STRUCTURAL RELATIONSHIPS OF ORGANIZATIONAL IDENTITY AND ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOUR AMONG MALAYSIAN HOTEL EMPLOYEES

Hashim Fadzil Ariffin, Raja Puteri Saadiah Raja Abdullah & Noradzhar Baba
Faculty of Hotel and Tourism Management,
Universiti Teknologi MARA,
MALAYSIA

Corresponding email: hashim@salam.uitm.edu.my

ABSTRACT

The main objective of this study is to investigate the structural relationships between organizational identity (OI) and organizational citizenship behaviour (OCB) among Malaysian hotel employees. The aim is to identify the perception of employees concerning the OI and OCB that they have perceived at their workplace. The data have been collected through sets of questionnaire answered by 624 respondents who are hotel employees in Malaysia. The result of this study reveals that OI and OCB are perceived as valid constructs. Findings also show that there is a relationship between OI and OCB, and is confirmed through Structural Equation Modeling. Respondents perceive that the more they possess OI, the more they react in OCB manners. Limitations and future research directions are also discussed.

Key words: *Organizational Identity (OI), Organizational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB), Malaysian Hotel Employees, Structural Equation Modeling*

INTRODUCTION

Employee retention is still a major concern for the hospitality industry. It is frustrating for management to spend time and effort on employees who go through the employment process only to leave a short time later. International Labor Organization (2003) warns that shortage of skilled employees and a low worker commitment are the most frequently cited problems facing by the hospitality industry by both the trade itself and by industry practitioners. Malaysian Minister of Human Resources, YB Datuk S. Subramaniam admits that local employees only hold the job for two to three weeks in the service sector such as hospitality, tourism and foodservice (Utusan Malaysia Online, 2008). Malaysian hospitality sector business and operation expansion are affected due to the shortage of employees (Utusan Malaysia Online, 2009). Annual surveys by Malaysian Employers Federation (2004) report reveal that the annual labor turnover rates in Malaysia for 2003 and 2004 were high, approximately 17 percent and 16 percent respectively.

The hospitality industry in general keeps on having one of the highest turnover rates across industries because of wages, shift schedules and social perceptions of entry-level jobs (Hurst, 1997). Hurst finds that as turnover rates increase, labor costs rise. Turnover rates also can influence employee training costs, customers' perceptions of service quality and employee job satisfaction. Howard (1997) advises that managers and companies to meet the basic needs of employees by paying closer attention to job characteristics and providing incentives, motivation and quality of life programs that could help decrease the turnover rate and increase job productivity. Kuean, Kaur and Wong (2010) view that turnover can give negative impact to the organization whether the employee leaving the organization voluntary or involuntary. Moreover, the fifth largest barrier for an efficient productivity that has been cited by 20% managers in the world is high rate of staff turnover (Proudfoot Consulting, 2008). As reported by Burke, Koyuncu and Fiksenbaum (2008), the aspects which contribute to high turnover rate, may include: labor intensiveness, weak internal labor markets, 24/7-52 weeks a year operation, low status and gender composition especially female employees and a low level of professional prestige. Moreover, Tuzun (2009) agrees that shaping the perceptions of employees about their

organization is crucial for understanding what mechanisms lead to employees' attitudes and behaviors toward their job. Hence, organizations need to strategize its employee's retention activities in order to minimize the employee turnover. One of the strategies is through a proper recruitment and selection process.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Organizational Identity (OI)

Organizational identity delineates the employee's view about himself or herself. In other words, at least a part of an employee's self-image is said to result from the organizations that a person chooses to identify with. If the organization is said to have such a strong impact on how an employee feels about himself or herself, then it would appear to follow that the employee will therefore do everything he or she can to make the organization successful, thereby enhancing the image of his or her own identity (Norman, Avey, Nimnicht & Pigeon, 2010). Albert and Whetten (1985) further view that OI is frequently described as what is central, distinctive and continuing about a firm, and is vital to members' efforts to make sense in and of organizations in ways that ease effective action. The importance and equivocality of the OI construct and its relevance across multiple theoretical perspectives and levels of analysis (Cornelissen, 2006; Pratt, 2003; Scott & Lane, 2000; Whetten & Mackey, 2002) reveal how significant and how difficult it is to determine what is or is believed to be central, unique and stable in collectivity.

Drawing from individual identity theories, organizational identity theorists also trust that both continuity and distinctiveness are required to successfully distinguish one organization from another. Continuity in identity provides an organization a sense of belonging or its ''own place in society,'' offering stability to its members (Tajfel, 1972, p. 293; Whetten & Mackey, 2002). Distinctiveness in identity suits the needs of uniqueness to be a part of others (Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Brewer, 1991).
OI is also viewed through the scope of social identity theory, or SIT (Ashforth & Mael, 1989). SIT attempts to understand and identify

why individuals classify themselves into some groups, but not others. It has been proposed that perhaps the process of social recognition is both comparative and relational by nature (Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Tajfel & Turner, 1985). There are said to be two separate purposes of social identification which are to segment and order the social environment through one's cognitive processes and to enable each individual to visualize and define themselves within a social context. The second of these functions is of most interest to SIT because it suggests that individuals categorize themselves and others within each social context in which they are embedded at the time by engaging different categorization schemas (Ashforth & Mael, 1989).

According to SIT, the self-concept is influenced by various recognizable qualities and the similarities that the individual has to referent others relative to these qualities. Such qualities include one's abilities, attributes, and psychological qualities. The degree of similarity between the individual and the organization's leadership and management can directly influence the degree of identification that a person has with the organization. This identification might make the organization more attractive to the employee, which might lead to actual behavior in the form of OCBs (Rousseau, 1998).

Moreover, Brown (1997) view that organizations' identities are key assets in their continuing search for legitimacy. Suchman (1995) define legitimacy as a view that something, individual or an event is attractive, proper or appropriate within a given social context, is official to those organizations that gratify stakeholders' rational calculations based on self-interest, match to their understandings of what is good and proper, and/or offer explanations that ease their anxieties.

The more intense the interactions, the more aware members may be of their organizational identity (Kawakami & Dion, 1995), because interaction increases the probability of members to use their organizational identity concepts. For example, Van Knippenberg and Van Schie (2000) find that members are more aware of the identity of their work group than of their organizational identity, because they interact more frequently with their work group than with other members of the organization.

Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB)

In accordance with Organ (1988), OCB is defined in the study as flexible behavior directed at individuals or at the organization as a whole, which goes beyond existing role prospect and benefits or is anticipated to benefit the organization. According to this definition developed by Organ (1988), OCB refers to organizationally valuable behaviors and gestures that can neither be forced on the basis of formal role obligations nor elicited by a contractual assurance of reward.

Smith, Organ and Near (1983) use 16 items for measuring OCB, which include two fairly interpretable and distinct factors – altruism and generalized compliance. Altruism is defined as helping co-workers personally, such as supporting a co-worker to lift a heavy load. Generalized compliance is impersonal helpful behavior, such as being punctual and not wasting time on the work.

Organ (1988) anticipates five categories of OCB. Civic virtue suggests that employees responsibly participate in the political life of the organization. Conscientiousness means that employees carry out in-role behaviors well beyond the minimum required levels. Altruism implies that they give help to others. Sportsmanship indicates that people do not complain, but have positive attitudes. Courtesy means that they treat others with respect.

Consequently, Podsakoff, MacKanzie, Paine and Bacharach (2000) discover almost 30 potentially different forms of OCB. However, they also asserted that the constructs greatly be related, so they might be captured in five general dimensions which are:

1. Altruism, or helping behavior – this involves voluntarily helping others with an organizationally relevant task or problem, such as helping others who have heavy workloads.
2. Conscientiousness (Preciseness) – namely going well beyond minimally required levels of attendance, punctuality, housekeeping, conserving resources, and related matters of internal maintenance, such as attending at work above the norm

3. Sportsmanship – this reflects the employee's willingness to tolerate the inevitable inconveniences and impositions of work without complaining, such as not wasting time complaining about trivialities
4. Courtesy (Good manners) – namely behaviors aimed at preventing work-related problems with others, such as not abusing the rights of others
5. Civic virtue – this reflects responsive, constructive involvement in the organization, such as keeping alongside of changes at the organization.

Additionally, Rousseau (1998) agrees that the level of similarity between individual and the whole organization's management and leadership can directly influence the level of identification that a person has with the company. Next, this identification might make the organization to be more attractive to the employee, and will contribute to actual behavior in the form of OCBs.

Organ (1988), who was genuinely, conceptualize OCBs as the discretionary behaviors that are exhibited by an individual and not formally recognized by the organizational system, yet that generally facilitate the effective and efficient functioning of the organization to which the individual belongs.

METHODOLOGY

Construct

OI was measured using the Organizational Identification Questionnaire (hereinafter OIQ) (Cheney, 1982). By using it, the behavior patterns of individuals, groups or organizations can be understood and behavioral responses that will occur after certain management decisions are predicted (Johnson, Johnson, & Heimberg, 1999). The OIQ is a 25-item scale measured on a 7-point Likert scale (strongly disagree to strongly agree). OCB was measured using the Organizational Citizenship Behavior scale (hereinafter OCBS) developed by Williams and Anderson (1991).The 21-item scale obtains responses on a 7-point Likert scale where 1= strongly disagree and 7= strongly disagree. Three types of OCBs measured included: behaviors di-

rected at specific individuals (OCBI), behaviors directed at the organization (OCBO) and employee-in-role behaviors (IRB). Each type of OCB was measured by seven single item indicators. OCB was also measured using the Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman and Fetter (1990). The five dimensions of OCBs measurement included altruism, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, courtesy and civic virtue. All dimensions have five, single-item indicators except civic virtue, which has four indicators. Hypothesized structural model is proposed for the study. It consists of OI as exogenous variables with three constructs for OI: Similarity, Membership and Loyalty. The model also consists of OCB as endogenous variables with five constructs for OCB: Courtesy, Altruism, Civic Virtue, Sportmanship and Conscientiousness. Afterwards, seven hypotheses (Table 1) are derived from the structural model of the study.

Table 1: Hypotheses formulation

Hypothesis	Hypothesis Statement
H1a	Similarity confirm as a construct of OI
H1b	Membership confirm as a construct of OI
H2a	Courtesy confirm as a construct of OCB
H2b	Civic Virtue confirm as a construct of OCB
H2c	Sportsmanship confirm as a construct of OCB
H2d	Courtesy confirm as a construct of OCB
H3	OI and OCB constructs have an interaction effect on significant structural equation model

Sampling and Measurement

The unit of analysis for this study was individual operational employee working in large hotels located in the states of Pulau Pinang, Selangor, Kuala Lumpur, Melaka, Sabah and Sarawak. For the purpose of this study, operational employee is defined as full-time hotel employees, who have been employed for more than six months and attached to the front office, housekeeping, food production, and food and beverage service departments. In order to gather relevant data for the study, a set of questionnaires were used. Also from the literature review, established measures from the related fields were incorporated in the questionnaire to evaluate the constructs in the study, namely, OI and OCB. Questionnaires with close-ended questions were utilized as research instrumentation. All questions in

parts 1 and 2 were developed using a seven-point Likert scale with the purpose of eliciting respondent's agreement on OI and OCB. Part 3 of the questionnaire was used to obtain the profiles of the respondents. For the purpose of data interpretation, the descriptive phrases for the main side of the seven-point scale are (7) "strongly agree", (6) "agree", (5) "slightly agree", (4) "neutral" (3) "slightly disagree", (2) "moderately disagree", and (1) "strongly disagree". The scale with a neutral response in the middle is the most commonly used in a research paper (Malhotra, 2006; Moser & Kalton, 1996; Sekaran & Bougie, 2010).

The Likert scale was employed in order to present the questions to the respondents. Due to its easy construction, quick completion and uncomplicated measuring, a numerical Likert scale is often used (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2000). Furthermore, Malhotra (2006) states that it is easier for the respondents to understand and they enjoy filling in this type of scale.

The questionnaire was divided into three different sections with a specific heading for each section. In addition, instructions were stated clearly and precisely for the respondents. The final section included the profile of the respondent as this data is considered to be personal (Sekaran & Bougie, 2010).

Part 1 consisted of 25 questions on OI. The purpose of this section is to find out the OI dimensions perceived by the employees in the Malaysian hotel industry. Part 2 comprised 45 questions to evaluate the OCB dimensions by the employees. In some cases, the items were represented in negative wordings in order to check the alertness of the respondents. Finally, there are 7 questions in part 3. These questions are related to the personal background of the respondents.

Data Screening and Analysis

The dataset were coded and saved into SPSS version 20.0 and analyzed using AMOS version 20.0. The process of data screening was done. Several statistical validity tests and analyses were then conducted such as reliability test and composite reliability tests, validity tests using confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) for construct validity,

discriminant validity for multicollinearity treatment, descriptive analysis, correlation and structural equation modeling (SEM) using AMOS version 20.0. The steps in SEM analyses are 2nd order analysis, measurement analysis, discriminant analysis, composite reliability analysis and direct impact analysis, testing the fit for the hypothesized structural model, generated model and revised model.

RESULTS

Profiles of Respondents

From the 624 respondents, the majority (57.9%) are males. Almost 47.3 percent of the respondents' age is between 21 to 25 years old. Moreover, about 46.2 percent of the respondents are Malays. Meanwhile, most of the respondents (40.5%) are doing the under-graduate degree program and 30.9 percent of them have worked in that particular hotel for less than a year. The majority of the respon-dents are from 3-star hotels (51.8%) and most of the respondents (42.6%) have a monthly income ranging from RM1500 to RM2999.

Descriptive Analysis of Variables

The research framework consists of two exogenous of OI construct and four endogenous of OCB construct (Table 3). Each construct shows Cronbach's alpha readings of acceptable value of above 0.60 (Nunnally, 1970). Furthermore, these variables are included in sub-sequent analysis for composite reliability and the results are above subjective norms of 0.779, thus conforming to Nunnally's standard.

Table 2: Descriptive statistics of variables

Variables	Mean (Std. Dev)	Cronbach Alpha	Composite Reliability	No of Final Items
OI	5.200 (1.277)	0.783	0.813	4
OCB	4.990 (1.488)	0.672	0.902	8

From the CFA result in Table 4, we observed that the factor loadings of all observed items are adequate ranging from 0.372 to o.991. The factor loadings or regression estimates of latent to observed variable mostly should be above 0.50 (Hair, et al., 2006). This indicates that all the constructs conform to the construct and convergent validity test (Kamariah & Sentosa, 2008). The remaining numbers of items for each constructs are as follows: Similarity (S)- 2 items, Membership (M)- 2 items, Courtesy (C)- 2 items, Civic Virtue (CV)- 2 items, Sportsmanship (SM)- 2 items and Conscientiousness (CS)- 2 items.

Table 3: Final CFA results of construct variables

Variable	Dimension	Standardized Regression Weight (β)	Items	Standardized Regression Weight (λ)	P
OI	S	0.941	OI15	0.831	***
			OI16	0.809	***
	M	0.938	OI4	0.671	***
			OI11	0.562	***
OCB	C	0.353	OCB27	0.372	***
			OCB31	0.991	***
	CV	0.821	OCB38	0.701	***
			OCB39	0.835	***
	SM	0.133	OCB32	0.794	***
			OCB33	0.840	***
	CS	0.330	OCB10	0.738	***
			OCB20	0.671	***

Composite Reliability and Discriminant Validity of the Constructs

Table 5 shows the result of the calculated composite reliability and variance extracted to support composite reliability of each construct (with error consideration) and discriminant validity of constructs respectively. The average variance extracted (AVE) measures the "amount of variance that is captured by the construct in relation to the amount of variance due to measurement error" (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). The AVE can be interpreted as a measure of reliability for a construct and it is recommended that the AVE should be greater than 0.50, which indicates that the construct captures more variance in the items than measurement error (Hair, et al., 2006; Chin, 1998). According to Fornell and Larcker (1981), AVE should be more than the correlation squared of the two constructs to support discriminant validity (compare Table 6 and 7). Each AVE value is more than correlation squared, thus discriminant validity is supported or multicollinerity is absent (Kamariah & Sentosa, 2008).

Table 4: Composite reliability and variance extracted of variables

Variable	No of Final Items	Composite Reliability	Variance Extracted
OI	4	0.813	0.526
OCB	8	0.902	0.539

Table 5: Correlation and correlation squared matrix of variables

Variable	(1)	(2)
OI(1)	1.00	0.261 (0.068)
OCB (2)		1.00

** Correlation is significant at .01 levels (2-tailed), values in brackets indicate correlation squared

Table 6: Average variance extracted (AVE)

Variable	(1)	(2)
OI(1)	1.00	0.533
OCB (2)		1.00

Goodness of Fit Indices

CFA was conducted on every constructs and measurement models (see Table 8). All 2nd order models and re-specified model produced a relatively good fit as indicated by goodness of fit indices such as CMIN/df ratio (<5), Goodness of Fit Index (GFI) of >0.90 and Root Mean of Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) of values less than 0.08. The measurement model has a good fit with the data based on assessment criteria such as 2nd order analysis of OI, OCB and OEB (Bagozzi & Yi, 1988). Table 8 shows that the goodness of fit of re-specified model is better than generated model. The goodness of fit of re-specified as the final model confirmed the achievement of Hypothesis 3.

Table 7: Goodness of fit analysis – Comparison between 2nd Order, generated and re-specified model

Final Models	2nd Order of OI	2nd Order of OCB	Generated Model	Re-specified Model
Items Remain	11	18	29	12
CMIN	189.078	474.176	2100.095	184.579
Df	42	119	375	47
CMIN/df	4.502	3.985	5.600	3.927
P-value	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
GFI	0.947	0.926	0.813	0.953
RMSEA	0.075	0.069	0.086	0.069

Re-specified Model

In the re-specified model, researchers confirmed the model as the final model of the hypothesized model. The significant of the goodness of fit (GOF) indexes confirmed the significance loading of measurement, the low level of common and unique error and shows the interaction among predictors on endogenous variable. Figure 5 depicts the Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) analysis. The GOF of the structural model shows support according to the standard norms in structural equation GOF indices as presented in Table 8.

Results of Hypotheses Testing and Variance Explained (Square Multiple Correlation)

Figure 1 shows the significant of 2nd order analysis of OI which confirmed Similarity (□=0.862, CR=3.774, P>0.000) and Membership (□=0.896, CR=2.796, P>0.000) as constructs of OI. Furthermore, Figure 2 also confirmed the significant results of 2nd order analysis of OCB which confirmed Courtesy (□=0.734, CR=4.108, P>0.000), Altruism (□=0.818, CR=4.906, P>0.000), Civic Virtue (□=0.648, CR=6.918, P>0.000), Sportmanship (□=0.415, CR=11.268, P>0.000) and Conscientiousness (□=0.474, CR=8.183, P>0.000) as the constructs.

Table 8: Results of hypotheses testing and variance explained (Square multiple correlations)

Hypo	Exog-e-nou s	En-dog-e-nous	Std. Esti-mate	Std. Error	CR	SMC	P	Status of Hypoth-esis
H1a	S	OI	0.862	0.061	3.744	0.802	0.000	Asserted
H1b	M	OI	0.896	0.058	2.796	0.743	0.005	Asserted
H2a	C	OCB	0.734	0.071	4.108	0.225	0.000	Asserted
H2b	A	OCB	0.818	0.035	4.906	0.172	0.000	Asserted
H2c	CV	OCB	0.648	0.068	6.918	0.420	0.000	Asserted
H2d	SM	OCB	0.415	0.146	11.268	0.669	0.000	Asserted
H3	OI	OCB	0.567	0.023	3.108	0.321	0.002	Asserted

Subsequently, Figure 1 and Figure 2 and Table 9 confirmed the loading of the factors, thus hypotheses 1 and 2 were asserted. Table 9 and Figure 4 also show that OI (□=0.567, CR=3.108, P>0.000) has a direct positive influence on OCB, thus hypothesis 3 was asserted and it could be deducted that OCB explains 32.1% of the variance of OCB. The structural model output displayed in Figure 4 shows that the model explained a substantial portion of the variance in all the endogenous variables (square multiple correlations).

DISCUSSIONS

Our main concern in this study is to confirm the construct of OI and OCB. Consequently, we found Similarity and Membership confirmed as construct of OI. We also found Courtesy, Altruism, Civic Virtue, Sportmanship and Conscientiousness confirmed as construct of OCB. Our study also found significant assertions for direct paths form OI on OCB. Hence, these findings substantiate the appropriateness of OI in assessing OCB of Malaysian hotel industry. By using OI and OCB, companies can improve their recruitment and selection strategies. This is very important so that the companies could recruit and select the correct employees with the correct knowledge, skill, ability and attitude. Employees with membership OI have a sense of belonging, strong feeling of attachment or emotional attraction, reference to self in organizational membership and pride in organizational membership. Employees with similarity OI have perceptions of shared characteristics and with respect to shared value or goals. Altruism or helping behavior OCB is a behavior that involves voluntarily helping others with an organizationally relevant task or problem, such as helping others who have heavy workloads. Sportsmanship OCB is a behavior that reflects the employee's willingness to tolerate the inevitable inconveniences and impositions of work without complaining, for example not wasting time complaining about trivialities. Courtesy (good manners) OCB is a behavior that is aimed at preventing work-related problems with others, such as not abusing the rights of others. Civic virtue OCB reflects responsive, constructive involvement in the organization, for instance keeping abreast of changes at the organization. The implication for organizations is that in order to increase citizenship behaviors, it is important for organizations to connect followers' self-identity to their social identity with the group and to model the types of behaviors sought (Van Dick, Grojean, Christ & Wieseke; 2006).

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This research has found significant direct influence of OI on OCB of Malaysian hotel employees. This study also confirmed the significant constructs of OI and OCB on the structural model. The construct has been tailored according to the Malaysian context. We be-

lieve that the model we have suggested could be useful for managerial research and practice of OI and OCB in Malaysian hotel industry in improving the recruitment and selection strategies as well as to maintain and retain the employees. The findings of this study are interpreted in the light of several limitations and together with the findings, suggest directions for future research.

Firstly, the generalizability of this study's findings may be limited to the star rating of the hotels, namely, 3-star, 4-star and 5-star hotels only. Therefore, future research should attempt to gather more information from the hotels regardless of their star ratings. In this way, comparison between different hotels with different star ratings can be obtained.

Secondly, the findings may be limited to hotel business only. For that reason, future research should attempt to gather information from other businesses in the service industry like the airlines, restaurants, banks, and hospitals. Subsequently, comparison between the different businesses in the service industry can be acquired.

Thirdly, the level of analysis of this study is on the variable or constructs level. For that reason, future research should attempt to analyze on the dimensions level where the relationships between different dimensions of OI and OCB can be gauged.

Finally, the limitation of this study is that it used only selected variables i.e., OI. There are other variables that could be interesting to be studied in future research in order to examine the antecedents of OCB. Variables such as organizational culture, knowledge, work experience or gender should be examined in detail.

REFERENCES

Albert, S. & Whetten, D. A. (1985). Organizational identity. In L. L. Cummings & B. M. Staw (Eds.), Research in organizational behavior: An annual series of analytical essays and critical reviews (pp. 263–295). Greenwich: JAI Press.

Ashforth, B. E. & Mael, F. (1989). Social identity theory and the organization. Academy of Management Review, 14, 20-39.

Bagozzi, R. P. & Yi, Y. (1988). On the evaluation of structural equation models. Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 16 (Spring), 74-94.

Barrow, S. & Mosley, R. (2006). The employer brand: Bringing the best of brand management to people at work. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Brewer, M. B. (1991). The social self: Of being the same and different at the same time. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 71, 83-93.

Brown, A.D. (1997). Narcissism, identity, and legitimacy. Academy of Management Review, 22, 643–86.

Burke, R., Koyuncu, M. & Fiksenbaum, L. (2008). Work experiences, satisfactions and psychological well-being of female and male managers in the hospitality sector in Turkey. Equal Opportunities International, 27(6), 505-18.

Cheney, G. (1982). Identification as process and product: A field study. Unpublished master's thesis. Purdue University, West Lafayette.

Chin, W. W. (1998). The partial least squares approach to structural equation modelling. In A. G. Marcoulides (Ed.), Modern methods for business research (pp. 295–336). Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Cohen, L., Manion, L. & Morrison, K. R. B. (2000). Research methods in education (5th ed.). London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Cornelissen, J. P. (2006). Making sense of theory construction: Metaphor and disciplined imagination. Organization Studies, 27(11), 1579–1597.

Fornell, C. & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. Journal of Marketing Research, 48, 39–50.

Gruen, T. W., Summers, J. O. & Acito, F. (2000). Relationship marketing activities, commitment, and membership behaviors in professional associations. Journal of Marketing, 64(July), 34–49.

Hair, J., Black, B., Babin, B., Anderson, R. & Tatham, R. (2006). Multivariate data analysis (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River: Prentice Hall.

Howard, T. (1997). Industry of choice: If you treat workers fairly, they will stay. Nation's Restaurant News, 31(12), 42.

Hurst, A. (1997). Emerging trends in college and university food-service. Journal of College and University Foodservice, 3(3), 17-32.

Johnson, W. L., Johnson, A. M. & Heimberg, F. (1999). A primary- and second-order component analysis of the organizational identification questionnaire. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 59(1), 159-170.
Kamariah, N.M. & Sentosa, I. (2008, October). The integration of technology acceptance model and technology of purchasing behavior: A structural equation modeling approach. Paper presented at the proceedings of the Asia Pacific Conference on Management of Technology and Technology Entrepreneurship (Malaysia), Melaka: Universiti Teknologi MARA.

Kawakami, K. & Dion, K. L. (1995). Social identity and affect as determinants of collective action. Theory and Psychology, 5, 551-577.

Kuean, W.L., Kaur, S. & Wong, E.S.K. (2010). The relationship between organizational commitment and intention to quit: The Malaysian companies perspective. Journal of Applied Sciences, 10(19), 2251-2260.

Malaysian Employers Federation. (2004). The MEF salary and fringe benefits survey for executives in 2003 and 2004. Kuala Lumpur: Author.

Malhotra, N. K. (2006). Marketing research: An applied orientation (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River: Prentice Hall.

Moser, C. & Kalton, G. (1993). Survey methods in social investigation (2nd ed.). London: Heinemann.

Norman, S. M., Avey, J. B., Nimnicht, J. L. & Pigeon, N.C. (2010). The interactive effects of psychological capital and organizational identity on employee organizational. Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies, 17(4), 380–391.

Nunnally, J.C. (1970). Introduction to psychological measurement. New York: McGraww-Hill.

Organ, D. W. (1988). Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome. Lexington: Lexington Books.

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Moorman, R. H. & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. Leadership Quarterly, 1(2), 107-142.

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Paine, J. B. & Bacharach, D. G. (2000). Organizational citizenship behaviors: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions, Journal of Management, 26, 513-563.

Pratt, M. G. (2003). Disentangling collective identities. In J. Polzer, E. Mannix, & M. Neale (Eds.), Identity issues in groups (Research on managing groups and teams, Volume 5) (pp. 161–188). Stamford: Elsevier.

Proudfoot Consulting. (2008). Global productivity report: A world of unrealized opportunities. Georgia: Author.

Rousseau, D. M. (1998). Why workers still identify with organizations. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 19, 217-233.

Scott, S. G. & Lane, V. R. (2000). A stakeholder approach to organizational identity. Academy of Management Review 25(1), 43–62.

Sekaran, U. & Bougie, R. (2010). Research methods for business: A skill building approach (5th ed.). Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Smith, C.A., Organ, D.W. & Near, J.P. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. Journal of Applied Psychology, 4, 653-63.

Suchman, M. C. (1995). Managing legitimacy: Strategic and institutional approaches. Academy of Management Review, 20(3), 571-610.

Tajfel, H. (1972). Social categorization. In S. Moscovici (Ed.), Introduction a la Pasychologie Sociale 1 (pp. 272–302). Paris: Larousse.

Tajfel, H. & Turner, J. (1985). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In S. Worcehl & W.G. Austin (Eds.), Psychology of Intergroup Relations (2nd edition, pp. 7024). Chicago: Nelson-Hall.

Tuzun, I. (2009). The impact of identification and commitment on job satisfaction: The case of a Turkish service provider. Management Research News, 32(8), 728-38.

Utusan Malaysia Online (2008). Sikap pilih kerja punca 400,000 belia menganggur. Retrieved from http://www.utusan.com.my/utusan/info.asp?y=2008&dt=0407 &pub=utusan_malaysia&sec=Dalam_Negeri&pg=dn_04.htm &arc=hive.

Utusan Malaysia Online (2009). Tidak wujud masalah tiada pekerjaan. Retrieved from http://www.utusan.com.my/utusan/info.asp?y=2009&dt=0420

&pub=utusan_malaysia&sec=Ekonomi&pg=ek_03.htm&arc=
hive.

Van Dick, R., Grojean, M. W., Christ, O. & Wieseke, J. (2006).
Identity and the extra mile: Relationships between organiza-
tional identification and organizational citizenship behaviour.
British Journal of Management, 17(4), 283-301.

Van Knippenberg, D. & Van Schie, E. C. M. (2000). Foci and cor-
relates of organi¬zational identification. Journal of Occupa-
tional and Organizational Psychology, 73, 137-147.

Whetten, D. A. & Mackey, A. (2002). A social actor conception of
organization identity and its implications for the study of or-
ganizational reputation. Business and Society, 41, 393-414.

Williams, L. J. & Anderson, S. E. (1991). Job satisfaction and or-
ganizational commitment as predictors of organizational citi-
zenship and in-role behaviors. Journal of Management, 17(3),
601–617.