates of internal consistency of the OCQ were calculated using coefficient alpha, item analysis, and factor analysis. Their results of Cronbach’s alpha were consistently high, ranging from 0.82 to 0.93. Results showed that each item had a positive correlation with the total score for the OCQ, with the range of average correlation being from .36 to .72. The results, as Mowday, Porter, and Steers (1982) suggested in their study of organizational commitment, indicated that the fifteen items of the OCQ were relatively homogeneous with respect to the underlying attitude construct they measured.

Researchers tested the reliability of the OCQ in non-Western countries. The findings of Al-Meer (1989), Luthans, McCaul, and Dodd (1985), Marsh and Mannari (1977), Near (1989), Putti, Aryee, and Liang (1989), and Putti, Aryee, and Phua (1990) all supported the generalizability of the OCQ to other cultures. In Saudi Arabia, Yavas, Luqmani, and Quraeshi (1990) found that the internal consistency reliability of the OCQ was high (Cronbach’s alpha = 0.87), which exceeded the level suggested by Nunnally.
(1978). The findings of these studies suggested the reliability of the OCQ scale in measuring organizational commitment in non-Western cultures.

The researcher of this study examined the reliability of the OCQ in Saudi Arabia to assure its use in Saudi petrochemical companies. The reliability of the two versions of the OCQ, Arabic and English, was pretested in the pilot study. Results of the pilot study showed that the instrument was consistent (Cronbach’s alpha = .89) in measuring the organizational commitment of the sample of employees obtained from Saudi Basic Industries Corporation in Riyadh. Also, the study showed high reliability (Cronbach’s alpha = .94) when conducted on employees from Saudi petrochemical companies in Jubail Industrial City. These alpha values for the pilot study and the study itself are above that recommended by Nunnally (1978). Results of both the pilot study and the study itself will be discussed in chapter IV.

Measurement Instrument Validity

Validity was defined by Sackett and Larson (1990) as typically the probable truth or falsity of an assertion. Venkatraman and Grant (1986) referred to validity as the degree to which an instrument truly measures the construct which it is intended to measure. From these definitions, it is clear that if the instrument used in any study does not demonstrate a high degree of validity then the findings of the study are not valid.

Steers's (1977) study on antecedents and outcomes of organizational commitment showed that the internal validity of OCQ is .88 (coefficient alpha). Recently, Banai and Reisel (1993) used the OCQ scale and reported an acceptable internal consistency (Cronbach’s alpha = 0.75). Also, this instrument was used in Saudi Arabia by Al-Meer.
(1989) and Yavas, Luqmani, and Quraeshi (1990), who found Cronbach's alpha to be 0.85 and 0.87, respectively.

The psychometric properties of this measure were examined by Cook, Hepworth, Wall, and Warr (1981), Mowday, Porter, and Steers (1982), and Mowday, Steers, and Porter (1979), who suggested the use of this instrument in research on organizational commitment. If the OCQ scale measures a global attitude, the researcher should be able to measure organizational commitment using a precise conceptual view of attitudes, as Ajzen and Fishbein (1980) concluded. If the meaning of the organizational commitment construct was different to individuals then we could conclude that individuals did not have the same view of the construct.

The researcher of this study assessed the validity of the OQC in Saudi Basic Industries Corporation headquarters in Riyadh by matching the responses of employees to both Arabic and English versions of the OCQ instrument in the pilot study. The responses to both versions of the questionnaire showed that the instrument is highly valid. The results of the validity test of the pilot study and the actual study will be discussed in chapter IV.

Content Validity

Content validity is defined by Kerlinger (1986) as the representativeness or sampling adequacy of the content of a measuring instrument. Content validity depends on the extent to which an empirical measurement reflects a specific domain of content. Churchill (1988) argued that content validity involves the issue of adequate coverage of the measurement instrument of the most important aspects of the construct under study. Thus,
the degree of the instrument content validity depends on the extent of its coverage. Any measuring instrument that does not contain items to measure the construct under investigation lacks content validity. Basically, Kerlinger (1986) believed that content validity is judgmental.

In this study, the researcher examined the content validity of the Arabic and English versions of the OCQ by asking five faculty staff and researchers in a Saudi university to evaluate the content of both versions of the questionnaire. Also, the sample in the pilot study was used to validate the instrument validity for Arabic and English versions. The researcher thoroughly explained the process of content validation of the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) in the section that discussed instrument translation and back translation.

Convergent Validity

Kerlinger (1986) concluded that convergent validity means that evidence from different sources collected in different ways all indicates the same or similar meaning of the construct. Simply, different methods of measurement should converge on the construct of interest. The purpose of examining convergent validity of a particular construct is to show that it means the same or is similar to all individuals.

Some researchers have examined convergent validity of the OCQ in their studies of organizational behavior. Mowday, Porter, and Steers (1982) found in their study of retail employees that securing independent ratings of employees' commitment by their superiors was possible to increase convergent validity. They used the procedures and formula provided by Porter and Smith (1970). Also, their findings showed that the OCQ correlated
at $r = .60$ with independent commitment rating. In Saudi Arabia, Yavas, Luqmani, and Quraeshi (1990) found in their study of organizational commitment of Saudis and expatriates in Saudi organizations that the OCQ demonstrated high convergent validity ($r = 0.60; p < 0.00001$). Hence, the findings of these studies supported the evidence of convergent validity of the OCQ in other cultures, including the Arab culture.

**Discriminant Validity**

Discriminant validity as explained by Kerlinger (1986) means that one can empirically differentiate the construct from other constructs that may be similar and that an individual can point out what is unrelated to the construct of interest. Igabaria and Greenhaus (1992) defined discriminant validity as the degree to which items differentiate between the constructs. They also suggested that the variance shared between measures of two different constructs be lower than the average variance extracted by the items measuring each construct.

Mowday, Porter, and Steers (1982) argued that organizational commitment as an attitude would be expected to be related to other job-related attitudes. They argued that if researchers are to identify commitment as a unique construct in the study of organizational behavior, it must show acceptable levels of discriminant validity when compared to other attitudes. The discriminant validity of a construct can be assessed by the correlation between the measures of constructs. High positive and significant correlation between the measures mean that they are measuring the same construct in the absence of social desirability. If the measures are not correlated, then we can conclude that the constructs are unrelated.
The relationship between organizational commitment and Lodahl and Kejner's (1965) job-involvement measure ranged from $r = .30$ to $r = .56$ across four samples used in their study. Also, Mowday, Porter, and Steers (1982) reported low correlation between organizational commitment and a three-item measure of career satisfaction. These correlations are .39 and .40 for two samples. Using confirmatory factor analysis, Brooke, Russell, and Price (1988), Kanungo (1982), and Mowday, Porter, and Steers (1982) examined the discriminant validity of the attitudinal items of the measures of job satisfaction, job involvement, and organizational commitment. The results of their study provided evidence that these items of the three constructs were distinct. This means that respondents differentiated between the organizational commitment construct and the other two constructs. Recently, Grover and Crooker (1995), in their study of the impact of family-friendly policies on the organizational attachment of parents and non-parents, found that affective commitment, which was measured by the OCQ, had an adequate discriminant validity.

In summary, the results of studies reviewed showed that organizational commitment was a distinct construct. It was distinguished by subjects in many studies in which researchers attempted to examine the discriminant validity of the OCQ. Researchers identified organizational commitment as a unique construct that differs from other types of commitment such as job involvement or job commitment.

Translation and Back Translation of the Questionnaire

Because some of the participants did not speak or read English fluently, the researcher asked five faculty staff and researchers in a Saudi university to translate the
original English version of the OCQ into Arabic. Faculty staff and researchers were not
informed about the back translation of the Arabic version into English when they were
initially given the first version of the instrument to avoid potential validity threats. The
Arabic version of the OCQ was collected from faculty staff and researchers for comparison.

One week later, the researcher asked the faculty staff and researchers to back
translate the Arabic version into English. The researcher was aware of the time reasonable
between the translation and back translation of the OCQ to avoid any possible
contamination. Such procedures of back translation and content validation were
recommended by Hofstede (1980) for translating cross-national research instruments into
another language. All versions were compared, and necessary corrections were made so
that the Arabic and English versions of the questionnaire correspond.

The researcher pretested the questionnaire in a pilot study to examine the reliability
and validity of the instrument and to check whether necessary changes were needed to
make it fit this study. Researchers have examined the appropriateness of the instrument in
non-Western nations, but the researcher of this study wanted to ascertain that the
questionnaire used in this study can work in Saudi Arabia. He pretested the length, layout,
format, coverage, and wording of the instrument. The researcher of this study was able to
correct any problem that may reduce the validity and reliability before surveying the
employees of participating Saudi petrochemical companies in Jubail Industrial City.

Scaling

A large majority of studies on organizational commitment used Likert-type scales to
measure attitudes of employees toward the organization. According to Summers (1970),
the Likert scale has advantages over other scales because of its validity, reliability, and practicality. Also, the Likert scale is fast and easy to use for measuring the attitudes of subjects toward their organizations. The opinion or attitude of a subject ranged between strongly agree and strongly disagree. The Likert scale can give a single score that represents the degree to which an individual or subject has a favorable or unfavorable attitude toward the employing organization.

The Pilot Study

For the pilot study, the investigator selected a total of forty employees from Saudi Basic Industries Corporation headquarters in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia. The selection was based on the employees' ability to read and speak Arabic and English fluently. Employees represented various departments, different managerial and non-managerial jobs, and other different demographics. They were divided into two groups of twenty so the first group received the Arabic version of the questionnaire while the second group received the English version simultaneously. Completed questionnaires were collected immediately after the first administration. One week later, the first group received the English version of the questionnaire while the second group received the Arabic version simultaneously. Responses were collected from the second questionnaire administration.

The Pearson's correlation coefficient (r) and Spearman's rank correlation coefficient were used to examine the reliability of the Arabic and English versions of the questionnaire. The results of Pearson's correlation show that there is a significant correlation between the two responses of the first group (r = .99), Arabic and English versions. Also, the results show that there is a significant correlation (r = 1) between the two versions of the
responses of the second group. A high correlation between the responses of the subjects to both Arabic and English versions of the first group or the second group means high reliability of the two versions of the OCQ. Also, a high correlation between the Arabic translation of the first group and the Arabic translation of the second group or the English version of the first group and the English version of the second group means high reliability of the questionnaire.

Spearman's rank correlation coefficients showed similar results to Pearson's correlation coefficient. The Spearman's correlation coefficients between the Arabic and English versions for the first groups is .99, while it is 1 for the second group. In conclusion, employees' consistent responses to both Arabic and English versions of the questionnaire show that it has high reliability and validity.

Nonresponse Bias in a Mail Survey

Many researchers believed that nonresponse in a mail questionnaire can be a problem because subjects who did not willingly respond to the questionnaire may have significant information. Nonresponse bias may not be a serious problem in this study because of the following reasons: (1) the effective response rate is relatively high, about 75.4 percent, (2) some of the employees who did not participate in the mail survey participated in the interviews, (3) checking the responses of employees who participated in the interview but not in the mail survey and the responses of those who responded to the mail survey but not to the interview showed the consistency, and (4) some of those who did not participate in the mail survey or the interview stated that they were not used to surveys. The unfamiliarity of some of the Arab employees with answering questionnaires
contributed to the absence of their responses to the mail survey. This is may be true to some extent because they expressed that to the researcher. One point that needs to be understood is that in less developed countries employees are more apprehensive to responding to surveys than those in industrial countries. Therefore, employees’ full cooperation may be gained if the management of an organization conveys the specific purpose of the study to them.

Data Collection Procedures

This study was conducted in an uncontrolled environment on a systemic random sample of Arab and non-Arab employees working in Saudi petrochemical companies. It is a non-experimental design, which used mail survey, voluntary interviews, and companies’ records to obtain the necessary information about employees’ demographics, job-based variables, and commitment to Saudi petrochemical companies. The purpose of multiple sources and multiple methods is to reduce the effects of social desirability and common method variance on the validity of the study.

Based on the lists of employees provided by participating Saudi petrochemical companies, a systematic random sample of employees was drawn and contacted to respond to the mail questionnaire and a voluntary short interview with personnel, managers, and supervisors to investigate the attitudes of employees toward their organizations. The researcher distributed the questionnaire, using the mailroom of each company to reduce the time and costs associated with regular mail. Each company provided its employees with mail services so each employee had a mailbox that carries a number without the employee’s name. The researcher could easily identify the responses of employees by matching them
with their mailbox numbers and the serial numbers assigned by the researcher. Also, personal demographics and job-related information from participating companies' records can be matched with that obtained from the mail questionnaire. Employees returned the completed questionnaires to the mailroom so the researcher could pick them up.

Along with the questionnaire, the researcher sent four letters to ask for the respondents' full cooperation. These four letters are from the researcher, the researcher's employer (King Faisal University), the Saudi Cultural Mission to the United States, and the management of participating Saudi petrochemical companies. In general, surveys that are sponsored or affiliated with universities or research institutions have higher response rates than those sponsored by independent businesses and managers or community economic councils, as noted by Duncan (1979) and Paxson (1992). They added that studies sponsored by a university have appeals to subjects. This increased the response rate of selected organizations and randomly selected employees.

The purpose of these letters was to introduce the management of each company to the researcher's objective and to ask for their full cooperation. The personnel and public relations department in each company fully cooperated with the researcher and communicated the interest in this study to the employees. They also communicated the anonymity of employees' names and the confidentiality of their responses. In addition, the researcher communicated the anonymity and confidentiality to all participants. In this study, participating employees must be representative of participating Saudi companies, managerial employees and non-managerial employees, the six nationalities of interest, low education employees and high education employees, and long-tenure employees and short-
tenure employees. Also, employees should be representative of old employees and young employees, employees born in Saudi Arabia and employees born outside Saudi Arabia, contract employees and non-contract employees, low-pay employees and high-pay employees, and Arab employees and non-Arab employees.

The investigator asked subjects to respond to a two-section mail questionnaire. These sections are the fifteen-item Organizational Commitment Questionnaire developed by Porter et al. (1974) and the demographic and job-based variables. Participants were asked to rate their agreement or disagreement with each item on a seven-point Likert scale, ranging from 1—*strongly disagree* to 7—*strongly agree*. Follow-up telephone calls and letters were made to ask employees to complete and return the questionnaires. They were also contacted to participate in the interview, which is relevant to commitment and its predictors. The researcher asked managers, personnel, and supervisors to voluntarily participate in a short interview concerning their attitudes and work behaviors that predict employees’ organizational commitment. Also, the researcher included employees in this short interview to match the data obtained from the face-to-face interview with that obtained from their responses to the OCQ mail questionnaire and companies’ records.

According to Angle and Perry (1981), Caldwell, Chatman, and O’Reilly (1990), Kuruvilla and Fiorito (1994), and Steers (1977), highly committed employees showed a higher level of performance and a high level of attendance. As an outcome of commitment, voluntary turnover of employees may tell researchers about employees’ commitment to the organization. The researcher referred to voluntary turnover to mean employees who leave their organizations on their own. Becker and Thomas (1992) and Clegg (1983) contended
that there is a strong belief among researchers that highly committed employees are less likely to voluntarily leave their organizations. In this study, the investigator obtained performance, attendance, and turnover data from companies' records to compare them with employees' commitment. Also, personal demographics and job-based data were collected from companies' records. Table 4 contains a summary of the data collection methods.

Table 4. A summary of the data collection methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Uncontrolled environment.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>Arab and non-Arab (Western) employees working in Saudi petrochemical companies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sampling</td>
<td>A systematic random sampling of the six nationalities of Arab and non-Arab (Western).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Non-experimental design focused on: (1) mail survey, (2) archival data, (3) and voluntary interviews.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures</td>
<td>(1) Saudi petrochemical companies were contacted for participation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Each participating company provided the researcher with a list of employees' mailbox numbers, nationalities, and other relevant job-based and personal demographics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3) A systematic random sample was drawn from these lists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4) Employees were mailed the questionnaire with a cover letter thanking them and asking them to participate in the interview.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5) Participating companies provided the investigator with archival data linked to their employees' commitment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(6) Follow-up telephone calls and letters were made to get employees' responses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A total of 566 out of 690 responses were returned and 520 usable responses were obtained; thus, the effective response rate is 75.4 percent. Forty-six questionnaires were
not completed so they were omitted from further analysis. Mail questionnaires that had personal demographics and job-related data missing were not a problem because such data were obtained from companies' records. Only questionnaires that had dependent variable data missing were not included in the analysis. A total of 288 employees participated in the short interview, which was about 42 percent of the employees who were approached to respond to the mail questionnaire. Employees who participated in the interviews were about 55.4 percent of those with usable responses.

Data Analysis Techniques

The researcher used SPSS to run the appropriate statistical tests to examine the hypotheses in this study. The researcher used the fifteen-item Organizational Commitment Questionnaire developed by Porter et al. (1974) and the independent variables to assess the commitment of domestic and international employees to Saudi petrochemical companies. Using factor analysis, all items loaded on one factor. This indicates that all items in the OCQ measured one single construct—organizational commitment. The researcher used the factor score to test the hypotheses.

The investigator examined the internal consistency of this study by using Cronbach's alpha coefficient for the fifteen items. The G.Power program developed by Buchner, Faul, and Erdfelder (1992) was a useful software to analyze the power of this study and to determine the appropriate sample size needed to reach an acceptable power level of .80. For the pilot study, the researcher used Pearson's correlations to examine the correlations between employees' responses to the English and Arabic versions of the OCQ.
Also, the researcher used Cronbach’s alpha to test the reliability of the pilot study and the actual study.

Choosing the appropriate statistical test to examine the hypotheses is an important step. Based on their place of birth, nationality, ethnicity, type of employment, type of position, education, age, pay, and tenure, the researcher investigated the difference in the levels of employees’ commitment to Saudi petrochemical companies. There are two groups of employees in each independent variable with the exception of the nationality variable which has six nationalities. The groups of individuals to be studied are employees born in Saudi Arabia vs. employees born outside Saudi Arabia, Arab employees vs. non-Arab employees, low educated employees vs. highly educated employees, managerial employees vs. non-managerial employees, long tenure employees vs. short tenure employees, old employees vs. young employees, contract employees vs. non-contract employees, and low pay employees vs. high pay employees.

On the other hand, there are six nationalities under the nationality variable: Americans, Saudis, Egyptians, British, Palestinians, and Sudanese. The researcher investigated the difference in the levels of employees’ commitment to Saudi petrochemical companies for two nationalities as two groups, and for each two groups of nationalities as two groups. The grouping of nationalities depends on the homogeneity of their cultures and ethnicities. For instance, the difference in the levels of commitment of Saudi nationality and Western nationalities to Saudi petrochemical companies was studied. Also, the difference in some Arab and non-Arab nationalities’ levels of commitment was investigated as two groups of nationalities. The data analysis techniques are summarized in
Table 5. The table shows the statistical techniques used in the pilot study, the actual study, and the power analysis.

Table 5. A summary of data analysis techniques.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pilot Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson’s correlation coefficient (r) and Spearman’s rank correlation coefficients to test the reliability and validity of the questionnaire translation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Power software was used to decide the appropriate sample size and effect size at alpha .05 and power .80.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Initially, a One-Way ANOVA was used, but the homogeneity of variance assumption was violated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) The nonparametric test, ranking of the factor score with One-Way ANOVA, was used to test the hypotheses because it does not have assumptions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Cronbach’s alpha was used to test the reliability of the study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Factor analysis was used to examine the possible number of factors and the loading of items on each factor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Initially, the analysis of variance, One-Way ANOVA, was selected as an appropriate statistical test to investigate the differences in the level of organizational commitment on the basis of employees’ demographic variables and job-related variables.

Dillon and Goldstein (1984) argued that, since the search for demographic and
organizational variables involves the use of categorical variables, analysis of variance (One-Way ANOVA) is an appropriate statistical method to assess the hypotheses of differences in the groups. One of the most important assumptions of the One-Way ANOVA is the normal distribution and homogeneity of variance. The normal distribution assumption can be relaxed for a large sample size, as Johnson and Wichern (1992) suggested, because the sample size in this study is large. However, the homogeneity of variance assumption was violated; therefore, the use of One-Way ANOVA is not appropriate to analyze the data.

Because of the violation of the homogeneity of variance assumption of One-Way ANOVA, the researcher used the non-parametric technique, ranking of the factor scores with One-Way MANOVA to test the hypotheses. Because there is only one dependent variable, the results of the factor scores ranking with One-Way MANOVA contains One-Way ANOVA. The non-parametric One-Way MANOVA method is the multivariate rank test that can be used under certain violations of the assumptions of normality and homogeneity of variance of parametric tests as discussed by Zwick (1985). The ranking of the factor scores with One-Way MANOVA test does not have assumptions like other parametric tests; thus, it is useful to test the hypotheses of this study.

Pavur and Nath (1989) suggested that researchers transform the raw data into ranks, then apply the parametric test on the transformed data. The rank transformation approach is easy and convenient to enter into a program for parametric analysis as suggested by Conover and Iman (1981). This approach is one of the best approaches used by researchers as an alternative to analyze data that can not be analyzed with One-Way
ANOVA due to the violation of assumptions. Therefore, the researcher of this study used these procedures to test the hypotheses.

Chapter Summary

This chapter covers the research methodology selected to gather data from domestic and international employees working in Saudi petrochemical companies. The research design appropriate to test the hypotheses is proposed in this chapter. The way that participating companies and sample subjects are selected is to ensure the validity and reliability of the results of this study.

Organizational commitment is a psychological state of an employee's attitudes toward his or her organization. It is a sensitive issue for both management and employees. For employees, it is important not to reveal their negative feelings about their organizations to management. For management, the issue is crucial for the survival of the organization. Management may want to keep highly committed employees in the case of downsizing. Because organizational commitment is so sensitive, it is difficult to investigate the phenomenon in a laboratory setting.

A random sample of forty employees from Saudi Basic Industries in Riyadh participated in the pilot study. Using Pearson's correlation coefficients (r) and Spearman's correlation coefficients to test the reliability of the two versions of the questionnaire, Arabic and English translation, the results show consistency in employees' responses. A mail survey is an appropriate data collection method because the identity of subjects can be kept anonymous to increase the rate of response. Also, organizational commitment, personal demographics, job-related variables, and other commitment-related data were collected.
from companies’ records and through interviews. Because the data collection method and source were triangulated, the threats of social desirability and common method variance may be reduced.

The researcher randomly and systematically drew the subjects from participating companies, with the consideration that nationalities of interest were represented in the sample. They were asked to respond to the OCQ, demographics, and organizational-related questions. Managers, supervisors, and personnel were asked to participate in an interview about the employees’ commitment to Saudi petrochemical companies. Also, data related to employees’ commitment, personal demographics, and job-based factors were collected from companies’ records and interviews.

The G.Power program was used to determine the appropriate sample size. Pearson’s correlations were used to examine the reliability and validity of the pilot study. Additionally, Cronbach’s alpha was used to measure the reliability of the pilot study and the study itself. Factor analysis and the ranking of the factor score with One-Way ANOVA were useful statistical tests to analyze data obtained from the respondents. Factor analysis was used to examine the possible number of factors of the OCQ and the loading of items on each factor. All items were loaded on one single factor that resulted from the factor analysis. The ranking of the factor score with the One-Way ANOVA test allowed the researcher to investigate the differences in the level of commitment between the two groups of employees as well as between each two or more selected nationalities of employees as two groups.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The results and analysis of the data collected are discussed in the following four sections. Section one contains the characteristics of the sample; it also includes the effective response rate of the mail questionnaire. This section covers the descriptive statistics of the personal demographics and job-related factors of employees. Personal demographics of employees include the nationality, ethnicity, education, age, and place of birth, while job-related variables cover organizational tenure, job type, employment type, and job pay. This means that the whole sample is divided into two groups by their job-related factors such as number of managerial employees versus non-managerial employees.

Section two covers the descriptive statistics of the measure of organizational commitment. Descriptive statistics of the dependent variable, the fifteen items of the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire, include the means and standard deviations of the items. Also, descriptive statistics, which are summarized in Table 9, show the lowest mean as well as the highest mean across all fifteen items of the OCQ.

Section three includes reliability and validity of each of the pilot study and the study itself as introduced in chapter III and chapter II, respectively. It includes the statistical tests used to examine the reliability and validity of the pilot study and the study itself. Section four is a discussion of the factor analysis and the results for the fifteen items of the
Organizational Commitment Questionnaire. The loadings of the fifteen items of the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire were reported as shown in Table 11.

Section five contains the appropriate statistical tests and hypotheses testing. Also, it contains the results of the hypotheses, the significance of possible differences in employees' levels of organizational commitment, and the power and effect sizes of hypotheses. An alpha level of .05 was used for power analysis and testing the hypotheses. Finally, this section concludes with a summary.

Characteristics of the Sample

The sample consists of 520 employees representing six nationalities working in Saudi petrochemical companies in Jubail Industrial City in Saudi Arabia. The researcher distributed the questionnaires to a systematic random sample of 690 employees, 115 questionnaires for each nationality. After follow-up letters and telephone contacts, 565 responses were returned to the researcher. Of the 566 responses, 520 were usable. The effective response rate was about 75.4 percent. Questionnaires that were produced by employees and distributed to their coworkers were excluded from the sample. The discussion of the findings for the total sample is based on organizational commitment and its relationship with personal demographics and job-related factors of employees.

Personal Demographics of Employees

Employees born in Saudi Arabia and employees born in other countries are 190 and 330, respectively. Arab employees as an ethnic group and non-Arab (Western) employees
as another ethnic group are 336 and 184, respectively. Table 6 shows the frequency and percentage of some of the personal demographics of employees.

Table 6. A summary of some of the personal demographics of employees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place of Birth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Countries</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabs</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>Old</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>53.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Arabs</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>Young</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>46.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The nationalities that were included in this study are as follows: Saudis (89), Americans (92), Egyptians (83), British (87), Palestinians (84), and Sudanese (85). American employees had the highest response rate, while Egyptian employees had the lowest response rate. Saudi employees came second in their response rate. Table 7 shows the nationalities and their percentage to the total sample.

Table 7. Frequency and percentage of employees in the sample by nationality.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Saudis</th>
<th>Americans</th>
<th>Egyptians</th>
<th>British</th>
<th>Palestinians</th>
<th>Sudanese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All employees regardless of their place of birth, nationality, or ethnicity were divided into two groups on the basis of their other demographics and job-related variables.
Employees with high education, some college education, low education are 250, 21, and 249, respectively. Employees with some college education are 21, which is about 10 percent of the total sample. They were not included in the education variable analysis because they are not of interest to the researcher. Old employees (40 years and more) and young employees (less than 40 years) are 279 and 241, respectively.

**Job-related Factors of Employees**

Managerial and non-managerial employees are 199 and 321, respectively. Long-tenure (7 years and more) and short-tenure employees (less than 7 years) are 321 and 199, respectively. Lifetime and contract employees are 226 and 294, respectively. Finally, employees with high pay and employees with low pay are 249 and 220, respectively.

Table 8 contains a summary of the frequency and percentage of the job-related variables.

**Table 8. A summary of the frequency and percentage of the job-related variables.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>Lifetime</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>43.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Manageral</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>56.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Descriptive Statistics of the Measure of Organizational Commitment

The measure of organizational commitment or Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) was used in this study to collect the data about employees'
commitment to Saudi petrochemical companies. Employees were asked to report their agreement or disagreement with each one of the fifteen items in the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire instrument. On a seven-point Likert scale, ranging from 1--strongly disagree to 7--strongly agree, employees' means of responses on the items ranged from 4.3 to 6.4. The standard deviations of employees' responses ranged from .046 to .078, while the variances of the fifteen items ranged from 1.04 to 3.65. The item "I feel very little loyalty to this organization" had the highest variance value of 3.65. One possible explanation of this large variance value is that Saudi employees scored higher than other non-Saudi employees.

The item stated "I am willing to put a great deal of effort beyond that expected in order to help this organization to be successful" had the highest mean (mean = 6.34, sd = 1.06), while the item that stated "Often, I find it difficult to agree with this organization's policies on important matters relating to its employees" had the lowest mean (mean = 4.3, sd = 1.78). Employees did not score high on the item that relates to loyalty (mean = 4.44, sd = 1.91). This means that employees had positive intentions to be involved in their organization even though they were not loyal to it. Employees scored high on the item that stated "I really care about the fate of this organization" (mean = 5.89, sd = 1.02), but generally they felt that deciding to work for their organizations was a definite mistake (mean = 5.55, sd = 1.3). A summary of some of the important descriptive statistics for the fifteen items that make up the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire is shown in Table 9. This summary table includes means, standard deviations, and variances explained by the factor.
Table 9. A summary of the descriptive statistics of the fifteen items of the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire instrument.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Commitment Questionnaire Items</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>Standard Deviations</th>
<th>Variances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I am willing to put a great deal of effort beyond that expected in order to help this organization to be successful.</td>
<td>6.34</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I talk up this organization to my friends as a great organization to work for.</td>
<td>5.69</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I feel very little loyalty to this organization.</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I would accept almost any type of job assignment in order to keep working for this organization.</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I find my values and the organization's values are very similar.</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I am proud to tell others that I am part of this organization.</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I could just as well be working for a different organization as long as the type of work was similar.</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. This organization really inspires the very best in me in the way of job performance.</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. It would take very little change in my present circumstances to cause me to leave this organization.</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I am extremely glad that I chose this organization to work for, over others I was considering at the time I joined.</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. There is not too much to be gained by sticking with this organization indefinitely.</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Often, I find it difficult to agree with this organization's policies on important matters relating to its employees.</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I really care about the fate of this organization.</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. For me this is the best of all possible organizations for which to work.</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Deciding to work for this organization was a definite mistake on my part.</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The overall high negative scores of attitudes reported by employees toward their organization may lead to the conclusion that employees with low loyalty, low involvement, and low care about the organization may leave it for another alternative that offers better opportunities. The interesting finding of this study is that employees who reported a neutral response to the loyalty item also reported neutral to difficulty to agree with the organization's policies with regard to matters relating to employees item.

Reliability and Validity of the Pilot Study and the Actual Study

The reliability and validity of the instrument were tested in both the pilot study and the actual study. The reliability and validity of a study are important for determining its goodness. The results of the statistical tests showed that the instrument is valid and reliable in measuring the commitment of employees from different countries in Saudi petrochemical companies.

The Reliability and Validity of the Pilot Study

The researcher conducted the pilot study in the Saudi Basic Industries Corporation on a random sample of forty employees, who speak and write Arabic and English fluently. The pilot study sample is similar in most of its characteristics to the actual study sample. Employees were divided into two groups and each group was given the questionnaire in Arabic and English as previously explained in chapter III. The purpose of the pilot study was to make sure that the instrument used to measure the variables of interest is reliable and valid. Cronbach's alpha was used to examine the consistency of employees' responses. Also, Pearson's correlation coefficients (r) and Spearman's correlation coefficients were
used to examine the reliability of employees' responses to the questionnaire in Arabic and English.

The reliability of the fifteen items of the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire used in the pilot study is relatively high (Cronbach's alpha = .89). The means of responses of the first group that received the Arabic version and then the English version of the questionnaire are 5.51 and 5.50, respectively, while the means of responses of the second group that received the English version and then the Arabic version of the questionnaire are 5.93 and 5.93, respectively. The standard deviations of the same group are .85 and .87, respectively, while the standard deviations of the second group are .44 and .44, respectively. The results of Pearson's correlation coefficients (r) showed that the correlation between the two versions of responses is .99, while the correlation between the two versions of the responses is 1. Also, the results of Spearman's correlation coefficients showed that the correlations between the Arabic and English versions of the questionnaire of the first group is .99, while it is 1 for the second group. For the pilot study, performing Pearson's correlations or Spearman's correlations to the data would yield the same results, which showed the reliability of the questionnaire in Arabic and English.

To examine the differences between the two versions of responses, the paired t-test was performed; the result showed that there was no significant difference (p > .05, t = .83). Also, the t-test was performed to examine the equality of means and the result showed that there was no significant difference in the means (p > .05). Overall, the results of the t-tests performed on the data collected from the pilot study indicate a high reliability alpha of the instrument in Saudi Arabia, particularly the Saudi petrochemical companies.
Whether the response in Arabic or English, employees responded consistently to the two versions of the questionnaire. This shows that the construct meant the same to all respondents. In this study, the measure of organizational commitment relates to the construct under investigation. In short, the test-retest reliability alpha is evidence of the reliability of this instrument in Saudi organizations. The construct is well understood by Arab employees like it is understood by non-Arab employees. Thus, there is no significant variation between Arab and non-Arab employees in understanding the construct, the OCQ.

The Reliability and Validity of the Actual Study

According to Peterson (1994), there is virtual consensus among researchers that for an instrument to be valid and have practical utility, it must be reliable. He added that Cronbach’s coefficient alpha is the most widely used measure of instrument reliability. The researcher used Cronbach’s alpha to examine the reliability of the measurement, and the result indicated a high Cronbach’s alpha of .94. The Cronbach’s alpha level that researcher of this study found is greater than that found in the pilot study or the ones found in Meyer and Allen (1987), Near (1989), and Putti et al.’s (1989) organizational commitment studies. Further, the level of Cronbach’s alpha of this study is greater than the one recommended by Nunnally (1978). He, without explanation, recommended that the minimally acceptable reliability level for a study should be .70.

The reason the Cronbach’s alpha level (.94) of the study is greater than that of the pilot study (.89) is that the sample size in the former is much larger than the sample size of the latter. Previous studies have examined the validity of the instrument in different cultures and the results of these studies indicated that the construct was related to the
measure. This means that the instrument used in these studies measured one underlying construct, the organizational commitment construct. Table 10 is a comparison of the reliabilities of other organizational commitment studies conducted in other countries.

Table 10. A comparison of the reliabilities of other organizational commitment studies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Researchers</th>
<th>Reliabilities, Cronbach's alphas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Aranya et al. (1986)</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arnold and Feldman (1982)</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ferris and Aranya (1983)</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meyer and Allen (1984)</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meyer and Allen (1987)</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meyer and Allen (1988)</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan and</td>
<td>Luthans et al. (1985)</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>Near (1989)</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>Putti et al. (1989)</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Putti et al. (1990)</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor Analysis

The majority of researchers linked the importance of factor analysis to the following reasons: (1) validating the questionnaire, (2) examining the number of factors that underlie the set of variables, (3) investigating the complex relationships between the variables, (4) finding the extent to which each variable depends on each common factor, (5) reducing the dimensionality of a set of multivariate variables, (6) developing a set of uncorrelated variables for applying some other techniques, and (7) interpreting the factors. Others such as Aaker (1980) believed that factor analysis has two primary functions in data analysis, which are identifying the underlying constructs and reducing the number of variables to a
more manageable set. Generally, researchers use factor analysis to examine the number of factors and the loadings of items on each factor.

The researcher of this study used factor analysis with Kaiser normalization. The researcher took several steps with regard to the selection of the loadings of items on the possible factors. He retained and reported only items with factor loadings equal to or greater than .40. This is a conservative value in comparison with the values that some researchers used in their studies. For example, Angle and Perry (1981), Luthans, McCaul, and Dodd (1989), and Nunnally and Bernstein (1994) suggested a minimum factor loading of .30. Some liberal values with factor loadings as low as .08 were retained by some of the organizational commitment researchers. However, the investigator of this study followed the suggestions made by Hair, Anderson, Tatham, and Black (1992); thus, only items that loaded .40 or above were reported. Because only one factor resulted, there was no need to remove items that loaded high on two or more factors as suggested by some researchers.

The results of the factor analysis indicate that for the total sample of employees representing the six nationalities the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire measured a single underlying construct, that is organizational commitment. These results are consistent with those of Luthans, McCaul, and Dodd (1985), who found one factor in their study of American employees' commitment to their employing companies. The one factor that emerged from the factor analysis of the fifteen-item Organizational Commitment Questionnaire has an eigenvalue greater than 1.0. It explained 60.2 percent of the variance. Table 11 shows the results of the factor analysis of the fifteen items of the OCQ.
Table 11. Factor matrix for the fifteen items of the construct of Organizational Commitment measured by the OCQ.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I am willing to put a great deal of effort beyond that expected in order to help this organization to be successful.</td>
<td>.63111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I talk up this organization to my friends as a great organization to work for.</td>
<td>.78359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I feel very little loyalty to this organization.</td>
<td>.67612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I would accept almost any type of job assignment in order to keep working for this organization.</td>
<td>.75121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I find my values and the organization's values are very similar.</td>
<td>.80164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I am proud to tell others that I am part of this organization.</td>
<td>.80064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I could just as well be working for a different organization as long as the type of work was similar.</td>
<td>.85996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. This organization really inspires the very best in me in the way of job performance.</td>
<td>.78567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. It would take very little change in my present circumstances to cause me to leave this organization.</td>
<td>.83315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I am extremely glad that I chose this organization to work for, over others I was considering at the time I joined.</td>
<td>.83236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. There is not too much to be gained by sticking with this organization indefinitely.</td>
<td>.83746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Often, I find it difficult to agree with this organization's policies on important matters relating to its employees.</td>
<td>.53305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I really care about the fate of this organization.</td>
<td>.72603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. For me this is the best of all possible organizations for which to work.</td>
<td>.86288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Deciding to work for this organization was a definite mistake on my part.</td>
<td>.84102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eigenvalue for the factor commitment. 9.03
Percent of variance explained by the commitment factor (one factor). 60.2

Kaiser (1960) suggested retaining only items whose eigenvalues are greater than one. Because only one factor emerged in this study and all items loaded high on the factor, the removal of items is not applicable. The purposes of the factor analysis in this study are:
(1) calculating the factor score, which can be used to examine the hypotheses, (2) examining the loadings of items and the number of factors, (3) reducing the factors to a manageable number, and (3) finding the percent of variance explained.

According to Johnson and Wichern (1992), interest in factor analysis is usually centered on the parameters in the factor model; thus, the estimated values of the common factors, which is called the factor score, may also be required. Using factor score is a common practice in organizational research as suggested by Gnanadesikan (1997). The factor score is simply the summation of the multiplication of the factor loading and standardized score for all fifteen items on each subject. This was done for all 520 subjects, who completed the questionnaire. The communality of the items on the same factor ranged from approximately .40 to .71, while the loadings of items on the organizational commitment construct ranged from .53 to .86. In comparison with other items on the OCQ, the item that stated “Often, I find it difficult to agree with this organization’s policies on important matters relating to its employees” had the lowest loading (.53) on the commitment factor, while the item stated “For me this is the best of all possible organizations for which to work” had the highest loading (.86).

Research Questions and Hypotheses

This section deals with the research questions and research hypotheses. In this study, there are two questions that need to be answered: (1) Is there a difference in the level of commitment to Saudi petrochemical companies between Arab and non-Arab employees?; and (2) Is there a difference in the level of commitment between employees working in Saudi petrochemical companies on the basis of their demographic and job-related variables?
Also, there are eleven hypotheses that are pertinent to organizational commitment and each of the variables in personal demographics and job-related components.

Hypotheses related to the personal demographics and organizational commitment are H1, H1a, H2, H3, H3a, H4, and H7, while job-related factors and organizational commitment hypotheses are H5, H6, H8, and H9. The major purpose of these hypotheses is to examine if there is a difference in the level of commitment to Saudi petrochemical companies between the two groups of employees on the basis of their personal demographics and job-related variables. Also, the means and standard deviations of the groups of employees were compared to see which group scored a higher level of commitment to Saudi petrochemical companies than the other group.

This section includes the appropriate statistical tests that were used to examine these hypotheses. Some statistical tests have assumptions that must be met such as normal distribution and homogeneity of variance. The investigator of this study took these assumptions into consideration. Violation of any of these assumptions means using alternative tests that do not have assumptions, but give reliable and valid results. The results of significance of differences, the power level, and effect size for each of the hypotheses examined were included in this section.

Appropriate Statistical Tests and Hypotheses Testing

The researcher used the One-Way ANOVA to examine the hypotheses, but the results showed that some of the assumptions were not met. The results of the Bartlett-Box test showed the homogeneity of variance was significant. Because of the violation of the ANOVA homogeneity of variance assumption, the researcher used factor scores ranking
with One-Way ANOVA in this study. Table 12 shows the p value as computed by Bartlett-Box test, which examined all hypotheses homogeneity of variance.

Table 12. Results of the Bartlett-Box test of homogeneity of variance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>P Value</th>
<th>The Status of ANOVA Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1 and H1a</td>
<td>p &lt; .001</td>
<td>Violated the homogeneity of variance assumption.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>p &lt; .001</td>
<td>Violated the homogeneity of variance assumption.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3 and H3a</td>
<td>p &lt; .001</td>
<td>Violated the homogeneity of variance assumption.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4</td>
<td>p &lt; .001</td>
<td>Violated the homogeneity of variance assumption.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5</td>
<td>p &lt; .001</td>
<td>Violated the homogeneity of variance assumption.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6</td>
<td>p &lt; .001</td>
<td>Violated the homogeneity of variance assumption.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7</td>
<td>p &lt; .001</td>
<td>Violated the homogeneity of variance assumption.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H8</td>
<td>p &lt; .001</td>
<td>Violated the homogeneity of variance assumption.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H9</td>
<td>p &lt; .001</td>
<td>Violated the homogeneity of variance assumption.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ranking with one-way ANOVA statistical technique was used by other researchers and proved to be reliable and valid with data that did not meet the homogeneity and normality assumptions of the parametric tests. The ranking of the normal scores in combination with a One-Way ANOVA, as suggested by Zwick (1985), is called nonparametric One-Way ANOVA, which was used in this study to test all hypotheses. It must be clarified that this nonparametric technique is a One-Way MANOVA, but the results were reported in One-Way ANOVA because there is only one dependent variable.
The researcher chose the ranking of normal scores with One-Way MANOVA because it calculated the power and effect size for each hypothesis tested. The conversion of raw data into ranks of scores was used as a bridge between nonparametric and parametric statistics as suggested by Conover and Iman (1981), who believed that this approach is useful where the parametric test assumptions are not satisfied. Conover and Iman (1981) believed that rank transformation procedures are ones in which the parametric test is applied to the rank of the transformed data instead of the raw data. They argued that researchers should view this technique as a useful tool for developing nonparametric procedures to solve new problems.

Because the researcher is testing eleven hypotheses, this may inflate the Type I error rates. Thus, the alpha level was adjusted to control for Type I error. The Type I error that results from testing many hypotheses is often recognized in organizational studies as the familywise Type I error rate. Some researchers including Fletcher, Daw, and Young (1989) and Kirk (1995) suggested the use of the Bonferroni adjustment procedure as an alternative method for controlling Type I error. This procedure provides appropriate control of the Type I error rate in experimental and non-experimental studies. The Bonferroni adjustment procedure provides a powerful test because it controls the familywise Type I error. Because the researcher wanted to control for the familywise Type I error rate inflation, the Bonferroni procedure was used to adjust the alpha level. The alpha level (.05) was divided by the number of hypotheses (11) to yield the Bonferroni alpha of .0045. This alpha value was compared with the p-value of each hypothesis where
the results show that the Bonferroni alpha value is greater than the p-value. Therefore, the null hypotheses are rejected.

Hypothesis H1 posited that there is a difference in the levels of organizational commitment between employees born in Saudi Arabia and those born in other countries (outside Saudi Arabia). For hypothesis H1, the results showed that there was a significant difference in the level of commitment to Saudi petrochemical companies (p < .001, F = 85.82) between these two groups of employees. At an alpha level of .05, the observed power and effect size of hypothesis H1 are .99 and .14 (medium), respectively. Table 13 shows the results of hypothesis H1, which include the significance of the difference, F test, degree of freedom, sum of squares, mean squares, alpha level, power, and effect size.

Table 13. Results of tests of significance and observed power for place of birth variable for employees born in Saudi Arabia and employees born in other countries.

(Hypothesis H1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place of Birth or Between Groups</td>
<td>590826.92</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>590826.92</td>
<td>85.82</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within + Residual</td>
<td>3566289.50</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>6884.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4157116.42</td>
<td>519</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance (Probability < .001), Power = .99, Alpha = .05, Effect size = .14 (medium)

The results of the statistical test confirmed hypothesis H1, which suggests that the place of birth of employees influences their commitment to the employing organizations. They had different levels of organizational commitment. The evidence from this research supports hypothesis H1. Employees born in Saudi Arabia (mean = 5.96, sd = .53)
reported a higher level of commitment to Saudi petrochemical companies than employees born in other countries (mean = 4.69, sd = 1.08).

For the Arab employees born in Saudi Arabia and Arab employees born in other countries, as two groups, the results of hypothesis H1a showed that there was a significant difference in the levels of commitment (p < .001, F = 65.96) to Saudi petrochemical companies. At an alpha level of .05, the observed power and effect size of hypothesis H1a are .99 and .16 (medium), respectively. The results are consistent with the expectation of hypothesis H1a, which suggests that Arab employees born in Saudi Arabia and Arab employees born in other countries had different levels of commitment to Saudi petrochemical companies. The evidence from this research supports hypothesis H1a. Arab employees born in Saudi Arabia (mean = 5.59, sd = .67) reported a higher level of commitment to Saudi petrochemical companies than Arab employees (mean = 4.46, sd = 1.02) born in other countries. Table 14 shows the results of the test of significance of hypothesis H1a, F test, degree of freedom, sum of squares, mean squares, alpha level, power, and the effect size.

Table 14. Results of tests of significance and observed power for place of birth variable for Arab employees born in Saudi Arabia and Arab employees born in other countries.

(Hypothesis H1a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place of Birth or Between Groups</td>
<td>399777.18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>399777.18</td>
<td>65.96</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within + Residual</td>
<td>2024242.25</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>6060.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2424019.43</td>
<td>335</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance (Probability < .001), Power = .99, Alpha = .05, Effect size = .16 (medium)
Hypothesis H2 posited that there is a difference in the level of commitment to Saudi petrochemical companies between two groups of employees on the basis of their ethnicities, Arab and non-Arab. The difference in ethnicity may mean a difference in the levels of employees' organizational commitment. The results of H2, which is concerned with ethnicity as an independent variable of organizational commitment, showed that there was a significant difference in the levels of commitment of Arab and non-Arab employees ($p < .001, F = 96.66$) to Saudi petrochemical companies. At an alpha level of .05, the observed power and effect size of H2 are .99 and approximately .16 (medium), respectively. Table 15 shows the results of the test of significance of hypothesis H2, which include the significance of the difference, F test, degree of freedom, sum of squares, mean squares, alpha level, power, and detected effect size.

Table 15. Results of tests of significance and observed power for the ethnicity variable for Arabs employees and non-Arabs employees in the total sample.

(Hypothesis H2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity or Between Groups</td>
<td>686721.97</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>686721.97</td>
<td>96.66</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within + Residual</td>
<td>3680169.00</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>7104.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4366890.97</td>
<td>519</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance (Probability < .001), Power = .99, Alpha = .05, Effect size = .16 (medium)

The results of the statistical test are consistent with the prediction of hypothesis H2 that the ethnicity of an employee has influence on his or her commitment to the employing organization. The results indicate that Arab employees as an ethnic group had different
levels of organizational commitment from non-Arab employees as another ethnic group; thus, the result of this study supports hypothesis H2. Arab employees (mean = 5.42, sd = .99) reported a higher level of commitment to Saudi petrochemical companies than non-Arab employees (mean = 4.12, sd = 1.26).

For the total sample, the results of the ranking with One-Way ANOVA showed that nationality was not a predictor of employees' commitment to Saudi petrochemical companies. Also, the results showed no significant differences in the levels of organizational commitment among the six nationalities (p > .05, F = .40) covered by this study. The very low values of power and effect size are .155 and .004, respectively. Table 16 shows the results of the tests of significance, F test, power, and effect size for the six nationalities of employees working in Saudi petrochemical companies.

Table 16. Results of the tests of significance, F test, effect size, and power for all nationalities of interest (six nationalities) in the total sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nationality or Between Groups</td>
<td>1263.53</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>252.71</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within + Residual</td>
<td>326687.50</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>635.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>327951.03</td>
<td>519</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance (Probability > .05), Power = .155 (very low value), Effect size = .004 (very small value)

According to Hinkle, Wiersma, and Jurs (1994), researchers recommended not performing post hoc multiple comparison tests or a pair comparison test for other hypotheses (groups hypotheses) when the the results of the hypothesis that is related to all
groups in the total sample showed no significant difference in the means of employees’ commitment. However, the researcher expected significant differences in the levels of commitment between selected groups of nationalities; thus, he went further and examined hypotheses H3 and H3a. Research hypotheses H3 and H3a suggest that there is a difference in the levels of commitment to Saudi petrochemical companies between two selected nationalities.

The research hypothesis H3 posited that there is a difference in the level of organizational commitment between Saudi nationality employees and Western nationality employees (Americans and British). The results of the score ranking with One-Way ANOVA showed that there was no significant difference in the level of commitment to Saudi petrochemical companies between Saudi and Western nationalities (p > .05, F = .007). Also, descriptive statistics showed that there was no significant difference between the means and standard deviations of organizational commitment of employees of Saudi nationality (mean = 4.45, sd = 1.24) and employees of Western nationalities (mean = 4.49, sd = 1.26). Because the results of hypothesis H3 showed that there was no significant difference in the levels of commitment to Saudi petrochemical companies between those two groups of nationalities, Saudis and Westerners, the researcher failed to accept hypothesis H3. The theoretical explanation of this finding is provided in details in chapter V under the discussion of findings section. Table 17 shows the results of the tests of significance, the sum of the squares, the mean of the squares, F test, power, and effect size. The results in Table 17 are based on six nationalities of employees working in Saudi petrochemical companies in Jubail Industrial city.
Table 17. Results of the tests of significance, F test, effect size, and power for Saudi and Western nationalities in the total sample.

(Hypothesis H3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nationality or Between Groups</td>
<td>4.826</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.828</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within + Residual</td>
<td>178770.50</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>635.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>178775.30</td>
<td>267</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance (Probability > .05), Power = .10 (very low value), Effect size = .04 (very small value)

The research hypothesis H3a suggested that there is a difference in the level of commitment to Saudi petrochemical companies between Saudi nationality employees and Egyptian nationality employees. However, descriptive statistics showed that there was no significant difference between the means and standard deviations of the commitment of Saudi employees (mean = 4.45, sd = 1.24) and Egyptian employees (mean = 4.41, sd = 1.24). Also, the results of the score ranking with One-Way ANOVA showed that there was no significant difference in the levels of commitment (p > .05, F = .618) to Saudi petrochemical companies between Saudi and Egyptian nationalities; thus, the researcher failed to accept hypothesis H3a. The results showed the low power and effect size of hypothesis H3a. Table 18 contains the results of the tests of significance, the sum of the squares, the mean of the squares, F test, power, and effect size of hypothesis H3a. This table is based on two nationalities in the total sample as two groups of employees that need to be investigated, which are Saudis and Egyptians.
Table 18. Results of the tests of significance, F test, effect size, and power for Saudi and Egyptian nationalities in the total sample.

(Hypothesis H3a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nationality or Between Groups</td>
<td>386.529</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>386.529</td>
<td>.618</td>
<td>.433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within + Residual</td>
<td>106382.0</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>625.776</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>106768.5</td>
<td>171</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance (Probability > .05), Power = .07 (very low value), Effect size = .03 (very small value)

The research hypothesis H4 suggested that there is a difference in the levels of commitment to Saudi petrochemical companies as a result of the difference in employees' levels of education. Employees' expectations increase with the increase in their level of education. Also, highly educated individuals may be more committed to another profession or trade; thus, it would be more difficult for the organization to compete successfully for the psychological involvement of such members as Mowday, Porter, and Steers (1982) suggested. Employees may have less or more intentions to leave their employing organizations when their expectations are not met by the organizations, depending on their levels of education. Alternatively, hypothesis H4 suggests that there is a difference in the levels of commitment to Saudi petrochemical companies between employees with low education and employees with high education. Table 19 shows the results of the test of significance of hypothesis H4, which include the significance of the difference, F test,
degree of freedom, sum of squares, mean squares, alpha level, power, and detected effect size.

Table 19. Results of tests of significance and observed power for the education variable for low education and high education employees in the total sample.

(Hypothesis H4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education or Between Groups</td>
<td>415557.51</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>415557.51</td>
<td>63.94</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within + Residual</td>
<td>3366609.00</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>6499.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3782166.51</td>
<td>498</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance (Probability < .001), Power = .98, Alpha = .05, Effect size = .19 (medium)

The results of hypothesis H4, which is concerned with the level of education as an independent variable of organizational commitment, showed a significant difference in the levels of commitment of employees with low education and employees with high education (p < .001, F = 63.94) to Saudi petrochemical companies. At an alpha level of .05, the observed power and effect size of hypothesis H4 are .98 and approximately .19 (medium), respectively. The results of the statistical test are consistent with the prediction of hypothesis H4 that the level of education of an employee had influence on his or her commitment to the employing organization. The results indicated that employees, as two groups on the basis of their levels of education, had different levels of organizational commitment. Therefore, the result of this study supports hypothesis H4. Employees with low level of education (mean = 5.84, sd = .99) showed a higher level of commitment to
Saudi petrochemical companies than employees with high level of education (mean = 4.45, sd = 1.24).

The type of job an employee holds can influence his or her level of commitment to the organization. Different types of jobs have different appeals to employees, that is, managerial jobs and non-managerial jobs may be viewed differently by employees. Thus, employees who hold non-managerial jobs may have different attitudes toward the organization from those who hold managerial jobs. Hence, they may have different levels of commitment to the organization. Hypothesis H5 suggests that there is a difference in the level of organizational commitment between managerial employees and non-managerial employees.

For hypothesis H5, the findings showed that there was a significant difference in the levels of commitment between employees with managerial jobs and those with non-managerial jobs (p < .001, F = 69.38) to Saudi petrochemical companies. At an alpha level of .05, the observed power and effect size of hypothesis H5 are .99 and approximately .12 (small), respectively. The results of the statistical test are consistent with the expectation of hypothesis H5, which stated that the type of job an employee holds had influence on his or her commitment to the employing organization. The results indicated that employees, as two groups on the basis of their types of jobs, had different levels of organizational commitment. The evidence from this research supports hypothesis H5. Employees with managerial jobs (mean = 5.60, sd = .91) showed a higher level of commitment than those with non-managerial jobs (mean = 4.49, sd = 1.25). Table 20 shows the results of the test of significance of hypothesis H5, which include the significance of the difference, F test,
Table 20. Results of tests of significance and observed power for the job type variable for managerial and non-managerial employees in the total sample.

(Hypothesis H5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Type or Between Groups</td>
<td>457103.38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>457103.38</td>
<td>63.38</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within + Residual</td>
<td>3413019.00</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>6588.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3870122.38</td>
<td>519</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance (Probability < .001), Power = .99, Alpha = .05, Effect size = .12 (small)

Organizational commitment literature focused on the length of time an employee has been with an organization as a predictor of his or her intention to stay (commitment) with the organization. The variation in the employee's tenure may be interpreted as a variation in the level of his or her commitment to the organization. The length of service an employee has been given to an organization may be short or long and it is measured in number of years. Commitment, which may take different forms, means intention to stay and be involved in the employing organization. Hypothesis H6 suggests that there is a difference in the level of organizational commitment between employees with short tenure and those with long tenure. Table 21 shows the results of the test of significance of hypothesis H6, which include the significance of the difference, F test, degree of freedom, sum of squares, mean squares, alpha level, power, and detected effect size.
Table 21. Results of tests of significance and observed power for the tenure variable for short and long tenure employees in the total sample.

(Hypothesis H6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenure or Between Groups</td>
<td>457103.38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>457103.38</td>
<td>63.38</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within + Residual</td>
<td>3413019.00</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>6588.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3870122.38</td>
<td>519</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance (Probability < .001), Power = .99, Alpha = .05, Effect size = .12 (small)

For hypothesis H6, the findings showed that there was a significant difference in the levels of commitment between employees with short tenure and those with long tenure (p < .001, F = 69.38) to Saudi petrochemical companies. At an alpha level of .05, the observed power and effect size of hypothesis H6 are .99 and approximately .12 (small), respectively. The results of the statistical test are consistent with the prediction of hypothesis H6 that the length of service an employee has given to the organization can influence his or her level of commitment to it. The results indicated that employees, as two groups on the basis of their length of tenure, had different levels of organizational commitment; thus, hypothesis H6 is supported. Employees with long tenure (mean = 5.79, sd = .55) showed a higher level of commitment than employees with short tenure (mean = 4.61, sd = 1.19).

Age is a major predictor of employees' commitment to their organization. As employees age their mobility, priorities, and orientation toward work and organization become different from that at a given age. However, young employees' mobility,
priorities, and orientation are different from that of old employees. These differences may affect old and young employees' views of their organizations differently. Simply, different age groups working in the same organization may mean different levels of commitment to the same organization. Hypothesis H7 posited that there is a difference in the levels of organizational commitment between young employees and old employees. Table 22 shows the significance of the difference of hypothesis H7, F test, degree of freedom, sum of squares, mean squares, alpha level, power, and detected effect size.

Table 22. Results of tests of significance and observed power for the age variable for old and young employees in the total sample.

(Hypothesis H7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age or Between Groups</td>
<td>46679.38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>46679.38</td>
<td>8.12</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within + Residual</td>
<td>2976220.00</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>5745.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3022899.38</td>
<td>519</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance (Probability < .001), Power = 0.81, Alpha = .05, Effect size = .02 (small)

Consistent with the hypothesis, the findings showed that there was a significant difference (p < .001, F = 8.12) in the levels of commitment to Saudi petrochemical companies between the two age groups as suggested in hypothesis H7; thus, hypothesis H7 is supported. Old employees (mean = 5.38, sd = .97) showed a higher level of commitment to Saudi petrochemical companies than young employees (mean = 4.44, sd = 1.25). This finding is expected because old employees are more career oriented than young
employees. At an alpha level of .05, the observed power and effect size of hypothesis H7 are .81 and approximately .02 (small), respectively.

In Saudi petrochemical companies, recruitment of international and domestic employees is either for a lifetime or contract job in which the duration of the employment is specified. The majority of Saudis working in Saudi petrochemical companies have lifetime employment. However, the majority of expatriates have contract employment. The difference in the recruitment policy practiced by Saudi petrochemical companies may psychologically influence employees’ commitment to those companies. The researcher suggests in hypothesis H8 that there is a difference in the levels of organizational commitment between lifetime and contract employees.

For hypothesis H8, the findings showed that there was a significant difference in the levels of commitment (p < .001, F = 24.85) to Saudi petrochemical companies between employees with lifetime employment and those with contract employment. At an alpha level of .05, the observed power and effect size of hypothesis H8 are .99 and approximately .05 (small), respectively. The results of the statistical test are consistent with the prediction of hypothesis H8 that the type of employment an employee holds can influence his or her level of commitment to the employing organization. The results indicated that employees, as two groups on the basis of their type of employment, had different levels of organizational commitment; thus, hypothesis H8 is supported. Employees with lifetime employment (mean = 5.69, sd = .85) showed a higher level of commitment to Saudi petrochemical companies than employees with contract (mean = 4.46, sd = 1.26). Table 23 shows the results of the test of significance of hypothesis H8, which
include the significance of the difference between the two groups, F test, degree of
freedom, sum of squares, mean squares, alpha level, power, and detected effect size.

Table 23. Results of tests of significance and observed power for the type of employment
variable for lifetime and contract employees in the total sample.

(Hypothesis H8)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment Type or Between Groups</td>
<td>147710.12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>147710.12</td>
<td>24.85</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within + Residual</td>
<td>3079569.00</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>5945.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3227279.12</td>
<td>519</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance (Probability < .001), Power = 0.99, Alpha = .05, Effect size = .05 (small)

Finally, hypothesis H9 posited that there is a difference in the levels of commitment
to Saudi petrochemical companies between employees with high pay and those with low
pay. Employees with high pay consider it a personal investment that could be maintained
by staying with the employing organization. However, employees with low pay tend to
look for better opportunities outside their current organizations. This argument suggests
that the difference in employees' pay can influence their levels of commitment to the
organization. Employees often compare their pay with the pay of those in other
organizations. Generally, this is true with low pay employees who seek alternative
employment with better salary.

For hypothesis H9, the findings showed that there was a significant difference in
the levels of commitment between employees with low pay and those with high pay (p <
.01, F = 8.28) to Saudi petrochemical companies. At an alpha level of .05, the observed
power and effect size are .81 and approximately .13 (small), respectively. Table 24 shows the results of the test of significance of hypothesis H9.

Table 24. Results of tests of significance and observed power for pay variable for low pay and high pay employees in the total sample.

(Hypothesis H9)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pay Between Groups</td>
<td>24557.56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24557.56</td>
<td>8.28</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within + Residual</td>
<td>2173814.00</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>4654.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2198371.56</td>
<td>468</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance (Probability < .001), Power = .81, Alpha = .05, Effect size = .13 (small)

The results of this study are consistent with the expectation of hypothesis H9. The results indicated that employees, as two groups on the basis of their pay levels, had different levels of organizational commitment. The evidence from this research supports hypothesis H9. Employees with high pay (mean = 5.32, sd = .97) scored a higher level of commitment to Saudi petrochemical companies than employees with low pay (mean = 4.47, sd = 1.24). This finding is not surprising because pay was found by the majority of researchers to be a reliable predictor of employees' commitment to their employing organization.

Chapter Summary

The primary focus of this study was to investigate if there is a difference in the levels of commitment to Saudi petrochemical companies between employees on the basis of their personal demographics and job-based factors. The G.Power analyses program
developed by Buchner, Faul, and Erdfelder (1992) was used to determine the sample size with a priori test at specified alpha level and a power level as suggested by Cohen (1988). This study included six nationalities to compare their levels of commitment to Saudi petrochemical companies. All hypotheses pertained to job-related variables were accepted. Also, personal demographics hypotheses, with the exception of nationality hypotheses, were accepted. Employees' responses varied with the variations in their personal demographics and job-based factors. Hence, they have different levels of commitment to Saudi petrochemical companies.

The results of the pilot study and the study itself show high reliability and validity of the instrument. Furthermore, Pearson's correlations were used to examine the correlations between employees' responses in Arabic and English. The translation of the questionnaire into Arabic was done before conducting the pilot study. The translation and back translation were done by five faculty from a Saudi university. They all agreed upon the content of the translated version of the questionnaire.

Because the homogeneity of variance of the ANOVA assumption was violated, the researcher used the factor score ranking with One-Way ANOVA to examine the eleven hypotheses, which relate to commitment and its relationship with its predictors. The results showed that there was a difference in the levels of organizational commitment between employees on the basis of their demographics and job-based variables. Only nationality did not predict employees' commitment to their organization or differentiate between stayers and leavers.
Factor analysis was used and the results show that all fifteen items of the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire loaded high on one single factor, that is organizational commitment. All items loaded at .40 or above. Fortunately, the loadings of items on one factor eliminates the removal of items that load on two factors. Furthermore, the range of item loadings on the commitment factor is extremely high, from .53 to .86.
CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

This chapter is divided into four sections. Section one covers the discussion of the findings. Section two is the theoretical and practical implications of the findings. Section three is a discussion of the limitations. Section four is suggestions for future research.

The discussion of findings includes the pilot study, the actual study, the power analysis, the reliability and validity of both the pilot study and the study itself, and the eleven hypotheses. The discussion of findings includes the explanations of why the nationality of employees did not predict their levels of commitment to the organizations. Also, nationality did not count for any significant difference in the levels of different nationalities’ commitment to Saudi petrochemical companies. Section one includes the discussion of the results of factor analysis.

Discussion

The following discussion is an attempt to provide a general understanding of organizational commitment of domestic and international employees in a non-Western culture, Saudi Arabia, using Western measurement. Therefore, it is also an attempt to examine the reliability and validity of the instrument. The improvement of the model in this study was successfully accomplished in both the pilot study and the study itself. Also, the introduction of new independent variables (new organizational commitment antecedents) to
the model is an achievement because they have not been investigated in previous cross-
national studies.

The fast growth of interest in international business and globalization over the last
decade is a signal for the importance of cross-national studies on employees working in
countries other than their own. One of the countries that attracts people seeking jobs is
Saudi Arabia. Working in Saudi Arabia is a dream for many nationalities because of the
generous pay and benefits most Saudi organizations provide for their domestic and
expatriate employees. The intuitive belief is that employees with different personal
demographics and job-based characteristics may have different levels of organizational
commitment. This belief is supported by the findings of this study, with the exception of
the nationality variable which was not found to differentiate between the levels of
employees’ commitment. Also, nationality of an employee did not predict which
nationality or group of nationalities had a higher level of commitment to Saudi
petrochemical companies than the other nationalities or group of nationalities.

Employees’ cultures seem to have more influence on their levels of commitment to
their organizations than does their nationalities. Individuals from different cultures may
have different attitudes and behaviors that can influence their organizational commitment
because self-other differences may be influenced by cultural factors. The argument made
by many researchers is that there is a difference in the levels of organizational commitment
between individuals from cultures that emphasize collectivist values and lengthy employer-
employee relations and individuals from cultures that emphasize individualist values and
greater employment mobility.
Personal demographics differences that individuals bring with them to the employing organization have been found by many researchers to be reliable predictors of their commitment. Also, job-based factors can have a significant influence on employees' organizational commitment. Employees' organizational commitment levels may vary by culture; thus, organizational commitment in collectivist cultures may be different from that in individualistic cultures. It is well understood that part of the organizational commitment of an individual springs from cultural sources. Unlike employees from individualistic cultures, employees from collectivistic cultures become committed to the employing organization to conform to prevailing cultural rules demanding subordination of employees to corporate interest.

The purpose of this study is to find out if there is a difference in the levels of commitment to Saudi petrochemical companies. This cross-national comparison study of employees is based on their personal demographics and job-based factors in relation to their commitment. In this study, efforts to empirically examine new personal demographic and job-based variables and organizational commitment in Saudi petrochemical companies were successful. Differences in the levels of employees' commitment for ten out of eleven hypotheses were found. The results of this study showed that researchers can use the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire developed by Porter and his associates and the theoretical model developed by Steers in Arab cultures. The instrument and the model have been widely used by the majority of organizational commitment researchers in many countries.
For this study, Cronbach’s coefficient alpha value of .94 is high compared with the values of other organizational commitment studies. It is relatively higher than the value of .93 found by Porter and his associates, the developers of the OCQ. It is consistent with the values of cross-national studies conducted in Canada, Japan and the United States.

Compared to Cronbach’s coefficient alpha values of studies on organizational commitment in Saudi Arabia, Cronbach’s coefficient alpha value of this study (.94) is greater than that reported in these studies. Furthermore, the internal consistency of this study exceeds the guidelines suggested by Nunnally. Overall, the reliability of this instrument is sound and above those found by the majority of researchers in industrial countries as well as in less developed countries. Therefore, the OCQ measure in this study had a substantial gain in alpha value when compared to the values of Cronbach’s alphas found in many organizational commitment studies. This result is surprising because this instrument was initially developed in the United States to measure Western employees’ organizational commitment. But with careful examination of the psychometric properties of the instrument in Saudi Arabia, it proved to have a high reliability and validity in other cultures such as Arab cultures.

From the results of the pilot study, it appeared that employees’ responses to both Arabic and English versions of the questionnaire did not differ, which substantiate the reliabilities of the measure in non-Western cultures. It also showed that the instrument translation is adequate in its accurate predictions of employees’ commitment across nations. The improvement in the translation and back translation process in the pilot study is an attempt to reexamine the universality of the OCQ. Coefficient alpha, the measure of
reliability, showed that the pretesting of the instrument has achieved an acceptable reliability level. In comparison with what Randall recommended in her review of research on cross-cultural commitment studies that they generally lack pre-test and pilot studies, the researcher made some improvement in this cross-national study by taking these recommendations into consideration.

For the total sample, employees scored high (mean = 6.34, sd = 1.06) on the first item in the OCQ, which is associated with extra effort to make the organization succeed. They also scored high (mean = 5.88, sd = 1.01) on care about the organization item. Employees scored low on loyalty (mean = 4.44, sd = 1.91) and little gain (mean = 4.30, sd = 1.78) in the organization items. The low ratings on both items relates to other Arab and non-Arab employees. Saudi employees reported high scores on the loyalty item. These results are not surprising because the ownership of the companies may have influenced their loyalty to Saudi petrochemical companies. Results showed that Saudi employees did not score high on the extra effort item. One explanation of such finding is that Saudi employees have more mobility and alternatives in the labor market so they do not intend to put extra work into the organization in order to keep working for it. Also, Saudi employees cannot be fired from the organization because of their low performance.

Unlike Saudi employees, expatriates who have low performance may not have the opportunity to renew their contracts with Saudi organizations. Thus, their involvement in the organization may predict their commitment to the organization more than loyalty, which sometimes becomes a burden on the organization. Some researchers suggested that organization should focus on keeping employees with high involvement because they
contribute to the company’s success. However, loyal employees, such as Saudis, may wish to stay with the organization, but they are not willing to invest extra effort.

The results of hypotheses pertaining to the five personal demographics variables and organizational commitment showed a significant difference in the levels of organizational commitment except for the hypotheses that examined the relationship between employees’ commitment and their nationality. Nationality of employees was not found to differentiate between the levels of employees’ commitment to the employing organizations. Also, the data collected from managers, personnel, and supervisors of Saudi petrochemical companies are consistent with that obtained through mail questionnaires. They all believed that the nationality of an employee is not a reliable predictor of his or her commitment to the organization. For the hypotheses pertaining to the four job-based variables and commitment, results indicated a significant difference in the levels of organizational commitment between the two groups of employees.

The researcher failed to accept all hypotheses pertaining to nationality as a predictor of organizational commitment. Nationality of employees did not appear significant in differentiating between the levels of employees’ commitment to Saudi petrochemical companies. This finding is consistent with the findings of Banai and Reisel (1993), who argued in their study of organizational commitment that nationality did not predict employees’ commitment. Surprisingly, nationality of employees may predict other dimensions of organizational commitment, but not organizational commitment. The inclusion of some references in this chapter is to provide a theoretical support for the
unexpected finding with regard to the nationality of employees as a predictor of their commitment to their organizations.

Using factor analysis with varimax rotation, Banai and Reisel (1993) found that organizational commitment had two dimensions, which are organizational involvement and organizational loyalty. Additionally, they found that nationality explains the level of organizational involvement (beta = .24, p < .05), but did not explain organizational commitment. Loyalty, as seen by Lincoln and Kalleberg (1990), was associated with strong feelings of attachment to an identification with the organization or it might be a direct behavioral reflection of workplace norms and institutionalized constraints that discourage changing one's job and organization. One may interpret that these findings support the notion that employees' nationality may play no significant role in influencing their levels of commitment to the employing organizations, but it can influence their organizational involvement and/or loyalty.

The theoretical literature suggested that organizational commitment is inherent in employees' cultures and not in their nationalities as one may think. To support this unexpected finding about the relationship between nationality and commitment, Banai and Reisel (1993) suggested that organizational involvement rather than organizational commitment is the dimension that has the potential to differentiate among different nationalities. Bass and Barrett (1972) argued that a willingness to be involved in the organization up to the level that requires the individual to invest personal effort (time, physical, and mental effort) is an outcome of the level of assertiveness of individuals and their need for achievement, factors that are culturally specific.
On the other hand, Banai and Reisel (1993) found that loyalty was another dimension of organizational commitment, which appeared to explain the psychological state of mind of an employee. They argued that employees' loyalty to the organization did not always lead to their involvement in it. However, it may lead to organizational commitment at a later stage of an employee's career in the organization. Many researchers believed that organizational loyalty precedes organizational commitment, but it is not always true that loyal employees are committed. Some employees with the same nationality may be loyal to an organization, particularly if it carries their nationality, but they may not be involved in it. Banai and Reisel (1993) recommended that involved employees should receive more attention than loyal employees. They argued that loyal employees may have pride in the organization or may wish to stay in it for psychological and ego-defensive reasons that may not contribute to its success. One important point that needs to be mentioned here is that the comparison of the means of Arab employees who had American or British nationalities apparently had the same levels of organizational commitment of Arab employees who had any of the four Arab states' nationalities that were included in this study. This means that commitment is culturally based and that nationality is not a predictor of it. Recent empirical findings by Randall (1993) and Sommer, Bae, and Luthans (1996) supported the surprising findings of this study with regard to the nationality of employees and its relationship with organizational commitment.

The results of place of birth hypotheses, as a new variable that has not been investigated before by researchers in many commitment studies, showed that there was substantial evidence that employees' place of birth is important in differentiating between
employees' levels of commitment to their employing organizations. For the total sample, employees who were born in Saudi Arabia reported a different level of commitment to Saudi petrochemical companies from that of those who were born in other countries. For Arabs in the total sample, Arab employees born in Saudi Arabia showed a different level of commitment to Saudi petrochemical companies from those who were born in other Arab or non-Arab countries. As two groups of employees, other Arab employees born in Saudi Arabia scored a different level of organizational commitment from their coworkers, non-Arab employees, who were born in other countries. Arab employees born in Saudi Arabia reported a different level of commitment to Saudi petrochemical companies from non-Arab employees born in other countries.

Employees born in Saudi Arabia showed a higher level of commitment to Saudi petrochemical companies than employees born in other countries. Arab employees born in Saudi Arabia reported a higher level of commitment to Saudi petrochemical than Arab employees born in other countries. Arab employees born in Saudi Arabia had a higher level of commitment than non-Arab employees born in other countries. Overall, regardless of nationality and ethnicity, employees born in Saudi Arabia reported a higher level of commitment to Saudi petrochemical companies than employees born in other countries.

The results of the two hypotheses pertaining to place of birth and commitment were consistent with regard to the evidence of a difference in the level of commitment to Saudi petrochemical companies. The results of the two hypotheses that dealt with employees' place of birth are not surprising because the country in which an employee was born has influence on his or her commitment to the employing organization. This may be due to the
loyalty an employee has for the country of birth which may develop into commitment after
a specific time of employment. It is apparent that place of birth can predict employees’
organizational commitment. The attachment and identification with the country of birth that
individuals develop over a period of time can significantly influence their commitment to
that country and what it represents. Because the employing organization is part of the
country of birth, employees born in that country may have more attachment to it than
employees who were born outside it. Apparently, place of birth of employees can
influence their level of organizational commitment.

Ethnicity of an employee, as a new predictor of organizational commitment, plays a
major role in his or her level of organizational commitment. One hypothesis examined
whether there is a difference in the level of commitment to Saudi petrochemical companies
between Arab and non-Arab employees as two groups of employees in the total sample.
As expected, the findings indicated empirical evidence of significant difference in the levels
of commitment to Saudi petrochemical companies between these two groups of employees.

Arabs and non-Arabs differed in their levels of organizational commitment because
they may have different organizational values or they differ along the collectivism-
individualism dimension as suggested by many researchers. Ethnicity of an employee is
within the boundaries of his or her cultural differences; thus, it is expected to influence
employees’ levels of organizational commitment. Ethnicity is a sense of difference of one
person from another. Arabs are, to some extent, different from all others in many ways
including their attitudes toward their employing organizations. Clearly, the results of this
study showed that ethnicity can have a great influence on employees’ levels of
organizational commitment. Overall, for the ethnicity variable, the variation in commitment levels may be the result of differences in employees' ethnicities. Furthermore, Arab employees, as one group of ethnicity, showed a higher level of commitment to Saudi petrochemical companies than non-Arab employees as another ethnicity group. This is a surprising finding because Arabs may have a higher level of loyalty to the organization, but less commitment and involvement in its activities. Arab employees come from a culture, collectivistic culture, that emphasizes the moral loyalty, verbal loyalty, to the organization, which does not mean high involvement or devotion to the organization. Family comes first before one's profession and employing organization in the Arab culture.

Data collected from personnel, managers, and supervisors are consistent with that obtained from employees with regard to ethnicity as a predictor of organizational commitment differences. Data from these sources and collection methods stressed the fact that ethnicity of an employee can be used as a criterion to differentiate between employees' levels of organizational commitment. Employees who participated in the interviews indicated that being an Arab or non-Arab makes a difference in their commitment levels to Saudi petrochemical companies. The interpretation of employees' responses obtained through interviews indicated that Arabs and non-Arabs, as two ethnicity groups, view their commitment to Saudi petrochemical companies differently, which can be seen as an indication of different levels of organizational commitment by different ethnicities.

The level of education of employees is negatively and significantly related to organizational commitment. This is consistent with the results of many studies that stressed that employees with high level of education had less commitment to the
organization than those with less education. The level of education an employee may have can influence his or her organizational commitment levels. Researchers who investigated this variable have found that variation in employees' education can affect their organizational commitment levels. The finding of this study showed that there was a difference in the levels of commitment to Saudi petrochemical companies between employees with college degree or higher and employees with high school or lower education. Furthermore, the result of the education variable in this study agreed with that found by many organizational commitment researchers. Employees with low level of education scored a higher level of commitment to Saudi petrochemical companies than those with high level of education.

As the level of education of an employee increases, his or her expectations increase. If his or her expectations are not satisfied, he or she may leave the organization. Of course unmet expectations can result in organizational resentment, which in turn may influence organizational commitment negatively. Another explanation of this finding is that better-schooled employees are less well integrated in workplace social environments; thus, they are less likely to remain with the organization. Unlike employees with low level of education, employees with high education may have more unmet expectations from their employers. Thus, their attitudes and intentions to leave the organization become more explicit. Employees with low education tend to stay with their employers because they have limited opportunities in the labor market. Data collected from employees who responded to the mail questionnaire and interview are consistent in investigating the difference in the level of commitment to Saudi petrochemical companies between
employees with low education and employees with high education. Also, the results of the
survey of personnel, managers, and supervisors showed that there was a difference
between the two groups of employees' commitment on the basis of the difference in their
level of education. They all agreed that employees with low level of education had higher
level of commitment to Saudi petrochemical companies than did those with high level of
education.

In fact, most Saudi petrochemical companies prefer to recruit employees with low
education and then train them for the job in Saudi Arabia or in the United States. This way
employees stay with the companies because the type of job training they receive may only
fit Saudi petrochemical companies. This leads to the fact that unmet expectations and
available alternatives in more environmentally and socially appropriate organizations may
attract employees with high education to leave their current organization for another one.

The type of job an employee holds is a predictor of his or her commitment to the
organization. The importance of this variable stems from its linkage with the prestigious
responsibilities attached to it. Different jobs, such as managerial and non-managerial, are
perceived differently by employees who hold them and the society in which they live.
Also, employees with managerial jobs have different responsibilities from those with non-
managerial jobs; thus, they have different levels of commitment to their organizations.

The result of this study supports the assumptions that there is a difference in the
levels of commitment to Saudi petrochemical companies between managerial and non-
managerial employees. The difference in organizational commitment levels may be the
result of the perception of their side bets in the Saudi petrochemical companies. Employees
holding managerial jobs showed a higher level of commitment to Saudi petrochemical companies than those holding non-managerial jobs.

The comparison of data obtained from the mail survey and the voluntary interviews showed consistency in employees' responses. Also, data from companies' records corresponded with that obtained from the mail questionnaire, particularly the personal demographics data. It is apparently clear that the difference in the job type variable can influence employees' organizational commitment levels. This finding is consistent with the findings of other researchers, who reported different levels of commitment to the organization by administrative and technical employees. The improvement of the model was achieved to include new variables, such as type of job, as one of the important objectives of this study.

Tenure is one of the most investigated antecedents of organizational commitment. The assumption is that the longer an employee remains with the organization, the more likely that he or she is committed to it. The tenure of an employee increases his or her personal investment in the organization; thus, he or she becomes committed to the organization by remaining with it. On the basis of the length of their tenure in Saudi petrochemical companies, the results of this study showed that long- and short-tenured employees reported different levels of commitment to their companies. Employees with long tenure scored a higher level of commitment to Saudi petrochemical companies than employees with short tenure.

Results from interviews and the mail questionnaire showed consistency in employees' responses to their tenure and commitment to Saudi petrochemical companies.
Also, data from companies' records, which are related to the length of service of employees (tenure), corresponded with that provided by employees in the mail questionnaire. Results from the mail survey, review of companies' records, and voluntary interviews revealed some interesting information about long- and short-tenured employees and their commitment to Saudi petrochemical companies. Long-tenured employees are willing to exert extra effort beyond that expected from them in order to help their companies succeed. They are willing to take any job in order to stay in their organizations. Short-tenured employees scored low commitment to Saudi petrochemical companies. They also scored low on the loyalty and care about the organization items. The findings of this study with regard to tenure and commitment differences are consistent with the findings of many researchers.

In summary, the results indicated a significant difference between short- and long-tenured employees, which clearly support the tenure hypothesis suggestion of such difference. With regard to tenure, the investigation was not focused on Arabs and non-Arabs, but rather on the total sample of employees as two groups on the basis of their tenure in the Saudi petrochemical companies. It is apparently true, in most situations including this one, that employees' commitment to the employing organization increases as their organizational tenure increases. The increase in organizational tenure means an increase in one's personal investment, which in turn influences the individual to stay in the employing organization.

The majority of organizational behavior researchers, particularly organizational commitment, found that age differences of employees result in organizational commitment
differences. One reasonable explanation of such differences in commitment to organizations is that individuals have different needs at different stages of their lives; thus, accordingly, their commitment levels differ. Also, young and old employees had different focuses in their lives, which change with age. For example, old employees become more career and family oriented while young employees focus on financial gains to improve their lives. Younger employees tend to focus less on career because of their competing priorities. Difference in organizational commitment levels may be the result of particular generational cohorts and/or differences in work experiences. Simply, age is a reliable predictor of employees' commitment to the organization so different age groups may have different levels of organizational commitment.

Consistent with the findings of the majority of researchers, the results of this study, with regard to age differences and organizational commitment differences, show that there are significant differences in the level of commitment to Saudi petrochemical companies between old employees and young employees. These results also are consistent with those obtained from the voluntary short interviews with employees. For the age variable, data collected from the mail questionnaire are consistent with that collected from companies' records.

The fact is that the larger the age differences, the larger the difference in employees' commitment to their organization. In this study, older and younger employees reported different levels of desire to put forth extraordinary effort in order to make their organization achieve its goal. They also reported different levels of loyalty and care about the organization. Their responses to the fifteen items of the OCQ differ significantly, which
support the age hypothesis that suggests that there is a difference in the levels of commitment to organizations between young and old employees. According to their age differences, the two groups of employees, old and young, responded differently to the intent to remain in the organization. Older employees showed a higher level of commitment to Saudi petrochemical companies than younger employees.

Apparently the perceived costs of leaving the organization varies with age. As people get older their perceived costs of leaving the organization increase; thus, they may decide to stay in the organization. For young employees the costs of leaving the organization are not high, which may result in their intentions to look for employment opportunities in different organizations. It may become a calculation of costs and benefits of leaving and staying with the organization, which is, to some extent, influenced by age differences. Age is a side bet (personal investment) that an employee puts into his or her organization.

The type of employment has a public image and an appeal to many people; thus, it may have influence on employees’ commitment to their organization. Logically differences in employment policies of many companies may result in different levels of employees’ organizational commitment. Some researchers believed that employment policies can influence employees’ attitudes and behaviors toward the employing organization. The influence of employment policies on employees’ behaviors and attitudes may be the result of the following: (1) terms of the contract, (2) the psychological effect of the formal contract, (3) mutual obligations perceived by the parties in the contract, and (4) the
perception of lifetime employment by those who hold it and those who hold contract employment.

The type of employment is a new variable introduced to find out if there is a difference in the levels of employees' commitment to Saudi petrochemical companies as a result of differences in their employment type (contract vs. lifetime employment). The findings of this study showed that there was a significant difference in the levels of contract and lifetime employees' commitment to Saudi petrochemical companies. Furthermore, lifetime employees scored a higher level of commitment to Saudi petrochemical companies than contract employees. In this study, the finding is consistent with the findings of other studies about the organizational commitment of American and Japanese employees.

There is a consistency in employees' responses to commitment and its antecedents, which were collected with mail survey and short interviews. With regard to employees' personal demographics and job-based data, there is a consistency in the sources, mail questionnaire and companies' records, when the researcher checked them against each other. This is helpful in reducing the threat of common method variance. The two groups of employees reported different scores on all fifteen items of the OCQ used to measure the dependent variable, organizational commitment. Additionally, the two groups of employees responded differently to three important items in the instrument, which are extraordinary effort, care about, and loyalty to the organization.

Considerable attention has been given to the relationship between organizational commitment and job salary. Because pay provides an important inducement for employees, the majority of researchers believed that pay plays an important role in
employees' desire to stay with the organization or leave it. However, some researchers argued that perceived pay is more important than the level of pay. Because of the great gap in pay between Saudis, Westerners, and other Arabs working in Saudi petrochemical companies, level of pay may be considered a more important determinant of organizational commitment than perceived pay. This implies that employees with high pay may have different levels of organizational commitment from employees with low pay. Some researchers believed that salary would be considered as a side bet because of its forfeiture implications.

Pay equity is an issue that is not considered by many Saudi organizations. The problem is that some nationalities with the same level of education, same tenure, and same work experience would have lower or higher pay than other nationalities. Equity theory cautioned organizations from unfair practices of underpayment because perceived inequality creates tension, which in turn influences an individual's commitment to his or her organization. Employees usually compare their pay with their coworkers, and most of the time with their input in the organization. Such comparison may influence their attitudes toward the organization; thus, employees with high pay may develop positive attitudes while those with low pay may develop negative attitudes toward the organization.

The result of this study showed that high pay employees reported different levels of commitment to Saudi petrochemical companies from low pay employees. Employees with high pay reported a higher level of commitment to Saudi petrochemical companies than employees with low pay. This finding is consistent with the findings of major organizational commitment studies. In short, it seems that pay can be used as a predictor of
employees' commitment to the organization. It can guide management and personnel to employees with high commitment and those with less commitment.

Implications of the Study

This study contributes significantly to the theory and practice of organizational commitment. The relationships between organizational commitment and its antecedents can help theoreticians and practitioners in many areas. The need for a global theory of organizational commitment is urgent, as nations move closer and many companies think internationally. A global theory is helpful for organizations that employ many different nationalities.

Theoretical Implications

The need for a theory to guide organizational commitment researchers to explain and predict the levels of commitment across a number of cultures is evident. This study can significantly contribute to building an organizational commitment theory. It also can contribute to the field of organizational behavior and organizational development. For organizational behavior, it is important to understand the differences between groups of employees on the basis of their personal demographics and job-based factors so researchers can develop some knowledge about a diverse workforce in an organization. The significant differences in the levels of organizational commitment are related to differences in employees' personal demographics and job-based factors, which were found in this study. This study can contribute to organizational development when strategies of change need committed employees to implement them successfully.
Organizational commitment may explain employees' resistance to change; thus, it can contribute to a theory that links organizational commitment with organizational development. Table 25 contains a summary of the theoretical contributions of this cross-national study.

Table 25. A summary of theoretical contributions of this study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) This study contributes to the building of a global theory of organizational commitment that can predict and explain the commitment of a diverse workforce.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) This study adds new constructs and predictors of organizational commitment to the already available literature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) It can contribute to the literature of organizational behavior across nations to explain the variations in individuals' attitudes and behavior toward the organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) It also can help theoreticians understand the validity and generalizability of studies that were conducted in Western cultures to non-Western cultures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) It may contribute to the field of organizational development, particularly organizational change. A theory to link organizational commitment with organizational development is needed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Employees who are committed to their organization and its success can be assigned responsible positions to lead organizational changes. This can help theoreticians find a link between commitment and successful organizational change so a theory can be developed to predict and explain the relationship between the two concepts. This study has added new predictors of commitment to the already available literature on organizational commitment antecedents. The generalizability of Western concepts was found applicable to Saudi and
other Arabs employees with regard to organizational commitment. Finally, this study is useful for human resources, personnel, and strategic management disciplines.

Practical Implications

The empirical findings of this study suggest that employees with different demographics and job-based characteristics have different organizational commitment levels. The focus on employees' attitudinal commitment may lead organizations to a better understanding of how they should hire employees to perform the work. As a guideline for recruitment, this finding can be of great importance to management and personnel in Saudi petrochemical companies and other similar industries.

Management and personnel may decide to recruit employees with certain demographics such as nationality and ethnicity, or employees with certain job-based characteristics such as lifetime and contract employees. Also, management of an organization can make things easier for employees from different cultures so they can adapt to the new environment. Gregersen and Black (1992) argued that general cultural adjustment is positively and significantly related to organizational commitment; thus, management of an organization may develop a cultural orientation program to make new employees, as much as possible, adjust to the new culture.

Management may focus on employees with higher levels of commitment to perform certain tasks. For global managers, these findings can be useful in understanding the management and motivation of a diverse workforce. Management should encourage and reward employees' positive attitudes and behavior toward the organization; thus, managerial techniques may include employees' participation in the decision-making
process. A participative management style may reduce some of the obstacles to organizational commitment. Committed employees may want to be given some autonomy in their jobs. Committed employees have concern for the success of their employing organization; thus, it is suggested that the management of an organization give those employees some responsibilities that are linked to facilitating organizational change policies. Furthermore, they are more likely to accept organizational change because resistance is an obstacle to organizational success. Table 26 is a summary of the practical implications of this study.

Table 26. A summary of the practical contributions of this study.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>This study contributes to the human resources personnel and managers in the areas of recruitment, training, selection, and retention of new employees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>For the retention of committed employees, human resources managers may benefit from this study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>Assignment of tasks and responsibilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>Global managers who interact with different nationalities may use this study.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Limitations of the Study

Because this study focuses on the Saudi petrochemical companies, the results may not be generalized to Saudi government agencies, Saudi oil companies, and non-petrochemical companies. The lack of homogeneity between petrochemical companies and government agencies is one major reason for this limitation. They have different work hours, different reward systems, different organizational cultures, and most of all different
operations. Also, the environment in which Saudi petrochemical companies operate is different from that in Western cultures. This study focuses on a cross-national comparison of particular nationalities and ethnicities with the focus on their demographic variables and job-related variables. Therefore, the results may not be generalized to ethnicities that were not included in this study because of cultural differences which may influence their attitudes and behaviors toward the employing organizations.

Women employees are absent in this study because of the type of industry as well as cultural and religious considerations; thus, the results may not be generalized to women. This limitation has been recognized by some researchers in organizational studies concerning Saudi Arabia. Saudi women have employment opportunities in social work, education, and medicine. Their role in industrialization can be achieved in industries that have segregation of men and women workers. There are many banks in Saudi Arabia that employ women in their segregated branches all over the country.

The researcher of this study is cautious of the threats associated with a self-report questionnaire that is linked to social desirability and common method variance. In this study, data about subjects were collected from more than one source and through more than one data collection method. One of the methods used to collect data about subjects is the interview of supervisors, managers, and personnel in Saudi petrochemical companies. The interview of employees may create a bias; however, this limitation is not crucial because the researcher did not ask those individuals who were interviewed very personal questions that may involve social desirability. Additionally, confidentiality and anonymity were assured to interviewees, which would reduce possible social desirability. Because of time and cost
considerations, self-report is more frequently used to gather demographics, feelings, and perceptions data about the subjects of interest. Self-reports are a widely accepted method of data collection and they will stay as a major one.

Organizational commitment is an attitudinal and psychological state of an employee and is best assessed by self-reported feelings, intentions, and perceptions. Although using a mail questionnaire in sensitive issues allows for anonymity, it involves self-report, which may contribute to serious problems such as common method variance and consistency motif. This problem may be reduced by assuring the anonymity and confidentiality of employees and obtaining the data about employees from different sources with different methods. Also, the triangulation of sources and data collection methods were recommended by many researchers to deal with self-report problems. Therefore, the researcher used different sources and methods to collect data about employees’ commitment, demographics, and job-based factors.

Different data sources and different data collection methods have been suggested by many researchers to reduce the threats of problems associated with self-report, which has been used by the majority of researchers to gather data from subjects about a particular phenomenon including organizational commitment. Overall, organizational commitment is a sensitive matter for management and employees; thus, self-report is an appropriate method to collect data from employees working in Saudi petrochemical companies. The limitations of this study include gender, industry, mail survey, interview, and self-report. Table 27 shows a summary of the limitations of this study.
Table 27. A summary of the limitations of this study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Limitation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td>This study is limited to male employees due to the unavailability of female employees working in Saudi petrochemical companies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Industry</strong></td>
<td>Results may not be generalized to employees in government agencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mail Survey</strong></td>
<td>(1) Non-response bias (statistical conclusion validity threat). (2) Lack of control over extraneous variables (internal validity threat).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3) Inability to manipulate variables (internal validity threat). (4) Cost in time and money.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5) Possible distortion in response by respondents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(6) Cannot infer causality from mail survey results (data).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interview</strong></td>
<td>(1) Possible social desirability due to face-to-face interviews (statistical conclusion validity threat). Can be checked against data collected through self-report (Triangulation of methods .... Denzin, 1975 and Jick, 1979).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Invalid interview procedures may change the context (construct validity and internal validity threat).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-report</strong></td>
<td>(1) One source of data (CMV) is a threat to statistical conclusion validity. Some data from self-report can be checked against archival data and interview data (Triangulation of sources .... Denzin, 1975 and Jick, 1979).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Possible social desirability and consistency motif.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Future Research

Although this study investigated the difference in the levels of domestic and international employees in Saudi petrochemical companies, there is a need to explore other less developed countries. Globally, cross-national or cross-cultural research on organizational commitment is a field in its early stage of development. The focus on only industrial countries may not help researchers to develop a global theory of organizational commitment; thus, exploration of organizational commitment in less developed countries is necessary to understand the construct across nations. The majority of researchers emphasized this issue by arguing that cross-cultural studies are helpful to understand the variations in commitment across countries. Now, cross-national studies are needed to meet the needs of globalization because many nations have become closer than in the past.

Despite the attempt to include women in this study, women were not present. The limitations of this study included the caution of generalizability of its findings to women because they were absent in the sample; thus, future researchers may consider including them because they constitute a great percentage of the workforce in Saudi Arabia, particularly in the education and health sectors. The nature of industries and operations contributed to this limitation. Many studies stressed the important role of gender in moderating relationships between organizational and personal variables. It is not just in the United States that the next century is characterized by many women and minorities entering the workforce, but the same can be said about Saudi Arabia and other less developed countries. Organizations need to know their employees' work values and commitment to compete internationally.
Although organizational commitment is a sensitive issue for many employees and organizations, experimental design may control for extraneous variables. The majority of researchers focused on mail survey to gather data about the phenomenon which involves self-report. However, self-report has been associated with social desirability and the consistency motif. Future research may integrate other data collection methods to overcome this limitation. Researchers may include other sources of data because relying on only one source can pose a threat to the validity and reliability of studies.

Although personal characteristics and job characteristics are important predictors of organizational commitment, future research may include organizational variables as well as work experiences to investigate their relationships with organizational commitment. Organizational characteristics may include participation, stock ownership, gain sharing, and autonomy. They may introduce organizational structure such as centralized organization versus non-centralized organization. Work experiences may include socialization, leadership or management style, personal importance, and pay equity.

For an expatriate in a foreign country, family left behind in the native country may influence the employee’s level of commitment to the host country’s employing organization. This variable can be included in the model for future research on family and organizational commitment. Also, family size and number and age of children left in the home country may influence an employee’s commitment to the host country’s employing organization. Future research may investigate the influence of employees’ marital status, family size, and the availability of school for their children in the host country on their levels of commitment to the employing organization.
Chapter Summary

Individuals with different personal demographics and job-based factors have different attitudes and behaviors, which can influence their levels of commitment to their organizations. These differences in organizational commitment increase as their cultural backgrounds differ significantly. Personal demographics and job-related factors are reliable predictors of employees’ commitment to their employing organizations. The researcher conducted this cross-national comparison of Arab and non-Arab employees in Saudi petrochemical companies in Jubail Industrial City in Saudi Arabia.

This study has provided empirical evidence for scholars who attempt to develop a global theory of organizational commitment. Also, it has some managerial implications for managers and personnel who interact with employees from many countries. This study examined the different levels of employees’ commitment to Saudi petrochemical companies given their demographics and job-related variables. The findings of this study suggest that differences in employees’ demographics and job-based variables influence the levels of their organizational commitment. The greater the differences in employees’ demographics and job-based factors, the greater the differences in the levels of their commitment to the employing organization.

The reliability and validity of the instrument were tested in the pilot study and the study itself and the results show that this instrument can be used in other cultures with careful translation and back translation. Employees’ responses to either version of the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire are consistent. This is evidence of the high reliability and validity of the instrument in non-Western culture. Also, this shows that the
organizational commitment construct is universal and that the items of the instrument measure the construct under investigation.

This study added new predictors of organizational commitment to the previous ones. These new variables predicted differences in the levels of employees' commitment to the organization. Also, many nationalities were investigated in this study, which is an accomplishment by itself because previous cross-national studies generalized the results of one or two nationalities to other nationalities that were not included in the sample. However, the nationality of an employee was not found to be a predictor of organizational commitment. It also was not found to differentiate between the levels of a particular nationality's commitment to Saudi petrochemical companies. Some researchers believed that employees' organizational commitment is rooted in their cultures and not in their nationalities.

The results showed that one group of employees had a higher level of commitment than the other. Employees born in Saudi Arabia reported a higher level of commitment to Saudi petrochemical companies than employees born in other countries. Arab employees showed a higher level of commitment than non-Arab employees. Employees with low level of education, long tenure, managerial jobs, lifetime employment (non-contract), high pay, reported a higher level of commitment than those with high level of education, short tenure, non-managerial jobs, contract employment, and low pay, respectively. Old employees reported a higher level of commitment than young employees.

The findings of this study have theoretical and managerial implications. Theoretical implications include the building of an organizational commitment universal theory and
linking it to other disciplines. The practical implications of this study include recruitment, selection, and assignment of employees. Future research may focus on organizational characteristics, job characteristics, and additional personal demographics relevant to organizational commitment.
APPENDIX A

RESEARCH QUESTIONNAIRE IN ENGLISH AND ARABIC
Please read the following statements very carefully then respond to each statement by checking (x) as your answer. There will be no right or wrong answer. The instrument contains 15 items, and responses range from "strongly disagree" (1) to "strongly agree" (7). Please make a note of the following abbreviations: (1) strongly disagree = S.D; (2) disagree = D.; (3) somewhat disagree = S.W.D; (4) neutral = N.; (5) somewhat agree = S.W.A; (6) agree = A.; (7) strongly agree = S.A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>D.</th>
<th>S.W.D.</th>
<th>N.</th>
<th>S.W.A</th>
<th>A.</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I am willing to put a great deal of effort beyond that expected in order to help this organization to be successful.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I talk up this organization to my friends as a great organization to work for.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I feel little loyalty to this organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I would accept almost any type of job assignment in order to keep working for this organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I find my values and the organization's values are very similar.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statements</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>D.</td>
<td>S.W.D.</td>
<td>N.</td>
<td>S.W.A</td>
<td>A.</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I am proud to tell others that I am part of this organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I could just as well be working for a different organization as long as the type of work was similar.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. This organization really inspires the very best in me in the way of job performance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. It would take very little change in my present circumstances to cause me to leave this organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I am extremely glad that I chose this organization to work for over others I was considering at the time I joined.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. There is not too much to be gained by sticking with this organization indefinitely.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>D.</th>
<th>S.W.D</th>
<th>N.</th>
<th>S.W.A</th>
<th>A.</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12. Often, I find it difficult to agree with this organization's policies on important matters relating to its employees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I really care about the fate of this organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. For me, this is the best of all possible organizations for which to work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Deciding to work for this organization was a definite mistake on my part.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Biographical Background

1. Gender:
   ______ Male
   ______ Female

2. Place of birth: ____________  (State the country of your birth please)

3. Nationality: ____________  (State your nationality please)

4. Ethnicity: ____________  (State your ethnicity please)

5. Education: ____________  (State your level of education please)

6. Current position in this organization:
   ______ Managerial
   ______ Non-managerial

7. Number of years of experience in this organization: _________  (You may state less than one year service with this organization).

8. Age: ____________  (State age in years please)

9. Type of employment:
   _________ Contract
   _________ Non-contract

10. Job pay: _________________  (State your job income please)
من فضلك قراءة الإستقصاء بكل تمكن ثم أجب على كل جملة إستنباتيه بكتابة الأحرف الأبجدية (س) أمام الخيار الذي تراه مناسب وليس هناك إجابة صح أو خطا. الإستقصاء يحتوي على 16 جملة إستنباتيه بالإضافة إلى الصفحة الأخيرة والتي تشمل المعلومات الشخصية. الرجاء الإجابة على جميع الأسئلة. الإجابة تتراوح بين "الموافق بشدة" (1) إلى "الموافق بشدة" (7). هذا الإستبيان يتعلق بالإلتزام الموظفين لشركاتهم التي يعملون فيها.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>الاستطلاع الإستنباتي</th>
<th>موافق بشدة</th>
<th>موافق نسبياً</th>
<th>معاد</th>
<th>غير موافق نسبياً</th>
<th>غير موافق بشدة</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. لدي الاستعداد والرغبة للبلد</td>
<td>موافق بشدة</td>
<td>موافق نسبياً</td>
<td>معاد</td>
<td>غير موافق نسبياً</td>
<td>غير موافق بشدة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. أحدث عن هذه المنظمة والعمل فيها بانتهاك عظمى .</td>
<td>موافق بشدة</td>
<td>موافق نسبياً</td>
<td>معاد</td>
<td>غير موافق نسبياً</td>
<td>غير موافق بشدة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. أشعر بالولاء القليل لهذا النظام</td>
<td>موافق بشدة</td>
<td>موافق نسبياً</td>
<td>معاد</td>
<td>غير موافق نسبياً</td>
<td>غير موافق بشدة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. سوف أقبل أي وظيفة في هذه المنظمة من أجل البقاء والعمل فيها</td>
<td>موافق بشدة</td>
<td>موافق نسبياً</td>
<td>معاد</td>
<td>غير موافق نسبياً</td>
<td>غير موافق بشدة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. أجد قيمتي ومزاياي متشابه مع قيم ومزايا المنظمة</td>
<td>موافق بشدة</td>
<td>موافق نسبياً</td>
<td>معاد</td>
<td>غير موافق نسبياً</td>
<td>غير موافق بشدة</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

أخلص الصفحة من فضلك
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>الاستمتاع الإستثماري</th>
<th>موافق بشدة</th>
<th>موافق نسبياً</th>
<th>محايد</th>
<th>موافق نسبياً</th>
<th>موافق بشدة</th>
<th>غير موافق نسبياً</th>
<th>غير موافق بشدة</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. أنا في غرفة عندما</td>
<td>ملاحظة</td>
<td>ملاحظة</td>
<td>ملاحظة</td>
<td>ملاحظة</td>
<td>ملاحظة</td>
<td>ملاحظة</td>
<td>ملاحظة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. إن هذه المنظمة</td>
<td>ملاحظة</td>
<td>ملاحظة</td>
<td>ملاحظة</td>
<td>ملاحظة</td>
<td>ملاحظة</td>
<td>ملاحظة</td>
<td>ملاحظة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. إن أي تعديل سبب</td>
<td>ملاحظة</td>
<td>ملاحظة</td>
<td>ملاحظة</td>
<td>ملاحظة</td>
<td>ملاحظة</td>
<td>ملاحظة</td>
<td>ملاحظة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. إنني سعيد جداً</td>
<td>ملاحظة</td>
<td>ملاحظة</td>
<td>ملاحظة</td>
<td>ملاحظة</td>
<td>ملاحظة</td>
<td>ملاحظة</td>
<td>ملاحظة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. بكل تأكيد ليس</td>
<td>ملاحظة</td>
<td>ملاحظة</td>
<td>ملاحظة</td>
<td>ملاحظة</td>
<td>ملاحظة</td>
<td>ملاحظة</td>
<td>ملاحظة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>الأسئلة الاستبيانية</td>
<td>موافق بشدة</td>
<td>موافق</td>
<td>محايد</td>
<td>غير موافق</td>
<td>غير موافق بشدة</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. غالباً، أجد صعوبة في تقبل سياسات المنظمة الامام المتعلق بالموظفين.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. حقايقني مصير هذه المنظمة.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. بالنسبة لي هذه أفضل منظمة للعمل.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. العمل في هذه المنظمة أعظم خطأ ارتكبته.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

أقلب الصفحة للإجابة على المعلومات المتعلقة بالتزام الموظفين لوظائفهم الحالية.
معلومات شخصية ووظيفية

1. الجنس:
   __________ نذكر
   __________ انتهى

2. بلد الولادة: __________________________ (أذكر بلد الولادة)
3. الجنسية: __________________________ (أذكر الجنسية)
4. الأصول العرقية: __________________________ (أذكر الأصول العرقية)
5. المستوى التعليمي: __________________________ (أذكر المؤهل الدراسي)
6. المركز الوظيفي:
   __________ إداري
   __________ غير إداري

7. مدة الخبرة الوظيفية في هذه الشركة: __________ (يمكن ذكر خدمة أقل من سنة)
8. العمر: __________________________ (أذكر العمر)

9. نوع التوظيف:
   __________ عقد سنوي وغيره
   __________ بدون عقد عمل يحدد مدة التوظيف بالشركة

10. الدخل الوظيفي: __________________________ (أذكر الدخل من فضلك)
APPENDIX B

POWER ANALYSIS
F-Test (ANOVA), Global, Groups: 2

Alpha: 0.0100  Power (1-beta): 0.8000

Total sample size

Effect size "f"

Note: Accuracy mode calculation.

A priori analysis for "F-Test (ANOVA)", Global, Groups: 2:
Alpha: 0.0100
Power (1-beta): 0.8000
Effect size "f": 0.1000  Small effect size
Total sample size: 1172
Actual power: 0.8003
Critical value: F(1,1170) = 6.6566
Lambda: 11.7200
Note: Accuracy mode calculation.

F-Test (ANOVA), Global, Groups: 2
Alpha: 0.0100  Power (1-beta): 0.8000
Step# Effect size "f" Total sample size
1 0.0500 4676
2 0.1000 1172 Small effect size
3 0.1500 524
4 0.2000 296
5 0.2500 134 Medium effect size
6 0.3000

Note: Accuracy mode calculation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
<th>Accuracy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.3500</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Large effect size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.4000</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Large effect size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.4500</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5000</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5500</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.6000</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.6500</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.7000</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.7500</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.8000</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.8500</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.9000</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.9500</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Accuracy mode calculation.
### A priori analysis for "F-Test (ANOVA)" Global, Groups: 2:

**Alpha:** 0.0500  
**Power (1-beta):** 0.8000  
**Effect size "f":** 0.1000  Small effect size  
**Total sample size:** 788  
**Actual power:** 0.8006  
**Critical value:** F(1,786) = 3.8533  
**Lambda:** 7.8800

**Note:** Accuracy mode calculation.

### Table of Sample Sizes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step#</th>
<th>Effect size &quot;f&quot;</th>
<th>Total sample size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0500</td>
<td>3142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1000</td>
<td>788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1500</td>
<td>352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.2000</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.2500</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.3000</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effect Size</td>
<td>Accuracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.3500</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.4000</td>
<td>52 Large effect size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.4500</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.5000</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.5500</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.6000</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.6500</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.7000</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.7500</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.8000</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.8500</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.9000</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.9500</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Accuracy mode calculation.
A priori analysis for "F-Test (ANOVA)", Global, Groups: 2:
Alpha: 0.1000
Power (1-beta): 0.8000
Effect size "f": 0.1000 Small effect size
Total sample size: 620
Actual power: 0.8002
Critical value: \( F(1,618) = 2.7137 \)
Lambda: 6.2000
Note: Accuracy mode calculation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step#</th>
<th>Effect size &quot;f&quot;</th>
<th>Total sample size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0500</td>
<td>2476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1000</td>
<td>620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1500</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.2000</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.2500</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.3000</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.3500</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.4000</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.4500</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.5000</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.5500</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.6000</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.6500</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.7000</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.7500</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.8000</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.8500</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.9000</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.9500</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Accuracy mode calculation.
A priori analysis for "F-Test (ANOVA)" Global, Groups: 6:

- **Alpha:** 0.0500
- **Power (1-beta):** 0.8000
- **Total sample size:** 1290
- **Actual power:** 0.8006
- **Critical value:** $F(5,1284) = 2.2211$
- **Lambda:** 12.9000

Note: Accuracy mode calculation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0.4500</th>
<th>72</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.5000</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.5500</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.6000</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.6500</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.7000</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.7500</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.8000</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.8500</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.9000</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.9500</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Accuracy mode calculation.
F-Test (ANOVA), Global, Groups: 6
Alpha: 0.0500  Power (1-beta): 0.8000

Total sample size
1300  
1200  
1100  
1000  
900   
800   
700   
600   
500   
400   
300   
200   
100   
0     

Effect size \( f \)
0.10  
0.15  
0.20  
0.25  
0.30  
0.35  
0.40  

Note: Accuracy mode calculation.
The calculations of the needed sample for six nationalities on the basis of fixed alpha of .05, fixed power of .80, three levels of effect size of .10, .25, and .40, and the most appropriate levels of effect size of .15 and .16 (approximately medium level).

A priori analysis for "F-Test (ANOVA)", Global, Groups: 6:
Alpha: 0.0500
Power (1-beta): 0.8000
Effect size "f": 0.1000
Total sample size: 1290
Actual power: 0.8006
Critical value: \( F(5,1284) = 2.2211 \)
Lambda: 12.9000

A priori analysis for "F-Test (ANOVA)", Global, Groups: 6:
Alpha: 0.0500
Power (1-beta): 0.8000
Effect size "f": 0.1500
Total sample size: 576
Actual power: 0.8003
Critical value: \( F(5,570) = 2.2298 \)
Lambda: 12.9600
Note: Accuracy mode calculation.

A priori analysis for "F-Test (ANOVA)", Global, Groups: 6:
Alpha: 0.0500
Power (1-beta): 0.8000
Effect size "f": 0.1600
Total sample size: 510
Actual power: 0.8031
Critical value: \( F(5,504) = 2.2319 \)
Lambda: 13.0560
Note: Accuracy mode calculation.

A priori analysis for "F-Test (ANOVA)", Global, Groups: 6:
Alpha: 0.0500
Power (1-beta): 0.8000
Effect size "f": 0.2500
Total sample size: 216
Actual power: 0.8113
Critical value: \( F(5,210) = 2.2571 \)
Lambda: 13.5000
Note: Accuracy mode calculation.

A priori analysis for "F-Test (ANOVA)", Global, Groups: 6:
Alpha: 0.0500
Power (1-beta): 0.8000
Effect size "f": 0.4000
Total sample size: 90
Actual power: 0.8225
Critical value: $F(5,84) = 2.3231$
Lambda: 14.4000
Note: Accuracy mode calculation.

Estimating the sample size for six nationalities on the basis of fixed alpha (.05), fixed power level (.80), and different levels of effect size (incremental effect size).

F-Test (ANOVA), Global, Groups: 6
Alpha: 0.0500  Power (1-beta): 0.8000
Step#  Effect size “f”  Total sample size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1000</td>
<td>1290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1100</td>
<td>1068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1200</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.1300</td>
<td>768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.1400</td>
<td>666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.1500</td>
<td>576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.1600</td>
<td>510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.1700</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.1800</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.1900</td>
<td>366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.2000</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.2100</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.2200</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.2300</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.2400</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.2500</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.2600</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.2700</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.2800</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.2900</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.3000</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.3100</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.3200</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.3300</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.3400</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.3500</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.3600</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.3700</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.3800</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.3900</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.4000</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.4100</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.4200</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>0.4300</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.4400</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.4500</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>0.4600</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.4700</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The calculations of the sample size for six nationalities using G.Power developed by Buchner, Faul, and Erdfelder (1992). This estimation of sample size is based on different alpha levels, different levels of effect size, and fixed power level of .80.

A priori analysis for "F-Test (ANOVA)", Global, Groups: 6:
Alpha: 0.0100
Power (1-beta): 0.8000
Effect size “f”: 0.1000
Total sample size: 1800
Actual power: 0.8017
Critical value: F(5,1794) = 3.0274
Lambda: 18.0000
Note: Accuracy mode calculation.

A priori analysis for "F-Test (ANOVA)", Global, Groups: 6:
Alpha: 0.0100
Power (1-beta): 0.8000
Effect size “f”: 0.2500
Total sample size: 294
Actual power: 0.8010
Critical value: F(5,288) = 3.0813
Lambda: 18.3750
Note: Accuracy mode calculation.

A priori analysis for "F-Test (ANOVA)", Global, Groups: 6:
Alpha: 0.0100
Power (1-beta): 0.8000
Effect size “f”: 0.4000
Total sample size: 120
Actual power: 0.8032
Critical value: F(5,114) = 3.1820
Lambda: 19.2000
Note: Accuracy mode calculation.
Power (1-beta): 0.8000
Effect size “f”: 0.1000
Total sample size: 1290
Actual power: 0.8006
Critical value: F(5,1284) = 2.2211
Lambda: 12.9000
Note: Accuracy mode calculation.

A priori analysis for “F-Test (ANOVA)”, Global, Groups: 6:
Alpha: 0.0500
Power (1-beta): 0.8000
Effect size “f”: 0.2500
Total sample size: 216
Actual power: 0.8113
Critical value: F(5,210) = 2.2571
Lambda: 13.5000
Note: Accuracy mode calculation.

A priori analysis for “F-Test (ANOVA)”, Global, Groups: 6:
Alpha: 0.1000
Power (1-beta): 0.8000
Effect size “f”: 0.4000
Total sample size: 90
Actual power: 0.8225
Critical value: F(5,84) = 2.3231
Lambda: 14.4000
Note: Accuracy mode calculation.

A priori analysis for “F-Test (ANOVA)”, Global, Groups: 6:
Alpha: 0.0500
Power (1-beta): 0.8000
Effect size “f”: 0.2500
Total sample size: 174
Actual power: 0.8052
Critical value: F(5,168) = 1.8819
Lambda: 10.8750
Note: Accuracy mode calculation.

A priori analysis for “F-Test (ANOVA)”, Global, Groups: 6:
Alpha: 0.1000
Power (1-beta): 0.8000
Effect size \( \Phi \): 0.4000
Total sample size: 72
Actual power: 0.8115
Critical value: \( F(5,66) = 1.9366 \)
\( \Lambda \): 11.5200
Note: Accuracy mode calculation.
APPENDIX C

RESEARCH CORRESPONDENCE
Dear Participant:

I am a faculty staff at King Faisal University, College of Management Sciences and Planning, Saudi Arabia. Now, I am pursuing my doctorate in Management, Organization Theory and Policy, at the University of North Texas. I have chosen Cross-national Organizational Commitment Comparison in Saudi Arabia as a topic for my dissertation.

I will conduct a questionnaire and voluntary interviews with participants on the site of each participating company to examine the relationship between employees' commitment to Saudi organizations and their personal demographics and job-related factors relevant to this study. Kindly, this letter is to ask for your participation and cooperation in this cross-national study. Your response will be very confidential and will not be revealed to any one inside or outside your organization. The findings of this study will be available to you upon your request. It should only take a very small amount of your time to complete the attached questionnaire. Please leave your completed questionnaire in your mail box in the mail room of your company. The researcher will contact you for a voluntary interview and follow up.

Thank you for your precious time and participation in this study. Your response and insights are important to me. Now, please turn the page and follow the instructions.

Sincerely,

Abdulwahab Al-Khattany
معزي المحترف،

أنا هنا لتقديم طلبًا من طرف شركة (الشركة المذكورة في إعلان التوظيف)، للاستفادة من خبراتك ومهاراتك. جمعت في العديد من المستشارات السابقة، يمكنني التعامل مع التطورات الصناعية بسرعة، وتحديث المعلومات بشكل تدريجيًا. أؤمن أن المهارات المذكورة في إعلان التوظيف يمكنني تجربتها بشكل أكثر فعالية.

لدي خبرة متنوعة في الحقول المختلفة، بما في ذلك: (الخليج، الرياضيات، الخدم). يمكنني العمل بشكل فعال في فرق متنوعة، وتحقيق أهداف الفريق. أنا مستعد لتعلم وتحديات جديدة.

أنا ملتزم بأعلى準度، وأتطلع للعمل في هذا المجال، حيث يمكنني التعامل مع التحديات واستيعاب التطورات الصناعية بسرعة.

أرجوعكم إلى الرسالة الموالية لتفحص المتطلبات المذكورة في إعلان التوظيف.

توفير التفاصيل الكاملة متوفرة في الرسالة الموالية.

التماسك

(الاسم)

(رقم الهاتف)

(البريد الإلكتروني)
سلام عليكم ورحمة الله وبركاته،

أما الإشارة بأن السيد عبد الله عبد القادر، أمير سمو الجامع، للدراسة لدرجة الدكتوراه في الولايات المتحدة الأمريكية، والمقرر بمساءدد اعداد بحث حول التركيبة العرقية والأمريكية للشركات السعودية، وهذا البحث منطلق بدماسك.

لذا أمل ألم سهل مهما وتوزيع الاماني الذي لديه...

شكراً وعرفاً لكم تعواكم ونفذوا خالص بنية وتقدير...

مدير الشؤون الإدارية
عمادة الدراسات العليا

عبد الروؤس سالم الكحلاوي

01/7/1980
تم الدخول الثقافي السعودي بالولايات المتحدة الأمريكية برسيد عبدالوهاب سعيد القطان.

طالب من قبل جامعة الملك فيصل للدراسات للدكتوراه في إدارة الأعمال بجامعة شمال تكساس و موضوع بحثه للدكتورة بتناول مقارنة الموظفين السعودي.

نرجو أن تكون مساعدتك في تفصيل المعلومات المطلوبة لبحثي ليتمكن من تكملة متطلبات دراسته والإعلام على درجة الدكتوراه.

مع اطيب التحيات .. والمسامحات ..

الملحق الثقافي السعودي بالولايات المتحدة الأمريكية

[ลาย صورة]
30 June 1993

To:

From: MANAGER PUBLIC RELATIONS

Subject: RESEARCH QUESTIONNAIRE

Attached is a request from Mr. Abdulwahab Al-Kahtany, Lecturer of Management at the King Faisal University. They are conducting a research on the subject of employee commitment to his organization. They would appreciate your assistance in completing this study by answering the attached questionnaire. This request has the approval of Sadaf Senior Management.

Kindly send the completed questionnaire to the Sadaf mailroom section on or before July 4, 1993 from which Mr. Al-Kahtany will retrieve them.

Thank you for your cooperation. Rest assured that the information you provide will be confidential.

A.I. Aldakheel
March 4, 1996

Abdulwahab Al-Kahtany
400 Gabe Court
Denton, TX 76205

Dear Mr. Al-Kahtany:

I hereby grant permission for you to use the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire for your doctoral dissertation proposal on "A Comparative Study of Organizational Commitment Among Arab and Non-Arab Employees in Saudi Organizations".

Attached is a copy of the Questionnaire. The checked items should be reverse-scored and are omitted for the nine-item version of the measure.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Lyman W. Porter

Attachment
April 24, 1997

Abdulwahab Said Al-Kahtany
400 Gebe Court
Denton, TX  76207

Re: IRB Application No 97-104

Dear Mr Al-Kahtany

I have reviewed your application to the Institutional Board for your proposed project titled “Organizational Commitment: A Cross-National Comparison of Arab and Non-Arab Employees in Saudi Basic Industries.” As designed, this project is exempt from review by the Institutional Review Board per Title 45, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 46

If you later expand this study or decide to use different methods of data collection, the study may not be exempt and you must submit an application to the IRB for that study prior to involving those subjects. If you have questions, please contact me at 865-1940

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Mark Elder
Chairman
Institutional Review Board

cc: IRB Members
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