

Organizational commitment, rewards, and education in the Philippines

Keisuke Kokubun  
Kyoto University

Kokubun, K. (2019), "Organizational commitment, rewards and education in the Philippines", *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, Vol. 27 No. 5, pp. 1605-1630.  
<https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOA-02-2019-1667>

**Abstract**

**Purpose** – The theory of organizational commitment (OC) was originally developed in the context of Western societies. Therefore, its application to a non-Western country may be easier and more successful if that country's society has been historically influenced by Western cultures. Based on this understanding, this paper aims to investigate the relationship between OC and rewards among employees in one of East Asia's developing countries most significantly influenced by Western cultures.

**Design/methodology/approach** – Hierarchical regression analysis was conducted using survey data obtained from 2,363 employees working for 11 Japanese manufacturing companies in the Philippines.

**Findings** – The paper revealed that the variables measuring intrinsic rewards were strongly related to OC than extrinsic and social rewards, suggesting that the antecedents of OC in the Philippines resemble more closely those found in the West than in the East. This tendency was found to be stronger for university graduates, whose OC is influenced more significantly by intrinsic rewards and less by social rewards, compared to that of non-graduates.

**Research limitations/implications** - The major limitation concerns reliability. This study used self-report data from individual respondents; this may result in common method bias relationships between variables being inflated.

**Practical implications** - The results of this study could support the revision of human-resource-management practices, enabling workers to contribute to their companies on a long-term basis in countries where Western cultures have influenced employees' mindsets and attitudes.

**Originality/value** – Intrinsic rewards impact OC more than other rewards in the Philippines due to its history of Westernization and recent industrialization. This research is the first, to

the best of the author's knowledge, to verify this assumption, and should assist managers of companies in the Philippines, and perhaps in other developing countries influenced by Western cultures, in formulating strategies to foster high levels of OC among their employees.

**Paper type** Research paper

**Keywords** the Philippines; education; Japanese companies; organizational commitment; rewards

**Acknowledgement** This research was done as a project of International Economy and Work Research Institute when the researcher was a member of it.

## **Introduction**

In recent years, growing number of research has been conducted to clarify associations between organizational commitment (OC) and rewards not only in the West but also in the East (e.g., Nazir *et al.*, 2016). OC is defined as the relative strength of an employee's self-identification with, and involvement in, an organization (Mowday *et al.*, 1979) and has been seen as one of the most significant factors in explaining why some individuals wish to remain employed while others seek to leave (Peyyer *et al.*, 2010) and why some individuals demonstrate high levels of work performance and others do not (Phipps, Prieto, & Ndinguri, 2013). OC-rewards relation as for its strength or rewards variety is not common in the world but rather could be affected by cultural differences: e.g., individuals with low collectivist orientations may develop higher levels of commitment if they are provided with high amounts of pay and autonomy than those with high collectivist orientations (Williamson *et al.*, 2009). However, to the best of author's knowledge, there has been no research with the aim to investigate its applicability in an East Asian developing country most influenced by

Western cultures. Therefore, we should like to tackle with this theme in the current research using the psychological data obtained in the Philippines. The current research is very important because the turnover rate in the Philippine labor market has been high relative to other countries in the region, making it difficult for firms to internalize labor markets (Amante, 1993). For instance, total turnover rate in the Philippines in recent survey was 20.32%, the highest among eight East Asian countries/regions including China (19.24%), Hong Kong (17.37%), South Korea (12.08%), Thailand (20.21%), India (18.07%), Japan (13.23%), and Singapore (19.66%) (Gutmann, 2016).

We use opinion survey data collected in Japanese manufacturing companies in this country. The reason is because development of East Asian countries has been significantly influenced by foreign direct investment (FDI), with Japanese companies' investment as a major driving force. Moreover, using the data of Japanese companies is more desirable in the light of collectivistic features of the Japanese manufacturing workplace which is said to be strongly present in Japanese overseas subsidiaries (Wasti, 1998). Therefore, if we could find any fragments of individualistic propensity even in collectivistic Japanese companies, the results would be more widely applicable to enterprises of different origins in the Philippines.

We also aims to show how university graduates' antecedents are different from those of other members of the workforce because there is a mismatch between educational attainment and available jobs: new entrants to the labor market do not have the skills and knowledge to meet employers' needs, a fact that explains much of the graduate unemployment in the Philippines (McQuaid and Lindsay, 2006; Buenviaje *et al.*, 2015). This leads to the conclusion that the correlations between graduates' OC and its antecedents may differ from those of non-graduates. Practically speaking, if OC-determinant relationships are not the same for different educational backgrounds, attempts to increase OC levels of need to be tailored accordingly. This study, therefore, also aims to enhance our understanding of OC-rewards relationships both for graduates and non-graduates in

an attempt to provide more practical implications and contributions.

## **Literature review**

### *Organizational rewards in the Philippines*

The concept of social exchange theory underpins this research, whereby employees' high perceived organizational support (POS), and the associated rewards from the organization for their efforts, will lead to employees feeling obliged to repay the organization for their support. In summary, higher POS should lead to employees being more committed to the organization (Eisenberger *et al.*, 1986). For example, several researchers have found a positive relationship between POS and commitment (Meyer and Allen, 1997; Mottaz, 1988) and that increased OC has several beneficial outcomes both in Western and Eastern cultures (e.g. Meyer *et al.*, 2002). In the context of the Philippines, OC has been shown to be associated with higher job performance (Tolentino, 2013), lower turnover intention (Cinches, 2013; Dimaculangan and Aguilung, 2012), and higher organizational citizenship behavior (Restubog *et al.*, 2006). Other research has also revealed how rewards are perceived and valued differently by employees in different regions. For example, intrinsic rewards impact the OC of Western employees more than extrinsic or social rewards due to individualistic cultures (Eby *et al.*, 1999; Malhotra *et al.*, 2007; O'Reilly and Caldwell, 1980), while the opposite is true for Eastern employees due to collectivistic cultures and relatively low income levels, respectively (Miao *et al.*, 2013; Newman and Sheikh, 2012).

Research on OC and its antecedents in the Philippines is, however, scarce. Recent work undertaken in the Philippines has suggested that extrinsic rewards (e.g. satisfaction with work-life balance policies; Kim and Ryu, 2017), intrinsic rewards (e.g. opportunities for learning; McNeese-Smith and Nazarey, 2001), and social rewards (e.g. perceived organizational support; Cinches, 2013) are all individually associated with OC. However, these studies did not test the comparative importance of these rewards regarding

their impacts on OC. Given the scarcity of research on the OC–rewards relationship in Philippine organizations, this research aims to examine the extent to which the effects of rewards found in the literature are also found in the Philippines.

Philippine culture can be conceptualized as a collectivist society, i.e. emphasizing group rather than individual accountability by Hofstede’s model (Hofstede, 1980), which is widely accepted by many scholars to characterize cultural differences among several countries. Although his model is also subject to lots of limitations and criticism from scholars including Schwartz (1990) regarding equivalency of sample, items, and value dimensions, the Philippines’ high collectivism was confirmed again by GLOBE study (House et al., 2004), another wide-ranging international cultural study. The traits valued by collectivist cultures include humility, deference, dependence, obedience, conformity, and traditionalism (Grimm *et al.*, 1999). Notably, these traits differ significantly from those expected to be found in an empowered individual: assertiveness; independence; initiative; and directness. Given that Philippine employees are collectivistic, social rewards are expected to have the greatest impact on OC. Consequently, hiring practices in the Philippines are characterized by an emphasis on informal, personal links: prospective employees who already have links to the company (e.g. relatives or friends already work there) are more likely to be recruited. This helps to reduce monitoring costs because the Filipino cultural values of reciprocity and obligation reduce the need for monitoring new employees that have been endorsed by supervisors or managers. These new employees would, therefore, loathe embarrassing their guarantors by being unproductive or demonstrating negative behavior (Amante, 1993).

Then, can the Philippine management culture be considered Asian? Actually, the Philippines played too little a part in the debate about Asian values as they are mostly Christians but neither Confucian nor Hindu nor Islamic (Mendoza, 2001). The nature of HRM in the Philippines has, however, been claimed to have been shaped by its history, e.g. the significant influence of employment rules adopted following Spanish and US

colonization (Amante, 1995). In particular, Filipino conceptions of political, social, and business organizations show marked US influences (following US colonization from 1898 to 1946). Selmer and de Leon (2001) have argued that Americanization has affected Filipino society more than any other Asian country and US theories and practices regarding management and industrial psychology underpin the running of most Filipino organizations (Jocano, 1999). Western empowerment techniques, e.g. labor-management councils and quality circles, have been utilized in Filipino organizations from the early 1980s (Hechanova *et al.*, 2006). Westernized management education in the Philippines is partly responsible for this, emphasizing objectivity, impersonality, and organization (Selmer and de Leon, 2001). It is said Filipinos are neither Asian in the eyes of Asians, nor Western in the eyes of Westerners (Sheridan, 1999). We predict, therefore, that intrinsic rewards will also be correlated with OC.

Extrinsic rewards, however, are also considered to have a significant impact on Filipino employees' OC, despite their collectivist culture because, given the Philippines' economic situation, i.e. an economy in transition in which employees must work to survive. Rothausen *et al.* (2009), for example, found that the relationship between extrinsic rewards and job satisfaction differed between employees in the US and those in the Philippines, being stronger for the latter. This is because of the importance to Filipino culture of any aspects of the job that facilitate activity outside of work, including rewards and flexibility, while for those with more individualistic values and fewer outside-of-work responsibilities, aspects of the job, e.g. autonomy and achievement, would be more important (Rothausen *et al.*, 2009). Prior research has also demonstrated that, rewards in countries with poor social welfare or security systems, extrinsic rewards determine job satisfaction more than intrinsic rewards (Diener and Diener, 1995; Huang and Van de Vliert, 2003; Kanungo, 1990; Lu *et al.*, 2006).

For the purposes of this research, we assume that intrinsic, extrinsic, and social rewards all have a positive impact on OC in the Philippines, given the mix of Eastern and

Western influences. It has been argued that Filipino workers value workplace familism while also subscribing to Western management philosophies and methods (Mathur *et al.*, 2001; Neelankavil *et al.*, 2000; Restubog and Bordia, 2006). However, we also assume that intrinsic rewards impact OC more than other rewards, given the Philippines' history of Westernization and recent industrialization. This research is the first, to the best of the author's knowledge, to verify this assumption, and should assist managers of companies in the Philippines in formulating strategies to foster high levels of OC among their employees.

The following sub-sections briefly summarize the results of previous research undertaken among Filipinos, both within and outside of the country, to confirm the validity of these assumptions, using seven rewards as antecedents of OC. For reference, previous studies explored similar questions within Japanese companies in Malaysia (Kokubun, 2006, 2017) and in China (Kokubun, 2018).

## **Theoretical framework**

### *Extrinsic rewards*

#### Benefit satisfaction

Recent work in the Philippines has suggested that satisfaction with monetary benefits (McNeese-Smith and Nazarey, 2001) and work-life balance policies (Kim and Ryu, 2017) enhance OC. Notably, rewards that allow employees to meet health-, physical- and emotional-care needs of their family, including benefits/rewards and working-time flexibility, have been found to be strongly related to job satisfaction in the Philippines than in the US (Rothausen *et al.*, 2009). We therefore propose the following hypothesis:

*H1: Benefit satisfaction is positively related to OC.*

#### Fatigue

In the context of the Philippines, call-center employees have reported that emotional stress has led to job dissatisfaction and reduced organization commitment,



significantly increasing their intention to leave (Ruppel *et al.*, 2013). Similarly, it has been shown that emotional exhaustion is significantly related to job dissatisfaction in the Philippines (Rosales *et al.*, 2013). The following hypothesis is, therefore, proposed:

*H2: Fatigue is negatively related to OC.*

#### *Social rewards*

##### Supervisor support

In the context of the Philippines, supervisor-related variables, perceived organizational support (Cinches, 2013) and transformational leadership (Dimaculangan and Aguilin, 2012), have all been shown to be significantly associated with OC. We therefore propose the following hypothesis:

*H3: Supervisor support is positively related to OC.*

##### Co-worker support

Filipino management style has been described by de Leon (1987) as viable and imperative, recognizing the importance to companies and other organizations of collective identities. It has also been argued that the Philippines, as a collectivist society, highly values smooth interpersonal relationships and reciprocity (Church, 1987; Restubog and Bordia, 2007). For example, a survey of nurses working for US hospitals, in which most participants were Filipino or other Asian migrants, revealed that co-worker relations were associated with OC (McNeese-Smith and Nazarey, 2001). A study among young Filipino workers also revealed that an important retention factor for young workers was having peers with whom they enjoy working (Hechanova *et al.*, 2006). Similarly, Selmer and de Leon's (2001) research revealed that Filipino workers who perceive a lack of concern and cooperation among fellow employees tend to be absent from work more frequently. We therefore propose following hypothesis:

*H4: Co-worker support is positively related to OC.*

### *Intrinsic rewards*

#### Autonomy

Recent research on Filipino employees, both inside and outside of the country, has demonstrated a strong relationship between psychological empowerment and OC (Palmiano, 2017; Vacharakiat, 2008). The following hypothesis is, therefore, proposed:

*H5: Autonomy is positively related to OC.*

#### Training provision

In the Filipino context, Fabiene and Kachchhap (2016) found a relationship between training and employees' commitment. Similarly, Yang *et al.* (2012) reported a positive relationship between employees' perceived access to training and OC. The opportunity for learning has been found to be one of the major factors increasing Filipinos' OC, both inside and outside of the country (Edralin, 2011; McNeese-Smith and Nazarey, 2001). We therefore propose the following hypothesis:

*H6: Training is positively related to OC.*

#### Role clarity

Most Filipinos are of the opinion that jobs need to have their specifications of duties and responsibilities clearly stated (Amante, 1993). Lu (2008) also demonstrated that organizational role stressors, e.g. role ambiguity, were among the most significant antecedents of burnout among nurses in the Philippines. The following hypothesis is, therefore, proposed:

*H7: Role clarity is positively related to OC.*

#### Comparative importance of rewards

For the purposes of this study, as previously described, we assume that HRM in

the Philippines demonstrates characteristics of both Western and Eastern organizations. We could assume that Filipinos' individualism and collectivism cancel each other out, leading to all three kinds of reward being equally associated with OC. However, we should like to assume that individualism is stronger than collectivism in the modern Philippines, i.e. we expect intrinsic rewards to be more associated with OC than other rewards in the sample. This assumption is founded on the fact that the Filipino collectivism revealed by Hofstede in the 1970s may have had its impact lessened following the country's long-term industrialization: according to Hofstede (1980), a country's culture changes as its economy develops. Prior empirical research in Vietnam has also indicated that the population has become more individualistic following rapid industrialization (Hoang, 2008). We therefore propose the following hypothesis:

*H8: Extrinsic and social rewards are both positively related to OC, and to the same extent; however, they have a less significant impact on OC than intrinsic rewards.*

The level of education and comparative importance of rewards

Many companies in the Philippines adopt Western management styles, which are less autocratic, more participatory, and more democratized. However, as the value orientation of Filipino workers makes them more predisposed to accept authority and hierarchy, Filipino rank-and-file are less autonomous, more dependent on superiors for guidance, and less accepting of risk and responsibility (Mendoza, 2001). Therefore, it can be argued that graduate employees are more modernized, or Westernized, than non-graduate employees and have more individualized views. Following Boyacigiller and Adler (1991), we expect graduate employees' OC to be strongly related to extrinsic and intrinsic rewards and weakly related to social rewards than that of non-graduate employees. The following hypotheses are, therefore, proposed:

Extrinsic (stronger)

*H9: There is a stronger relationship between benefit satisfaction and OC for graduates than*

non-graduates.

*H10*: There is a stronger relationship between fatigue and OC for graduates than non-graduates.

Social (weaker)

*H11*: There is a weaker relationship between supervisor support and OC for graduates than non-graduates.

*H12*: There is a weaker relationship between coworker support and OC for graduates than non-graduates.

Intrinsic (stronger)

*H13*: There is a stronger relationship between autonomy and OC for graduates than non-graduates.

*H14*: There is a stronger relationship between training provision and OC for graduates than non-graduates.

*H15*: There is a stronger relationship between role clarity and OC for graduates than non-graduates.

Finally, from *H9–15*, we propose the following hypotheses:

*H16*: There is a stronger relationship between extrinsic rewards (benefit satisfaction; fatigue) and OC for graduates than non-graduates.

*H17*: There is a weaker relationship between social rewards (supervisor support; coworker support) and OC for graduates than non-graduates.

*H18*: There is a stronger relationship between intrinsic rewards (autonomy; training provision; role clarity) and OC for graduates than non-graduates.

## **Research methodology**

### *Participants*

An anonymous questionnaire (from September 2012 to December 2013) was

used to survey employees from 11 Japanese manufacturing companies based in the Philippines. The sample was confined to Japanese companies because they are the largest source of foreign capital, representing 31.9% of the total approved foreign investments from January 2016 to September 2017 (Philippine Statistics Authority, 2017). This decision was also taken to avoid any unpredictable fluctuations that may have occurred by including companies with different origins. The companies' HR departments were used to distribute 6,000 questionnaires. A total of 5,572 surveys were completed (a 92.9% response rate). However, 3,209 surveys were eliminated because values were missing (1,057 surveys) or the respondents were inappropriate for this research (209 surveys of probationary and 1,943 surveys of contractual employees). Contractual employees were excluded, even if Filipino, because they are likely to demonstrate different perceptions and behaviors regarding the OC-rewards relationship than standard employees. Contract workers' perceived status relative to the client's own standard employees has been shown to influence their OC in previous empirical research (Boswell *et al.*, 2012). These eliminated surveys will, however, be used in future analyses by the author. The final sample comprised 2,363 Filipino participants, of which 607 were graduates and 1,756 were non-graduates.

All the 11 companies were located in the provinces in Luzon Island (five from Lagna; three from Cavite; and one each from Batangas, Zambales, and the National Capital Region). The sample size in this study is larger than that used in prior research; consequently, the results may be considered more representative of Filipino employees in the Philippines. Participants' demographic information is shown in Table AI. We controlled for all demographic variables to remove concerns regarding sample compatibility.

### *Measures*

The survey questions were adapted from Kokubun (2006) that have been recently used in research in other East Asian countries (Kokubun, 2017; Kokubun, 2018). The questionnaire was developed in English before being translated into Tagalog, the Philippines' official

language. It was then translated back into English to ensure the translation's accuracy. The variables measured were as follows:

- *Benefit satisfaction* (four-item scale). A five-point Likert scale from 1 (dissatisfied) to 5 (satisfied) was used to measure the items. Cronbach's alpha reliability was 0.798 for graduates and 0.809 for non-graduates.
- *Fatigue* (three-item scale). A five-point Likert scale from 1 (incorrect) to 5 (correct) was used. Cronbach's alpha reliability was 0.837 for graduates and 0.821 for non-graduates.
- *Supervisor support* (six-item scale). A five-point Likert scale from 1 (I don't think so) to 5 (I think so) was used. Cronbach's alpha reliability was 0.907 for graduates and 0.891 for non-graduates.
- *Co-worker support* (three-item scale). A five-point Likert scale from 1 (I don't think so) to 5 (I think so) was used. Cronbach's alpha reliability was 0.748 for graduates and 0.723 for non-graduates.
- *Autonomy* (three-item scale). A five-point Likert scale from 1 (I don't feel so) to 5 (I feel so) was used. Cronbach's alpha reliability was 0.685 for graduates and 0.632 for non-graduates.
- *Training provision* (two-item scale). A five-point Likert scale from 1 (I don't think so) to 5 (I think so) was used. Cronbach's alpha reliability was 0.645 for graduates and 0.694 for non-graduates.
- *Role clarity* (two-item scale). A five-point Likert scale from 1 (I don't think so) to 5 (I think so) was used. Cronbach's alpha reliability was 0.622 for graduates and 0.562 for non-graduates.
- *Organizational commitment* (five-item scale). A five-point Likert scale from 1 (I don't think so) to 5 (I think so) was used. Cronbach's alpha reliability was 0.833 for graduates and 0.796 for non-graduates.
- *Control variables*. To control for individual differences, several demographic

variables were included. The sample dummy represents graduate or non-graduate status. Age, length of service, turnover experience, gender, indirect/direct department, marital status, and managerial/non-managerial position were also measured. To control for the 11 companies, 10 dummy variables were created.

### **Analysis and findings**

Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was conducted for all items (except the control variables) to examine measurement invariance between graduates and non-graduates. The reason why EFA was chosen rather than other methods (e.g., confirmation factor analysis) was because this is the first attempt to apply the Kokubun's questionnaire to the Pilipino labor forces. In this case, exploring most fitted factor composition for both graduate and non-graduate Pilipino samples were more important than confirming applicability of the items used in other countries. Table 1 presents the results of the factor analysis with varimax rotation, confirming an eight-factor solution for each of the following items: benefit satisfaction; fatigue; supervisor support; co-worker support; autonomy; training provision; role clarity; and OC. The factor structure for graduates and non-graduates was the same, from which we deduce that both graduates and non-graduates ascribed the same meanings to the scale items used (Milfont and Fischer, 2010). We discarded seven low-factor-loading items: three benefit-satisfaction items ("My position or rank at the working place," "Possibility of my promotion," and "Company's evaluation of myself"); one co-worker-support item ("My co-workers are willing to teach me what I do not know about my work"); one autonomy item ("My own ideas are fully utilized in my work"); one training-provision item ("At work, the bosses/supervisors and the seniors are training their subordinates"); and one OC item ("I want to be employed by this company as long as possible"). Based on the EFA results, respondents did not ascribe the same meanings to these items, and they were removed to prevent multicollinearity with other variables.

(Insert Table 1 about here)

Table 2 presents the descriptive statistics for both graduates and non-graduates. Table 3 presents the results of the hierarchical regression analysis used to test our hypotheses. In step 1, the control variables were entered and in step 5, the main effects of rewards. The sample variable was entered in step 6 (0 for non-graduate, 1 for graduates), along with its interaction terms with the main seven reward variables, to test graduate moderation following Aiken and West (1991). To test their comparative importance, the main reward variables were entered separately according to their type (social, extrinsic, or intrinsic rewards) in steps 2–4. We also conducted a separate regression analysis using graduates and non-graduates.

(Insert Table 2 about here)

(Insert Table 3 about here)

The results when only the control variables were included in the regression are represented in step 1. Of the seven demographic variables, four were found to influence OC: position, turnover experience, and age were positively related; and gender was negatively related. This shows that older, female employees who held managerial positions and had worked for other companies tended to have higher OC than their counterparts.

Six of the seven reward variables, as shown by steps 2–4, were significantly associated with OC ( $p < 0.01$ ). Fatigue, however, was not significantly associated with OC ( $p > 0.05$ ). Based on the adjusted  $R^2$  values, 27%, 28%, and 34% of the additional variance in OC was explained by extrinsic, social, and intrinsic rewards, respectively, implying that social and extrinsic rewards impact OC to the same extent, but less so than intrinsic rewards: *H8* is, therefore, supported. Step 5 shows the results with all seven reward variables added to the regression. Fatigue was not significantly associated to the regression ( $p > 0.05$ ); the other six reward variables, however, were associated significantly and positively ( $p < 0.01$ ), thus supporting *H1* and *H3–7*, but not *H2*.

The relationship between benefit satisfaction and OC was not moderated by the sample in step 6, showing that this relationships was equally strong for graduates and non-



graduates ( $\beta=-0.01$ ,  $p>0.05$ ). Likewise, the relationship between fatigue and OC was not moderated by the sample, showing that this relationship was equally strong for graduates and non-graduates ( $\beta=0.02$ ,  $p>0.05$ ). The insignificant results of these moderation tests reject both *H9* and *H10*.

The relationship between supervisor support and OC was, however, weaker for graduates than non-graduates ( $\beta=-0.22$ ,  $p<0.01$ ), suggesting that support from supervisors is less important, in terms of engendering OC, for graduates than non-graduates (supporting *H11*). On the other hand, the relationship between co-worker support and OC was not moderated by the sample ( $\beta=0.08$ ,  $p>0.05$ ), suggesting that support from co-workers is equally important, in terms of engendering OC, for graduates and non-graduates (rejecting *H12*).

The relationship between autonomy and OC was moderated by the sample in step 6, showing that this relationship was stronger for graduates than non-graduates ( $\beta=0.26$ ,  $p<0.01$ ). To summarize, graduates' OC was affected more than that of non-graduates (supporting *H13*). On the other hand, the relationship between training provision and OC was not moderated by the sample ( $\beta=0.01$ ,  $p>0.05$ ), suggesting that training is equally important, in terms of engendering OC, for graduates and non-graduates (rejecting *H14*). Likewise, the relationship between role clarity and OC was not moderated by the sample ( $\beta=0.02$ ,  $p>0.05$ ), suggesting that role clarity is equally important, in terms of engendering OC, for graduates and non-graduates (rejecting *H15*).

The significant results of these moderation tests support both *H11* and *H13*, but not *H9*, *10*, *12*, and *14*, and *15*. In summary, extrinsic rewards equally predicted OC for graduates and non-graduates, rejecting *H16*. However, intrinsic rewards better predicted OC than social rewards for graduates than non-graduates, supporting both *H17* and *H18*.

## **Discussion**

This study's aim was to investigate OC's antecedents among Filipino workers

employed in the Philippines. Opinion data was collected from 11 Japanese manufacturing companies in the Philippines and social, extrinsic, and intrinsic rewards were found to be associated with OC. Notably, however, intrinsic rewards were strongly associated with OC than the other social and extrinsic rewards, in line with findings from prior studies in the West, supporting *H8*. Specifically, provision of training, autonomy, and role clarity were also found to influence OC, supporting *H5-7*. Filipino employees may show results that resemble more closely those of Western, rather than Eastern, employees, in terms of the comparative importance of intrinsic rewards, because the Philippines is a country in which Western culture has significantly influenced its HRM practices.

However, it is also important to note that companies in the Philippines still function as corporations in a developing and collectivistic country. Benefit satisfaction was found to significantly influence OC (in line with *H1*). This may be because of the country's economic level, i.e. employees tend to be more responsive to financial rewards. Supervisor and co-worker support, however, were found to have a significant influence on OC (in line with *H3* and *H4*), further demonstrating the importance of social rewards in collectivistic societies like the Philippines. Among the seven reward variables, only fatigue was not associated with OC, in consistent with *H2*.

The interaction terms' results suggest that the impact of autonomy on OC was greater for graduates than non-graduates, supporting *H13*. The relationship between OC and supervisor support, however, was weaker for graduates than non-graduates, supporting *H11*. These results also support *H17* and *H18*, i.e. the graduates' OC was impacted more by intrinsic than social rewards than that of non-graduates. The insignificant interaction results (contradicting *H9*, *H10*, *H12*, and *H14-16*), however, suggested no significant difference between graduates and non-graduates regarding the relationships of OC with extrinsic rewards (benefit satisfaction; fatigue), coworker support, training provision, and role clarity.

### *Implications for theory and practice*

This research contributes to the literature in four ways. First, it demonstrates that there are several ways of enhancing employees' OC of the employees in the Philippines (they respond significantly to extrinsic, social, and intrinsic rewards). This corresponds to the findings of prior research in both Western and Eastern countries.

Second, however, results revealed that their comparative significance differed. Filipino employees were more responsive to intrinsic rewards than extrinsic and social rewards, showing that they were more individualistic than employees in other East Asian countries, possibly attributable to the aforementioned fact that the Philippines is the country most influenced by Western cultures in the region. For reference, recent research on Japanese manufacturing companies in China, using a similar model to that used in this research, found that social rewards were as significant as intrinsic rewards in their relationship with OC (Kokubun, 2018). This indicates that employees, at least those within Japanese manufacturing companies, in the Philippines are more individualistic than those in China.

Third, this study demonstrates fatigue is not correlated with OC. This was an unexpected result, though in line with the findings of McNeese-Smith and Nazarey (2001) that monetary incentives were more influential than better-life or work factors for OC in the Philippines. Most Filipinos are still low-income earners, working to survive. They may, therefore, be more concerned with earning a living than with their long-term health. This finding, however, does not mean that health care is not an important factor to be considered by corporations in the Philippines. On the contrary, managers should make even more of an effort to safeguard Filipino employees' health, because they tend to work excessively hard even when tired.

Finally, several differences between graduates and non-graduates were revealed. Autonomy was more important for graduates, while supervisor support was more important for non-graduates. If we assume that non-graduates are more collectivistic than graduates

due to lower experience in westernized education, this difference in the OC–autonomy relationship is in line with recent research showing that the positive relationship between OC and employee involvement in decision-making practices is weaker in collectivistic cultures than in individualistic cultures (Rode *et al.*, 2016). This may be attributable to the fact that, in more individualistic cultures, where personal needs and goals are prioritized over collective ones, individuals view involvement in decision making as a sign that the organization values their input (based on their skills and ability), which leads to a stronger relational psychological contract and higher OC (Rode *et al.*, 2016).

The difference in the OC–supervisor-support relationship between graduates and non-graduates, however, may also be because of the individualistic–collectivistic distinction. In less collectivistic cultures, individuals tend to value their independent, individual identity more than team identity (Hofstede, 1980). In light of this, it becomes clearer as to why the OC of more individualistic graduates is impacted less by supervisor support than that of non-graduates. Another possible reason explaining this difference is tolerance to abusive supervision. For instance, previous research in the Philippines has found that employees who experience abusive supervision tend to perceive decreased organizational support, consequently engaging in behaviors that are unproductive harmful to the organization or unproductive, considering this abusive supervision as proof that the organization does not value them (Shoss *et al.*, 2013). If such an effect is typically observed even among Filipinos, who live a country in which the difference in power within organizational hierarchies tends to be widely accepted (Hofstede, 1980), this counterproductive effect may be stronger among more Westernized (and conceivably less tolerant of power distance) graduates than non-graduates.

In addition to such cultural reasons, the differences that autonomy was more important for graduates while supervisor was more important for non-graduates may be attributed to Blanchard's Situational Leadership Theory, which predicts that an optimal style of supervision can be prescribed for given levels of subordinate maturity: employees with

less maturity could depend more on directing, coaching and supportive styles of leadership; meanwhile capable and confident employees would benefit from a delegating style of leadership (Blanchard, 2007). Therefore the results of our moderation test are suggestive to effectively enhance graduates' OC as it is reported that engineering graduates confront critical issues during the transition from university to an engineering career, including taking on new responsibilities, performing under pressure, dealing with superiors and communicating with people from diverse backgrounds, especially in developing countries still immature about collaboration between schools and firms (Baytiyeh & Naja, 2012).

Overall, many kinds of rewards, including extrinsic, social, and intrinsic rewards, may be effective in enhancing Filipinos' OC. However, as their culture has been influenced by the Western cultures more than other countries in the region, intrinsic rewards may be more effective than other rewards in engendering higher OC, especially for graduates, who prefer intrinsic rewards to social rewards. The results contradict with the findings that Filipinos were high on power distance and uncertainty avoidance (Hofstede, 1980), which were associated with the reluctance to exercise autonomy and accept responsibility (Acuna and Rodriguez, 1999). However, our results are consistent with more recent research which found Filipino managers were more similar to their U.S. counterparts than their Chinese counterparts as for determinants of managerial performance rating leadership ability rather than charisma to be important (Neelankavil et al., 2000). This will be because a significant number of multinationals who came to the Philippines have provided a rich source of managerial skills and the Philippines have continued to change benefitting from multinational presence and westernized education (Tiglao, 1992). On the other hand, many Chinese managers are still comparatively new to modern management theory and techniques because the Chinese society had long been closed to Western influences until the "Open Door Policy" was instituted in the late 1970's.

These findings can also enable leaders in multinational enterprises to develop a better understanding of the subtle differences in organizational behavior around the world

which, in turn, can help their organizations perform better and have better relations with their employees. This is because global managers are in danger of assuming that effective management practice is universal, although practically managerial practices that work effectively in one culture often work poorly in others (Earley and Erez, 1997). In the same vein, what works in the West does not necessarily work in other parts of the world (Hofstede, 1994). Moreover, Asian countries are not necessarily very similar despite geographical proximity and economic similarity (Neelankavil et al., 2000). Therefore, the fit between national culture and organizational approach is crucial in engendering employees' positive attitudes toward work; irrespective of any historical or present-day links to other cultures, deep cultural differences may still remain (Testa *et al.*, 2003).

Notably, a review of the results for the three rewards revealed unexpected results; specifically, where there were no significant differences between graduates and non-graduates in terms of OC. Benefit satisfaction was expected to be strongly positively associated with OC among graduates, since they are considered to be more acquisitive and individualistic. However, results revealed that the relationship between benefit satisfaction and OC might in fact be even stronger in non-graduates, possibly because they tend to be less wealthy and must work harder to earn a living, owing to the labor market being deeply divided by educational background (Amante, 1993). If these possible effects cancel each other out, one may draw the conclusion that benefit satisfaction does not differentiate between graduates and non-graduates in any significant way in terms of its relationship with OC.

Another surprising result was that no significant differentiation was found for co-worker support, in terms of OC, between graduates and non-graduates, despite the fact that graduates are typically considered to be more correlated with OC than non-graduates. This may be attributable to the country's culture. In the Philippines, respect for authority is based on the special honor paid to elder family members and, by extension, to anyone in a position of power in the workplace. A supervisor can, therefore, be considered as a parent

substitute, providing not only direction and guidance in work-related matters, but also offering counsel and nurturing to his/her subordinates (Restubog and Bordia, 2006). Relationships with co-workers, however, are considered to be less related to this aspect of the culture and may not, therefore, lessen the impact of co-worker support, even for graduates.

No significant difference was found between graduates and non-graduates regarding the effect of training on OC. This may be attributable to possible mismatches, in terms of quantity and quality of the training provided and the training actually required by employees, between the companies surveyed. This mismatch may be more significant for graduates than non-graduates, as graduates have already cultivated specialties during their education and may, therefore, experience a larger skills gap than non-graduates. Another possible explanation is that, for graduates, training may operate as hygiene factor: graduates are perceived as being more individualistic, assessing training from an economic/transactional perspective. Thus, were adequate training not provided, graduate employees would be demotivated and disinclined to form a relational psychological contract. Further, once adequate training is provided, at a threshold level, any further improvements would not lead to a linear increase in relational psychological contract focus (Rode *et al.* 2016; Sparrow, 1998).

Unexpectedly, no significant difference between graduates and non-graduates was found regarding the impact of role clarity on OC. We expected that the association would be stronger for graduates than non-graduates because graduates are considered to be more individualistic than non-graduates, focusing more on intrinsic rewards. Prior research, however, has indicated that employees in a high power-distance culture often feel uncomfortable doing anything other than what they are told (Jin *et al.*, 2014). Assuming that this is also the case in the Philippines, non-graduates, who have been less exposed to a Westernized education system, may respond strongly to role clarity. Once again, if these influences cancel each other out, it can be concluded that role clarity offers no

differentiation, in any meaningful way, in terms of its relationship with OC.

#### *Limitations of the study limitations and directions for future research*

This study has three limitations. The major limitation concerns reliability. This study used self-report data from individual respondents; this may result in common method bias relationships between variables being inflated. However, the hypotheses proposed do not rely on the absolute strength of relationships but rather on the relative strength of relationships, which may still be validly tested in cross-sectional research. Therefore, the author argues that reliability is not a major concern, as the paper aims to clarify *comparative* features in the OC–rewards relationship of employees in the Philippines; most previous research in other companies has also faced the same problem. In the same vein, the bias may not have been influential on the comparison between graduates and non-graduates in the Philippines. However, future research could still expand on the present analysis by incorporating measures of actual behavior or variables assessed by means other than self-reporting.

The second limitation of the present study concerns comparability. Currently, the most widely used measures for OC, especially in the West, are Myer and Allen's (1991) and Mowday *et al.*'s (1979) questionnaires. This research, however, used Kokubun's (2006) questionnaire, which has been employed in recent studies in East Asian countries. Therefore, the results may to some extent be influenced by scale difference. Although previous research has shown that the present research's OC and Mowday *et al.*'s OC are strongly correlated (Kokubun, 2006), future research should aim to determine possible, though subtle, differences between these measures.

The third limitation regards generalizability. Although the present results have been extracted from a sample of employees working for Japanese manufacturing companies, this research has aimed to determine effective means of enhancing the OC not only of employees working for Japanese manufacturing companies but also of general



laborers working in the Philippines. Had the research included a more diverse range of companies, the results might have been different. However, alternation may not be particularly significant, as Adler (1986) suggested that national culture has a greater impact on employees than does their organization's culture. Moreover, comparing the present findings with those of Kokubun (2018), this research confirms that employees in the Philippines are more individualistic than those in China. This implication could not have been obtained if the researcher had not limited the sample to Japanese manufacturing companies.

## **Conclusion**

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between OC and rewards among employees in an East Asian developing country known to have been influenced by Western cultures more significantly than other countries in the region. Intrinsic rewards impact OC more than other rewards in the Philippines due to its history of Westernization and recent industrialization. This research is the first, to the best of the author's knowledge, to verify this assumption, and should assist managers of companies in the Philippines, and perhaps in other developing countries influenced by Western cultures, in formulating strategies to foster high levels of OC among their employees.

Hierarchical regression analysis was utilized to examine survey data obtained from 2,363 employees of 11 Japanese manufacturing companies in the Philippines. The findings demonstrate that the variables measuring extrinsic, social, and intrinsic rewards were strongly related to OC. However, it was also found that intrinsic rewards were more significantly associated with OC than other rewards, most likely due to the influence of Western cultures in this country. This tendency was more significant for graduates, whose OC was more correlated with intrinsic rewards and less with social rewards than that of non-graduates.

The results of this research could be utilized to reshape future HRM practices to

attract and employ the best employees who can contribute to the companies on a long-term basis in non-Western countries where Western cultures significantly influence employees' behavior and attitudes.

## References

- Acuna, J. E. and Rodriguez, R. A. (1999). "Value Orientations of Filipinos," *Readings in Human Behavior in Organizations*, Acuna, Rodriguez & Pilar (editors), Diwata Publishing, Inc., Manila, Philippine
- Adler, N.J. (1986), *International Dimensions of Organizational Behavior*, Kent Publishing, Boston, MA.
- Aiken, L.S. and West, S.G. (1991), *Multiple Regression: Testing and Interpreting Interactions*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Amante, M.S. (1993), "Human resource management in Japanese enterprises in the Philippines: Issues and problems", *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, Vol. 10 No. 2, pp. 237-245.
- Amante, M.S. (1995), "Employment and wage practices of Japanese firms in the Philippines: convergence with Filipino-Chinese and Western-owned firms", *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol. 6 No. 3, pp. 642-655.
- Baytiyeh, H., & Naja, M. (2012). Identifying the challenging factors in the transition from colleges of engineering to employment. *European Journal of Engineering Education*, 37(1), 3-14.
- Blanchard, K.H. (2007), *Leading at a Higher Level*, FT Press, Upper Saddle River, NJ.
- Boswell, W.R., Watkins, M.B., del Carmen Triana, M., Zardkoohi, A., Ren, R., and Umphress, E.E. (2012), "Second-class citizen? Contract workers' perceived status, dual commitment and intent to quit", *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol. 80 No. 2, pp. 454-463.
- Boyacigiller, N. and Adler, N.J. (1991), "The parochial dinosaur: organizational suicide in

- global context”, *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 16 No. 2, pp. 262-290.
- Buenviaje, M.G., del Mundo, G.V., Añonuevo, F. and Martinez, M. (2015), “Employability of Business and Computer Management Graduates of one Higher Education Institution in the Philippines”, *Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, Vol. 3 No. 5, pp. 63-71.
- Church, A.T. (1987), “Personality research in a non-western culture: the Philippines”, *Psychological Bulletin*, Vol. 102 No. 2, pp. 272–292.
- Cinches, M.F.C. (2013), “Organizational retention capability models: the case of autonomous Universities in Southern Philippines”, *Liceo Journal Higher Education Research*, Vol. 8 No. 1, pp. 44-68.
- de Leon, C.T. (1987), “Social categorisation in Philippine organisations: values toward collective identity and management through intergroup relations”, *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, Vol. 5 No. 1, pp. 28-37.
- Diener, E. and Diener, C. (1995), “The wealth of nations revisited: Income and quality of life”, *Social Indicators Research*, Vol. 36 No. 3, pp. 275-286.
- Dimaculangan, E.D. and Aguilung, H.M. (2012), “The effects of transformational leadership on salesperson's turnover intention”, *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, Vol. 3 No. 19, pp. 197-210.
- Earley, P. Christopher & Miriam Erez. 1997. *The Transplanted Executive*. Oxford University Press. New York.
- Eby, L.T., Freeman, D.M., Rush, M.C. and Lance, C.E. (1999), “Motivational bases of affective organizational commitment: a partial test of an integrative theoretical model”, *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, Vol. 72 No. 4, pp. 463-483.
- Edralin, D.M. (2011), “Training and development practices of large Philippines companies”, *Asia Pacific Business Review*, Vol. 17 No. 2, pp. 225-239.
- Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S. and Sowa, D. (1986), “Perceived organizational support”, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 71 No.3, pp. 500-507.

- Fabiene, E.E. and Kachchhap, S.L. (2016), "Determinants of employee's commitment among healthcare professionals", *International Journal of Academic Research in Accounting, Finance and Management Sciences*, Vol. 6 No. 2, pp. 44-52.
- Grimm, S.D., Church, A.T., Katigbak, M.S. and Reyes, J.A.S. (1999), "Self-described traits, values, and moods associated with individualism and collectivism: Testing IC theory in an individualistic (US) and a collectivistic (Philippine) culture", *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, Vol. 30 No. 4, pp. 466-500.
- Guha, M. (2012), "Historical Dictionary of the Philippines (3rd edition)", *Reference Reviews*, Vol. 26 No. 7, pp. 61-62
- Gutmann, P. (2016), *Mercer webcast series: Tackling trends in turnover*, New York: Mercer.
- Hechanova, M., Regina, M., Alampay, R.B.A. and Franco, E.P. (2006), "Psychological empowerment, job satisfaction and performance among Filipino service workers", *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, Vol. 9 No. 1, pp. 72-78.
- Hoang, H. (2008), *Culture and management: A study of Vietnamese cultural influences on management style (Unpublished doctoral dissertation)*, Capella University, Minnesota, United States.
- Hofstede, G. (1980), *Culture's Consequence*, Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Hofstede, G. 1994. Management scientists are human. *Management Science*. 40(1):4-13.
- House, Robert J., Paul J. Hanges, Mansour J. Javidan, Peter W. Dorfman, and Vipin Gupta (Eds.), (2004), *Culture, Leadership, and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Huang, X. and Van de Vliert, E. (2003), "Where intrinsic job satisfaction fails to work: National moderators of intrinsic motivation", *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 24 No. 2, pp. 159-179.
- Jocano, F.L. (1999), *Working with Filipinos: A Cross Cultural Encounter*, PUNLAD Research House, Manila.
- Jin, J., Chen, C.C., Fosh, P. and Chen, Y. (2014), "Understanding Chinese non-managerial

- employees' response to western HRM: changes in turnover intention", *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, Vol. 52 No. 3, pp. 316-332.
- Kanungo, R.N. (Ed.). (1999), *Entrepreneurship and innovation: Models for development (Vol. 2)*, SAGE Publications Pvt. Limited.
- Kim, J.S. and Ryu, S. (2017), "Employee Satisfaction with Work life Balance Policies and Organizational Commitment: A Philippine Study", *Public Administration and Development*, Vol. 37 No. 4, pp. 260-276.
- Kokubun, K. (2006), *Globalization and Industrial Reallocation: How to Motivate Malaysian Workers*, A paper presented at the 3rd International Globalization Studies Network (GSN) Conference, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia.
- Kokubun, K. (2017), "Motivating Malaysian Workers in Japanese Manufacturing Companies: An Analysis based on Gift Exchange Theory", *Malaysian Management Review*, Vol. 52 No. 2, pp. 33-49.
- Kokubun, K. (2018), "Education, organizational commitment, and rewards within Japanese manufacturing companies in China", *Employee Relations*, Vol. 40 No. 3, pp.458-485
- Lu, J.L. (2008), "Organizational role stress indices affecting burnout among nurses", *Journal of International Women's Studies*, Vol. 9 No. 3, pp. 63-78.
- Lu, L., Gilmour, R., Kao, S.F. and Huang, M.T. (2006), "A cross-cultural study of work/family demands, work/family conflict and wellbeing: the Taiwanese vs British", *Career Development International*, Vol. 11 No. 1, pp. 9-27.
- Malhotra, N., Budhwar, P. and Prowse, P. (2007), "Linking rewards to commitment: an empirical investigation of four UK call centres", *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol. 18 No. 12, pp. 2095-2128.
- Mathur, A., Zhang, Y. and Neelankavil, J.P. (2001), "Critical managerial motivational factors: A cross cultural analysis of four culturally divergent countries", *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, Vol. 1 No. 3, pp. 251-267.
- McNeese-Smith, D.K. and Nazarey, M. (2001), "A nursing shortage: Building organizational

- commitment among nurses/practitioner application”, *Journal of Healthcare Management*, Vol. 46 No. 3, pp. 173-186.
- McQuaid, R.W. and Lindsay, C. (2006), “The concept of employability”, *Urban Studies*, Vol. 42 No. 2, pp. 197-219.
- Mendoza, M. L. (2001, September). The crisis of management culture in the Philippines: Neither East Asian nor Western. In 3rd EUROSEAS Conference in London, UK and the 4th European Philippine Studies Conference in Alcoba, Spain on September.
- Meyer, J.P. and Allen, N.J. (1991), “A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment”, *Human Resource Management Review*, Vol. 1, pp. 61-98.
- Meyer, J.P., Stanley, D.J., Herscovitch, L. and Topolnysky, L. (2002), “Affective, continuous, and normative commitment to the organization: a meta-analysis of antecedents, correlates, and consequences”, *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol. 61 No. 1, pp. 20-52.
- Miao, Q., Newman, A., Sun, Y. and Xu, L. (2013), “What factors influence the organizational commitment of public sector employees in China? The role of extrinsic, intrinsic and social rewards”, *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol. 24 No. 17, pp. 3262-3280.
- Milfont, T.L. and Fischer, R. (2010), ‘Testing measurement invariance across groups: applications in cross-cultural research”, *International Journal of Psychological Research*, Vol. 3 No. 1, pp. 111-121.
- Mottaz, C.J. (1988), “Determinants of Organizational Commitment”, *Human Relations*, Vol. 41 No. 6, pp. 467-482.
- Mowday, R.T., Steers, R.M. and Porter, L.W. (1979), ‘The measurement of organizational commitment’. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol. 14 No. 2, pp. 224–247.
- Nazir, S., Shafi, A., Qun, W., Nazir, N., and Tran, Q. D. (2016), “Influence of organizational rewards on organizational commitment and turnover intentions”, *Employee Relations*, Vol. 38 No. 4, pp. 596-619.

- Neelankavil, J.P., Mathur, A. and Zhang, Y. (2000), "Determinants of managerial performance: A cross-cultural comparison of the perceptions of middle-level managers in four countries", *Journal of International Business Studies*, Vol. 31 No. 1, pp. 121-140.
- Newman, A. and Sheikh, A.Z. (2012), "Organizational commitment in Chinese small- and medium-sized enterprises: the role of extrinsic, intrinsic and social rewards", *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol. 23 No. 2, pp. 349-367.
- O'Reilly, C.A. and Caldwell, D.F. (1980), "Job choice: the impact of intrinsic and extrinsic factors on subsequent satisfaction and commitment", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 65 No. 5, pp. 559-565.
- Palmiano, D.A. (2017), *Teamwork Atmosphere and Employees' Organizational Commitment*, 2017 CEBU International Conference on Studies in Arts, Social Sciences and Humanities (SASSH-17) Jan. 26-27, 2017, Cebu.
- Peyyer, C., Jordan, C., Firms, I. and Travaglione, A. (2010), "Predicting turnover intentions", *Management Research Review*, Vol. 33 No. 9, pp. 911-923.
- Philippine Statistics Authority (2017), "Total Approved Foreign Investments by Country of Investor Q1 2016 - Q3 2017", available at: <https://psa.gov.ph/content/total-approved-foreign-investments-611-percent-q3-2017>
- Phipps, S.T., Prieto, L.C. and Ndinguri, E.N. (2013), "Understanding the impact of employee involvement on organizational productivity: The moderating role of organizational commitment", *Journal of Organizational Culture, Communication and Conflict*, Vol. 17 No. 2, pp. 107-120.
- Restubog, S.L.D. and Bordia, P. (2006), "Workplace familism and psychological contract breach in the Philippines", *Applied Psychology*, Vol. 55 No. 4, pp. 563-585.
- Restubog, S.L.D., Bordia, P. and Tang, R.L. (2006), "Effects of psychological contract breach on performance of IT employees: The mediating role of affective commitment", *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, Vol. 79 No. 2, pp. 299-306.
- Restubog, S.L.D. and Bordia, P. (2007), "One big happy family: understanding the role of

- workplace familism in the psychological contract dynamics”, In Glendon, A.I., Myers, B. and Thompson, B.M. (Eds), *Advances in Organizational Psychology: An Asia-Pacific Perspective*, Brisbane: Australian Academic Press, pp. 371–87.
- Rode, J.C., Huang, X. and Flynn, B. (2016), “A cross-cultural examination of the relationships among human resource management practices and organisational commitment: an institutional collectivism perspective”, *Human Resource Management Journal*, Vol. 26 No. 4, pp. 471–489.
- Rosales, R.A., Labrague, L.J. and Rosales, G.L. (2013), “Nurses' job satisfaction and burnout: Is there a connection?”, *International Journal of Advanced Nursing Studies*, Vol. 2 No. 1, pp. 1-10.
- Rothausen, T.J., Gonzalez, J.A. and Griffin, A.E. (2009), “Are all the parts there everywhere? Facet job satisfaction in the United States and the Philippines”, *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, Vol. 26 No. 4, pp. 681-700.
- Ruppel, C.P., Sims, R.L. and Zeidler, P. (2013), “Emotional labour and its outcomes: a study of a Philippine call centre”, *Asia-Pacific Journal of Business Administration*, Vol. 5 No. 3, pp. 246-261.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1990). Individualism-collectivism: Critique and proposed refinements. *Journal of cross-cultural psychology*, 21(2), 139-157.
- Selmer, J. and de Leon, C. (2001), “Pinoy-style HRM: Human resource management in the Philippines”, *Asia Pacific Business Review*, Vol. 8 No. 1, pp. 127-144.
- Shoss, M.K., Eisenberger, R., Restubog, S.L.D. and Zagencyk, T.J. (2013), “Blaming the organization for abusive supervision: The roles of perceived organizational support and supervisor's organizational embodiment”, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 98 No. 1, pp. 158-168.
- Sparrow, P.R. (1998), “Reappraising psychological contracting: lessons for the field of human-resource development from cross cultural and occupational psychology research”, *International Studies of Management and Organization*, Vol. 28 No. 1, pp.



30–63.

Testa, M.R., Mueller, S.L. and Thomas, A.S. (2003), "Cultural fit and job satisfaction in a global service environment", *Management International Review*, Vol. 43 No. 2, pp. 129-148.

Tiglao, R. 1992. Focus: Philippines - New, upwardly mobile tycoons. *Far Eastern Economic Review*, 155(35): 44-45.

Tolentino, R.C. (2013), "Organizational commitment and job performance of the academic and administrative personnel", *International journal of Information technology and Business Management*, Vol. 15 No. 1, pp. 51-59.

Vacharakiat, M. (2008), *The Relationships of Empowerment, Job Satisfaction, and Organizational Commitment among Filipino and American Registered Nurses Working in the USA*, George Mason University.

Wasti, S.A. (1998), "Cultural barriers in the transferability of Japanese and American human resources practices to developing countries: the Turkish case", *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol. 9 No. 4, pp. 608-631.

Williamson, I.O., Burnett, M.F. and Bartol, K.M. (2009), "The interactive effect of collectivism and organizational rewards on affective organizational commitment", *Cross Cultural Management: An International Journal*, Vol. 16 No. 1, pp. 28-43.

Yang, H., Sanders, K. and Bumatay, C.P. (2012), "Linking perceptions of training with organizational commitment: the moderating role of self-construals", *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, Vol. 21 No. 1, pp. 125-149.

(Insert Table AI about here)

Table 1. Results of Exploratory Factor Analysis

Items	University graduates								Non-graduates							
	Benefit satisfaction	Fatigue	Supervisor support	Co-worker support	Autonomy	Training provision	Role clarity	Organizational commitment	Benefit satisfaction	Fatigue	Supervisor support	Co-worker support	Autonomy	Training provision	Role clarity	Organizational commitment
Welfare system of the company.	<b>0.78</b>	-0.15	0.14	0.04	0.01	0.04	0.05	0.14	<b>0.71</b>	-0.18	0.24	0.06	0.03	0.11	0.05	0.22
Holidays and working hours.	<b>0.63</b>	-0.16	0.17	0.07	0.12	-0.02	0.11	0.18	<b>0.61</b>	-0.17	0.24	0.05	0.10	0.06	0.07	0.17
Facilities and equipment of the company.	<b>0.60</b>	-0.15	0.11	0.13	-0.01	0.09	0.06	0.15	<b>0.54</b>	-0.17	0.28	0.09	0.05	0.18	0.04	0.16
Amount of my salary or wage.	<b>0.58</b>	-0.22	0.15	-0.02	0.04	0.19	0.01	0.10	<b>0.56</b>	-0.24	0.26	0.06	-0.01	0.10	0.04	0.15
I often feel exhausted.	-0.17	<b>0.81</b>	-0.08	-0.05	-0.01	-0.01	-0.07	-0.05	-0.14	<b>0.79</b>	-0.13	-0.05	-0.03	-0.01	-0.06	-0.03
After finishing my work, I feel exhausted.	-0.19	<b>0.78</b>	-0.02	0.00	0.01	-0.02	-0.05	-0.04	-0.15	<b>0.75</b>	-0.10	-0.01	0.09	-0.01	-0.02	-0.04
I feel exhausted when I wake up in the morning.	-0.22	<b>0.71</b>	-0.15	0.00	-0.06	-0.08	-0.06	-0.11	-0.20	<b>0.73</b>	-0.10	-0.04	0.01	-0.05	-0.01	-0.12
My boss/supervisor is willing to instruct the employees what they do not know about their work.	0.05	0.00	<b>0.80</b>	0.08	-0.02	0.13	0.11	0.12	0.18	-0.04	<b>0.68</b>	0.06	0.01	0.28	0.12	0.22
My boss/supervisor deals with employees' complaints effectively.	0.19	-0.04	<b>0.80</b>	0.05	0.02	0.07	0.05	0.08	0.31	-0.13	<b>0.71</b>	0.12	0.06	0.08	0.11	0.13
My boss/supervisor is trustful.	0.11	-0.12	<b>0.78</b>	0.17	0.06	0.07	0.03	0.06	0.14	-0.09	<b>0.78</b>	0.16	0.08	0.05	0.08	0.13
My boss/supervisor treats employees fairly.	0.12	-0.09	<b>0.77</b>	0.14	0.04	0.08	0.04	-0.01	0.25	-0.15	<b>0.73</b>	0.18	0.02	0.03	0.05	0.07
My boss/supervisor gives me sufficient information about the management policy of the company and the division.	0.10	0.02	<b>0.71</b>	0.12	0.06	0.14	0.05	0.15	0.17	-0.02	<b>0.57</b>	0.10	0.03	0.28	0.07	0.23
My boss/supervisor trusts workers.	0.10	-0.13	<b>0.71</b>	0.12	0.07	0.04	0.06	0.06	0.13	-0.11	<b>0.64</b>	0.20	0.09	0.07	0.07	0.10
My co-workers are trustful.	0.09	-0.06	0.29	<b>0.86</b>	0.06	0.07	-0.03	0.11	0.10	-0.03	0.21	<b>0.85</b>	0.05	0.03	0.06	0.10
My co-workers trust me.	0.03	0.05	0.14	<b>0.62</b>	0.20	0.08	0.11	0.19	0.01	-0.01	0.17	<b>0.59</b>	0.17	0.06	0.09	0.19
I have good cooperation from my co-workers in my workplace.	0.17	-0.04	0.27	<b>0.46</b>	0.02	0.11	0.21	0.14	0.12	-0.06	0.20	<b>0.44</b>	0.09	0.15	0.18	0.12
I can mostly solve the problems that arise in my work.	0.01	-0.02	0.04	0.03	<b>0.74</b>	0.03	0.05	0.22	0.02	0.01	0.04	0.08	<b>0.70</b>	0.00	0.07	0.11
I carry out my work by observing and planning it by myself.	0.02	0.00	-0.01	0.09	<b>0.62</b>	-0.04	0.13	0.18	0.00	0.09	0.01	0.06	<b>0.59</b>	0.08	0.13	0.17
I can fully utilize my talent/ability in my work.	0.14	-0.03	0.12	0.14	<b>0.48</b>	0.16	0.12	0.22	0.15	-0.05	0.13	0.15	<b>0.44</b>	0.14	0.17	0.18
For the past one year, I was given useful training to develop ability and achieve my target.	0.23	-0.11	0.28	0.13	-0.08	<b>0.73</b>	0.10	0.10	0.18	-0.03	0.25	0.07	0.03	<b>0.68</b>	0.09	0.12
In my work, I can master new skills and develop my ability.	0.09	-0.01	0.21	0.11	0.24	<b>0.52</b>	0.10	0.21	0.14	-0.04	0.17	0.14	0.21	<b>0.59</b>	0.10	0.24
The achievement of my work can be seen clearly.	0.07	-0.08	0.09	0.10	0.25	0.07	<b>0.68</b>	0.18	0.02	0.00	0.12	0.12	0.17	0.01	<b>0.49</b>	0.14
The work division that I have to do is clearly identified.	0.16	-0.18	0.21	0.12	0.10	0.16	<b>0.47</b>	0.21	0.11	-0.08	0.12	0.12	0.15	0.17	<b>0.62</b>	0.18
I have strong will to work hard in this company.	0.09	-0.06	0.09	0.14	0.22	0.06	0.12	<b>0.78</b>	0.06	-0.03	0.14	0.09	0.16	0.10	0.13	<b>0.68</b>
I am willing to contribute to development of this company.	0.10	-0.06	0.08	0.09	0.18	0.05	0.18	<b>0.72</b>	0.10	-0.07	0.14	0.14	0.13	0.06	0.08	<b>0.69</b>
I have dreams about the future of my company and its work.	0.21	-0.08	0.09	0.08	0.25	0.06	0.01	<b>0.63</b>	0.17	-0.08	0.10	0.06	0.15	0.06	0.11	<b>0.62</b>
I am attracted to the slogan of the company and the strategies to achieve it.	0.35	-0.10	0.14	0.14	0.14	0.14	0.15	<b>0.53</b>	0.29	-0.07	0.19	0.13	0.08	0.14	0.10	<b>0.50</b>
My company makes very meaningful contributions to this society.	0.39	-0.05	0.07	0.12	0.10	0.16	0.00	<b>0.47</b>	0.30	-0.05	0.14	0.12	0.07	0.16	0.08	<b>0.45</b>

Note. The italic values are the scores higher than 0.4.

Table 2. Descriptive statistics and correlations.

	Mean		SD		Non-graduates\ University graduate																
	University graduates	Non-graduates	University graduates	Non-graduates	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15		
1 Gender	0.519	0.509	0.500	0.500																	
2 Age	3.382	3.228	1.383	1.279	0.160**																
3 Tenure	3.433	3.818	1.227	1.257	-0.016	0.741**															
4 Turnover experience	0.761	0.845	0.427	0.362	0.047*	0.089**	-0.017														
5 Marital status	0.418	0.457	0.494	0.498	0.203**	0.488**	0.416**	0.113**													
6 Indirect department	0.839	0.381	0.368	0.486	0.057*	0.126**	-0.005	-0.026	0.055*												
7 Position	0.092	0.021	0.290	0.142	0.054*	0.257**	0.165**	0.007	0.134**	0.126**											
8 Benefit satisfaction	3.425	3.076	0.928	1.049	0.131**	0.100**	-0.032	0.024	0.056*	0.185**	0.074**										
9 Fatigue	3.238	3.730	1.144	1.071	-0.145**	-0.099**	0.015	-0.022	-0.052*	-0.144**	-0.044	-0.415**									
10 Supervisor support	3.833	3.549	0.910	0.974	0.112**	0.018	-0.085**	0.034	-0.016	0.161**	0.038	0.571**	-0.279**								
11 Co-worker support	4.110	3.959	0.773	0.793	0.118**	0.037	-0.016	-0.001	0.037	0.166**	0.033	0.293**	-0.135**	0.440**							
12 Autonomy	3.790	3.875	0.954	0.963	0.114**	0.189**	0.140**	0.061*	0.127**	0.100**	0.075**	0.204**	-0.014	0.227**	0.286**						
13 Training provision	3.993	4.073	0.921	0.896	0.005	-0.069**	-0.052*	0.036	-0.024	-0.022	-0.048*	0.395**	-0.139**	0.447**	0.303**	0.277**					
14 Role clarity	4.043	3.994	0.720	0.765	0.089**	0.041	0.012	0.081**	-0.004	-0.008	0.022	0.238**	-0.113**	0.303**	0.315**	0.339**	0.282**				
15 Organizational commitment	4.274	4.271	0.665	0.675	-0.003	0.083**	0.034	0.035	0.031	0.087**	0.043	0.485**	-0.213**	0.445**	0.366**	0.366**	0.401**	0.357**			

Note. n=607(University graduate), 1756(Non-graduates). \*\*p<0.01, \*p<0.05.

Correlations for university graduates appear above diagonal and non-graduates below diagonal.

Table 3. Results of hierarchical regression analyses.

Organizational commitment (University graduates and Non-graduates, n=2,363)						
Variables	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 4	Step 5	Step 6
Gender	-0.07 **	-0.05 *	-0.10 **	-0.09 **	-0.09 **	-0.09 **
Age	0.12 **	0.05	0.08 *	0.10 **	0.05	0.06 *
Tenure	-0.06	0.00	0.00	-0.06 *	-0.01	-0.03
Turnover experience	0.07 **	0.06 **	0.06 **	0.02	0.03	0.02
Marital status	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Indirect department	0.01	-0.03	-0.05 *	-0.01	-0.05 **	-0.04 *
Position	0.05 *	0.01	0.03	0.02	0.00	0.01
Company 1 (dummy)	-0.02	-0.02	-0.01	0.03	0.01	0.01
Company 2 (dummy)	-0.05 *	-0.09 **	-0.07 **	-0.05 *	-0.08 **	-0.07 **
Company 3 (dummy)	0.02	-0.02	0.02	0.03	0.01	0.01
Company 4 (dummy)	-0.03	-0.06 **	-0.05 **	-0.03	-0.05 **	-0.05 **
Company 5 (dummy)	0.06 **	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.00	0.00
Company 6 (dummy)	-0.06 **	-0.12 **	-0.10 **	0.00	-0.05 *	-0.03
Company 7 (dummy)	-0.05 *	-0.10 **	-0.04	-0.07 **	-0.08 **	-0.08 **
Company 8 (dummy)	0.11 **	0.00	0.07 **	0.09 **	0.03	0.04 *
Company 9 (dummy)	0.16 **	-0.02	0.13 **	0.19 **	0.10 **	0.11 **
Company 10 (dummy)	0.15 **	0.02	0.09 **	0.09 **	0.03	0.04
<i>Extrinsic rewards</i>						
Benefit satisfaction		0.47 **			0.26 **	0.25 **
Fatigue		-0.01			0.01	0.01
<i>Social rewards</i>						
Supervisor support			0.29 **		0.09 **	0.12 **
Co-worker support			0.24 **		0.12 **	0.12 **
<i>Intrinsic rewards</i>						
Autonomy				0.26 **	0.22 **	0.19 **
Training provision				0.25 **	0.12 **	0.12 **
Role clarity				0.21 **	0.14 **	0.14 **
Sample						-0.23
Sample×Benefit satisfaction						-0.01
Sample×Fatigue						0.02
Sample×Supervisor support						-0.22 **
Sample×Co-worker support						0.08
Sample×Autonomy						0.26 **
Sample×Training provision						0.01
Sample×Role clarity						0.02
R <sup>2</sup>	0.09	0.27	0.28	0.34	0.43	0.43
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	0.08	0.26	0.27	0.34	0.42	0.42
F	13.49 **	44.70 **	47.51 **	61.55 **	72.07 **	55.20 **

\*Significance at the 5% level; \*\*Significance at the 1% level.

Table 3. Results of hierarchical regression analyses. (continued)

Variables	Organizational commitment (University graduates, n=607)					Organizational commitment (Non-graduates, n=1,756)				
	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 4	Step 5	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 4	Step 5
Gender	-0.02	0.00	-0.04	-0.08 *	-0.05	-0.10 **	-0.08 **	-0.13 **	-0.12 **	-0.12 **
Age	0.08	0.02	0.04	-0.04	-0.06	0.13 **	0.06	0.10 **	0.14 **	0.09 **
Tenure	-0.06	-0.01	0.01	-0.02	0.01	-0.08 *	0.00	-0.03	-0.09 **	-0.04
Turnover experience	0.14 **	0.13 **	0.12 **	0.07	0.06	0.03	0.03	0.02	-0.01	0.00
Marital status	-0.01	0.01	-0.02	0.02	0.02	0.00	-0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00
Indirect department	-0.01	-0.04	-0.03	-0.07	-0.09 **	0.04	-0.01	-0.03	0.02	-0.03
Position	0.10 *	0.04	0.08	0.06	0.03	0.03	0.00	0.01	0.02	0.00
Company 1 (dummy)	0.00	-0.01	-0.02	-0.06	-0.06	-0.02	-0.03	-0.02	0.03	0.01
Company 2 (dummy)	-0.15 **	-0.17 **	-0.13 **	-0.13 **	-0.14 **	-0.02	-0.06 **	-0.05 *	-0.03	-0.06 **
Company 3 (dummy)	0.02	0.03	0.06	0.04	0.06	0.01	-0.03	0.01	0.02	-0.01
Company 4 (dummy)	-0.06	-0.07	-0.08 *	-0.09 *	-0.09 **	-0.03	-0.07 **	-0.05 *	-0.03	-0.05 *
Company 5 (dummy)	-0.02	-0.03	-0.03	-0.06	-0.06	0.08 **	0.03	0.04	0.04	0.02
Company 6 (dummy)	-0.22 *	-0.21 **	-0.18 *	-0.14 *	-0.13	-0.02	-0.08 **	-0.06 *	0.02	-0.03
Company 7 (dummy)	-0.09	-0.10 *	-0.05	-0.12 **	-0.11 **	-0.04	-0.10 **	-0.04	-0.06 **	-0.07 **
Company 8 (dummy)	-0.04	-0.08	-0.04	-0.02	-0.03	0.15 **	0.02	0.11 **	0.11 **	0.05 *
Company 9 (dummy)	0.07	-0.09	0.10	0.09	0.03	0.16 **	0.01	0.13 **	0.20 **	0.12 **
Company 10 (dummy)	0.11	0.02	0.10	0.04	0.02	0.14 **	0.02	0.08 **	0.08 **	0.03
<i>Extrinsic rewards</i>										
Benefit satisfaction		0.40 **			0.24 **		0.48 **			0.25 **
Fatigue		-0.04			0.01		0.00			0.01
<i>Social rewards</i>										
Supervisor support			0.15 **		-0.01			0.33 **		0.12 **
Co-worker support			0.30 **		0.15 **			0.22 **		0.12 **
<i>Intrinsic rewards</i>										
Autonomy				0.34 **	0.30 **				0.24 **	0.20 **
Training provision				0.22 **	0.11 **				0.26 **	0.12 **
Role clarity				0.21 **	0.15 **				0.21 **	0.14 **
Sample										
Sample×Benefit satisfaction										
Sample×Fatigue										
Sample×Supervisor support										
Sample×Co-worker support										
Sample×Autonomy										
Sample×Training provision										
Sample×Role clarity										
R <sup>2</sup>	0.16	0.30	0.30	0.43	0.49	0.08	0.27	0.29	0.34	0.42
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	0.14	0.28	0.28	0.41	0.47	0.07	0.26	0.28	0.33	0.41
F	6.60 **	13.12 **	13.52 **	21.77 **	23.43 **	9.04 **	33.04 **	37.23 **	43.71 **	52.38 **

\*Significance at the 5% level; \*\*Significance at the 1% level.

Appendix. Demographic information.

Educational background									
	Elementary School	High School	Vocational School	College	University	Graduate School	In the middle of school years	Others	Total
University graduates	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	582 95.9%	25 4.1%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	607 100.0%
Non-graduates	2 0.1%	568 32.3%	479 27.3%	600 34.2%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	88 5.0%	19 1.1%	1,756 100.0%
Total	2 0.1%	568 24.0%	479 20.3%	825 34.9%	357 17.2%	25 1.3%	88 3.7%	19 0.8%	2,363 102.4%

  

	Gender		Total	Turnover experience		Total
	Male	Female		Have experience	Have no experience	
University graduates	315 51.9%	292 48.1%	607 100.0%	462 76.1%	145 23.9%	607 100.0%
Non-graduates	894 50.9%	862 49.1%	1,756 100.0%	1,483 84.5%	273 15.5%	1,756 100.0%
Total	1,209 51.2%	1,154 48.8%	2,363 100.0%	1,945 82.3%	418 17.7%	2,363 100.0%

  

Age									
	Below 20 years old	21-25	26-30	31-35	36-40	41-45	46-50	51 years old and above	Total
University graduates	0 0.0%	184 30.3%	202 33.3%	109 18.0%	65 10.7%	21 3.5%	16 2.6%	10 1.6%	607 100.0%
Non-graduates	23 1.3%	567 32.3%	564 32.1%	355 20.2%	138 7.9%	68 3.9%	27 1.5%	14 0.8%	1,756 100.0%
Total	23 1.0%	751 31.8%	766 32.4%	464 19.6%	203 8.6%	89 3.8%	43 1.8%	24 1.0%	2,363 100.0%

  

Tenure									
	Below 6 months	6months-1 year	2-4 years	5-9 years	10-14 years	15-19 years	20-24 years	25 years and above	Total
University graduates	12 2.0%	115 18.9%	231 38.1%	154 25.4%	55 9.1%	24 4.0%	14 2.3%	2 0.3%	607 100.0%
Non-graduates	39 2.2%	151 8.6%	588 33.5%	530 30.2%	262 14.9%	141 8.0%	37 2.1%	8 0.5%	1,756 100.0%
Total	51 2.2%	266 11.3%	819 34.7%	684 28.9%	317 13.4%	165 7.0%	51 2.2%	10 0.4%	2,363 100.0%

  

	Marital status			Total	Department		Total	Position		Total
	Single	Married	Others		Direct department	Indirect department		Managerial position	Non-managerial position	
University graduate	344 56.7%	254 41.8%	9 1.5%	607 100.0%	98 16.1%	509 83.9%	607 100.0%	56 9.2%	551 90.8%	607 100.0%
Non-graduates	923 52.6%	802 45.7%	31 1.8%	1,756 100.0%	1,087 61.9%	669 38.1%	1,756 100.0%	36 2.1%	1,720 97.9%	1,756 100.0%
Total	1,267 53.6%	1,056 44.7%	40 1.7%	2,363 100.0%	1,185 50.1%	1,178 49.9%	2,363 100.0%	92 3.9%	2,271 96.1%	2,363 100.0%