

California State University, San Bernardino

CSUSB ScholarWorks

Theses Digitization Project

John M. Pfau Library

1990

Dysfunctional effects of commitment: How much commitment is enough?

Kristina Skoog Froelich

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/etd-project>



Part of the [Industrial and Organizational Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Froelich, Kristina Skoog, "Dysfunctional effects of commitment: How much commitment is enough?" (1990). *Theses Digitization Project*. 451.

<https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/etd-project/451>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the John M. Pfau Library at CSUSB ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses Digitization Project by an authorized administrator of CSUSB ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@csusb.edu.

✓ DYSFUNCTIONAL EFFECTS OF
COMMITMENT: HOW MUCH COMMITMENT IS ENOUGH?
✓

A Thesis
Presented to the
Faculty of
California State University,
San Bernardino

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts
in
Psychology

by
Kristina Skoog Froelich
June 1990

DYSFUNCTIONAL EFFECTS OF
COMMITMENT: HOW MUCH COMMITMENT IS ENOUGH?


A Thesis
Presented to the
Faculty of
California State University,
San Bernardino

by
Kristina Skoog Froelich
June 1990

Approved by:


Janet L. Kottke, Ph.D., Chair, Psychology

6/1/90
Date


Matt L. Riggs, Ph.D., Psychology


Geraldine B. Stanly, Ph.D., Psychology

ABSTRACT

This study investigated the relationships between organizational commitment and role conflict, job satisfaction, and ethical behaviors at work. The hypothesis of interest in this study was that organizational commitment could be more accurately explained by a curvilinear relationship. 225 employed people responded to a 75 question survey. Support was found for a relationship between organizational commitment and job satisfaction. However, no support was found for the other linear relationships of organizational commitment and role conflict, organizational commitment and ethical behavior, or for the curvilinear relationship of organizational commitment and ethics.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my committee members Janet L. Kottke, Matt L. Riggs, and Geraldine B. Stahly for their help and support throughout this project. Their guidance was truly invaluable.

I would also like to thank my husband Matt Froelich without whose help and understanding I would never have completed this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title Page.....i
Signature.....ii
Abstract.....iii
Acknowledgements.....iv
Table of Contents.....v
List of Tables.....viii
Introduction.....1
 Correlates of Low Levels of Commitment.....6
 Correlates of Moderate Levels of Commitment.....7
 Correlates of High Levels of Commitment
 (Individual).....7
 Correlates of High Levels of Commitment
 (Organization).....9
 Conclusions from the Organizational Research.....10
 Purpose of this Study.....11
Hypotheses.....12
Pilot Study
Method.....14
 Design.....14
 Subjects.....14
 Instrument.....15
 Procedure.....15

Results.....	16
Discussion.....	17
Thesis Study	
Method.....	18
Design.....	18
Subjects.....	18
Instrument.....	19
Procedure.....	22
Results.....	24
Discussion.....	31
Summary.....	36
Appendices	
A. Pilot Study #1 Questionnaire (Ethics Scale).....	37
B. Pilot Study #2 Questionnaire (Role Conflict Scale).....	42
C. Pilot Study Descriptive Statistics (Ethics Scale).....	49
D. Pilot Study Descriptive Statistics (Role Conflict Scale).....	50
E. Pilot Study Reliability Analysis (Ethics Scale).....	51

F.	Pilot Study Reliability Analysis (Role Conflict Scale).....	53
G.	Thesis Study Demographic Descriptions.....	55
H.	Thesis Study Cover Letter.....	57
I.	Thesis Study Survey.....	58
J.	Thesis Study Reliability Analysis (Organizational Commitment).....	68
K.	Thesis Study Reliability Analysis (Job Satisfaction).....	70
L.	Thesis Study Reliability Analysis (Ethics).....	72
M.	Thesis Study Reliability Analysis (Role Conflict).....	74
	Bibliography.....	76

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Thesis Study Scale Statistics.....26

Table 2. Thesis Study Regression of Organizational
Commitment and Role Conflict.....27

Table 3. Thesis Study Regression of Organizational
Commitment and Job Satisfaction.....27

Table 4. Thesis Study Correlations of Organizational
Commitment Subscales with Job Satisfaction
Subscales.....28

Table 5. Thesis Study Regression of Organizational
Commitment and Ethics.....29

Table 6. Thesis Study Regression Table Quadratic
Effect.....30

INTRODUCTION

William Whyte first warned corporate America about the dangers of overcommitment in his 1956 book, The Organization Man. Whyte described an employee who not only worked for an organization, but actually belonged to it (Randall, 1987). Two years later Paul R. Lawrence (1958) wrote, "Ideally, we would want one sentiment to be dominant in all employees from top to bottom, namely a complete loyalty to the organizational purpose" (p. 208).

In search of a new cure-all for corporate woes, researchers and managers across America started looking for ways to increase employee commitment (Gibson, Ivancevich, & Donnelly, Jr., 1985). As a result, for the past thirty years most of the research involving organizational commitment has either started with or concluded with the concept that employers should be fostering high levels of commitment in employees (Fisher, 1989; Romzek, 1989; Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982; Stevens, Beyer, & Trice, 1978; Becker, 1960). This sentiment has especially prevailed when commitment measurements are linked with absenteeism and turnover rates (Blau & Boal, 1987; Stumpf & Hartman, 1984;

O'Reilly & Caldwell, 1980; Hom, Katerberg, & Hulin, 1979; Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1979). Robbins (1983) wrote that, "...research into commitment has developed around the assumption that highly committed employees will be better performers and have lower turnover than those expressing low levels of commitment to the organization" (p. 57).

Despite the amount of research in this area, organizational commitment is still a diverse concept. Mowday, Porter, and Steers (1982) list ten definitions from 10 different studies. These definitions generally mention attitudes or types of behaviors that describe a worker's feelings of belonging or his/her intention to stay with an organization. These definitions differ widely in their basic understandings of organizational commitment describing it as a phenomenon, a process, a state of being, an attachment, an orientation, a relationship, and more (for a more complete description see Mowday et al. pp. 20-21).

However, much of the recent research can be divided into two camps based on specific and reliable measurement devices that have been developed for the two more popular definitions. The first involves Porter, Steers, Mowday,

& Boulian's (1974) definition which reflects an employee's involvement with, identification with, and intention to remain with an organization. This type of organizational commitment is also called affective commitment, and is usually measured with the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) (see Mowday et al., 1982).

The second commonly used definition stems from Becker's (1960) "side-bet" theory which looks at the worker's intention to stay with an organization by measuring the "perceived costs" in leaving. Also known as continuance commitment, this definition can be measured by the Ritzer and Trice Scale (1969) or the Hrebiniak and Alutto Scale (1972) (Meyer, Paunonen, Gellatly, Goffin, & Jackson, 1989).

Both definitions try to explain the bond between the employee and the organization, but approach this connection from different motivating factors. By definition, affectively committed workers stay on the job because they want to, while employees with continuance commitment stay because they feel they have to. As a result, the worker's subsequent behaviors are believed to differ. Employees who want to remain are hypothesized

to put forth more effort benefiting the organization (Mowday, et al., 1982), whereas employees who feel they must remain are thought to be less dedicated and motivated (Meyer, et al., 1989). This difference in commitment motivation has led researchers to conclude that affective commitment is positively related and continuance commitment negatively related to performance. So, in order to measure performance at least, it may become necessary for researchers to first determine which kind of commitment they are dealing with.

Since the need to continue defining and measuring organizational commitment perseveres without respite, one route that researchers have taken is to try to clarify the concept of organizational commitment by incorporating it into more detailed models. An example of this involves the concept of "work commitment" which uses a facet design to measure a combination of commitments including job involvement, organizational commitment, work ethic endorsement, and intention to remain (Morrow & McElroy, 1987). Previously, Morrow (1983) postulated that several aspects of work commitment actually overlap and are not distinct enough to be measured separately. Hoping that an integration of multiple commitment

functions would reduce redundancy within the commitment literature, Morrow and McElroy (1987) designed a study using "work commitment" to measure job satisfaction over three career stages. Unfortunately, the overall levels of explained variance were low. Therefore, more research will be necessary to decide if this approach is valid or not.

In a later study, Brooke, Russell, and Price (1988) cited a lack of data and separate research traditions as their reasons for designing a study to assess the discriminant validity of job satisfaction, job involvement, and organizational commitment. They concluded that the three attitudinal variables were empirically distinct concepts.

How much commitment is desirable?

As the Morrow and McElroy (1987) and the Brooke, Russell, and Price (1988) studies have indicated, the variety of definitions, research, and new concepts are causing researchers to question whether they have studied organizational commitment closely enough. Looking more deeply into commitment's individual components, one recent proposal suggests that different levels of commitment may be caused by different attitudes and

result in different behaviors (Randall, 1987). This has produced a debate about how much commitment is actually beneficial.

Correlates of Low Levels of Commitment.

Since much of the commitment research has focused on the under-committed employee, who feels little identification or sense of belonging within an organization, results have generally concluded that low levels of commitment are more dysfunctional than productive for both the individual and the organization (Randall, 1987; Mowday, et al., 1982; Kanter, 1977; Hacker, 1978). The research reports that diminished commitment can inhibit promotion (Hacker, 1978). Low levels of commitment have also been attributed, possibly unfairly, to whistle-blowers who are regarded as disloyal and rebellious employees (Hacker, 1978). (However, whistle-blowers may actually be highly committed workers since they are concerned enough to "stick their necks" out in an attempt to fix specific problems.) Meanwhile, organizations burdened with under-committed employees may suffer from high turnover (Porter, Crampon, & Smith, 1976), too much absenteeism (Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1979), increased tardiness (Angle & Perry, 1981), low

work quality, (Steers, 1982), and disloyalty (Schein, 1968).

Correlates of Moderate Levels of Commitment.

Moderate levels of commitment are hypothesized by some to be the ideal blend between employee and organizational interaction with both parties benefitting from mutual needs being met (Randall, 1987; Mowday et al., 1982; Stumpf & Hartman, 1984). Moderate commitment to the organization helps the employees to feel secure, useful, and a sense of belonging (Mowday et al., 1982), while still allowing them to maintain their own identity (Katz & Kahn, 1966). The organization benefits from a loyal and diligent workforce that intends to stay and receives a sense of satisfaction from the work (Mowday et al., 1982).

Correlates of High Levels of Commitment (Individual).

Finally, despite the fact that some researchers still advocate increasing employee commitment (Romzek, 1989; Fisher, 1989), Mowday, Porter, and Steers (1982) and Randall (1987) have categorized long lists of deleterious effects attributed to high levels of commitment suggesting many dysfunctional consequences. For example, the negative results of overcommitment for an individual

employee can include: the inhibition of self-development, growth, and opportunity for mobility (Mowday, et al. 1982); resistance to change and a susceptibility to groupthink (Staw & Ross, 1978); stress within family units (Graddick, & Farr, 1983; Holahan & Gilbert, 1979; Kanter, 1977); family conflict sometimes resulting in a denial of family life (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985); tension within other relationships stemming from the loss of self and the inability to relate to others outside of the job (Korman & Korman, 1980); possible lessening of time for outside activities (Larson & Fukami, 1984); workgroup conflict (Mowday et al., 1982; Etzioni, 1975); and role-conflict resulting from role overload (Reichers, 1986).

Researchers have also speculated that the inhibition of creativity and innovation (Wright, 1980; Thompson 1965), reduced peer group solidarity (Whyte, 1956), wasted and/or misused energies of devoted employees kept in jobs they dislike or are unsuited for (Rowan, 1981), and organizations overburdened by employees too willing to suspend their own judgement (Hoffer, 1963) could also be problems arising from too much commitment. These areas still need more research.

Correlates of High Levels of Commitment (Organization).

Possible negative consequences for the organization include: reduced effectiveness because of decreased functional turnover (Mowday et al., 1982); less innovation, creativity, and/or adaptation (Mowday, et al., 1982); devotion to past policies and traditions resulting in entrenchment (Salancik, 1977); and a willingness to commit illegal or unethical behaviors for the company welfare (Randall, 1987) which can result in lawsuits, public ill will, and even death. Some examples of illegal or unethical types of behaviors include John DeLorean's reported experiences as a General Motors executive that described how high levels of loyalty and commitment not only reduced creativity, but also led to deadly consequences because of the failure to fix safety defects still inherent in the Corvair when it went on sale in 1959 (Wright, 1980); the General Electric price-fixing conspiracy in which GE was charged with monopoly practices and price-fixing making this a real-life example of how corporate norms and codes can clash with the legal system (Geis, 1982); the escalation of the Vietnam War as stated in a memo written by George Ball to Lyndon Johnson in 1965 noting that so many casualties

had already occurred that to stop would result in public humiliation making further commitment seem like the only course left open (Staw & Ross, 1978); and the Watergate Conspiracy that thrived because of the protective groupthink that surrounded Richard Nixon before, during, and after the Watergate break-in (Mullen, 1976).

Conclusions From the Organizational Research

Drucker (1972) suggested that there is a natural tendency for organizations to discourage initiative by promoting conformity. He wrote that this can be accomplished by weakening external ties and encouraging dependence on the corporation. As Cook (1966) noted about the organizational men involved in the GE price-fixing conspiracy, "They were men who surrendered their own individualities to the corporate gods they served. Though they knew that their acts were illegal, not to say unethical, though the shady maneuvering at times affronted their sense of decency, not one found it possible to pronounce an unequivocal 'no'" (p. 38). Angle and Perry (1981) wrote, "It is more likely that, with respect to adaptability, there is some optimal level of commitment -- sufficient to evoke needed employee behaviors beyond explicit role stipulations, but not so

strong as to incur the suspension of individual judgment in favor of the organizational precepts" (p. 11). In addition, Morrow (1983) concluded "...that decreasing levels of organizational commitment sometimes is desirable (Salancik, 1977)." because "Maintaining a sufficient amount of turnover and avoiding groupthink practices represent situations in which excessive commitment can be dysfunctional (p. 496)."

Purpose of this Study

Randall (1987) concluded that, "Because the relationship between commitment and negative work-related outcomes is not fully understood, more attention should be paid to the potential negative aspects of high levels of commitment for both organizational members and the organization itself", (1987, p. 461). She also wrote that the linear relationship between high levels of commitment and positive work behaviors previously thought to exist should be re-examined. Randall suggested that an inverted U-shaped curve is a more accurate statistical description of commitment because it is possible that at both ends of the spectrum, commitment (like stress and anxiety) is more harmful than beneficial, thus making moderate rather than high levels of commitment more

likely to produce beneficial work behaviors.

Hypotheses

To test this theory, this study has been designed to measure an employee's perceived differences between organizational commitment and role conflict, job satisfaction, and ethical behaviors at work.

Since people spend most of their time at home or at work, the variables of role conflict and job satisfaction, were chosen to cover the widest number of possible role variations within individual workers.

Hypothesis one. Role conflict is defined as, "A situation in which an individual is confronted by divergent role expectations, (Robbins, 1983, p. 543). The role conflict scale will measure if workers report conflicts between work and home, and then assess the relationship between the subjects' organizational commitment and role conflict scores.

Hypothesis two. Job satisfaction is defined as "...a worker's emotional, affective, or evaluative response toward his (or her) job " (Saal & Knight, 1988, p. 297). This scale will determine if a relationship exists between the subjects' organizational commitment scores and how satisfied (or not) they report feeling about

their jobs.

Hypothesis three. Ethics is defined as the "...discipline that deals with what is good or bad, right or wrong, and the principles of what constitutes a moral duty or an obligation" (Clinard & Yeager, 1980, p 213). The ethical behavior component of this study has been added to see if the subjects report a willingness to sacrifice individual judgement on behalf of the organization. Because it has been hypothesized, but not researched, this scale will assess the relationship between the subjects' organizational commitment and their reported ethical behavior scores.

Hypothesis four. Ultimately, a curvilinear relationship is being predicted between organizational commitment and ethics.

PILOT STUDY

Method

Design

To test the reliability of the two scales developed by this author, a survey was created in the style intended for the final thesis questionnaire.

The Ethics Scale was written from items based on the Brenner & Molander (1977) survey reported in the Harvard Business Review, and chapter 10 ("The Failure of Business Ethics), in the Clinard & Yeager book entitled Corporate Crime

The Role Conflict Scale was adapted from the Gilbert & Holahan (1979) Role Conflict Scale. This adaptation was made because the original scale did not specifically address work related behaviors.

In both cases, the pilot study was intended to assess the reliability of the two scales before they were used in the final thesis study.

Subjects

The subjects were 50 undergraduate and graduate students enrolled at California State University, San Bernardino. The subjects were a non-random, convenience sample whose participation was voluntary and

confidential. The demographic information of gender, age, and number of years employed were also asked of the subjects. The subjects were treated in accordance with the "Ethical Principles of Psychologists" (American Psychological Association, 1983).

Instrument

The Ethics Scale consisted of 21 items and was written from the above mentioned Brenner & Molander survey and the Clinard & Yeager Corporate Crime book. The scale was designed to measure a subject's perception of his/her own ethical beliefs relating to his/her job. (See Appendix A for a copy of the original survey.)

The Role Conflict Scale, which consisted of 20 items, was adapted from the Gilbert & Holahan (1979) scale. It was designed to measure perceived conflicts between a subject's home and work lives. (See Appendix B for a copy of the complete survey.)

Procedure

Permission was received from the University's Human Subjects Committee to run the pilot study which was distributed to students while they attended class. Both surveys were passed out at one time to each subject and then collected. The subjects were told the nature of the surveys and their confidentiality was guaranteed.

PILOT STUDY

Results

Summary statistics for both surveys were calculated for item means, standard deviations, inter-item covariance, correlation matrices, scale means, item-to-total correlations, and factor analysis to assess the psychometric properties of the scales.

Ethics Scale. The Ethics Scale produced a Cronbach's coefficient alpha of .69 (N = 42). After further examination, seven of the items (question numbers 1, 9, 11, 12, 15, 17, and 20), were dropped. Once the seven items were deleted, the alpha equalled .84. (See Appendix C for a Ethics Scale Descriptive Statistics.)

Role Conflict Scale. The Role Conflict Scale produced a Cronbach's coefficient alpha of .82 (N = 41). After items 8, 10, and 14 were deleted because they were not contributing to the scale, the alpha increased to .83. (See Appendix D for Role Conflict descriptive statistics.)

PILOT STUDY

Discussion

The pilot study results produced Cronbach coefficient alphas of .84 for the Ethics Scale, and .83 for the Role Conflict Scale. Therefore, these scales' alphas met the generally accepted levels of consistency (.70) for psychological research (Nunnally, 1978, p. 245).

THESIS STUDY

Method

Design

This thesis study used a survey method. The survey consisted of 75 questions in all, complete with instructions for responding to the items. Two of the scales were previously tested standard measurement devices. The other two were developed by this author specifically for this research project. (For a complete discussion, please refer to the Pilot Study.)

Subjects

The subjects for this study were 225 employed people who worked at a variety of jobs for various lengths of time. The subjects were recruited at four small sized universities in Southern California, as well as from private industry. The subjects ranged in education from high school graduates to master's level graduate students. This study actively tried to sample many different types of jobs specifically to avoid any inherent biases found within one group of employees working at one organization.

There were 122 female respondents and 102 male respondents, with one person declining to state his/her

gender. The subjects ranged in age from 16 to 58. The most common length of employment was within the range of one to ten years. (Appendix E shows the complete demographic break-down for the subjects).

The subject's participation was voluntary and anonymity was guaranteed. The subjects were treated according to the "Ethical Principles of Psychologists" (American Psychological Association, 1983).

Instrument

Organizational Commitment. The Organizational Commitment Scale was devised by Buchanan (1974) and was selected for use because it incorporates the three components of (1) identification, which is described as how much an employee internalizes the goals and values of the organization; (2) job involvement, described as the immersion of one's self into the work role; and (3) loyalty, designed to measure feelings of attachment to the organization. All three subscales were considered important for a well-rounded measurement of differing levels of organizational commitment. Seven of the 23 items are reversed scored. This scale includes items like; "I feel a sense of pride in working for this organization", "The most important things that happen to

me involve my work", and "I feel a strong sense of loyalty toward this organization". These questions are rated with a Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). In creating this scale, Buchanan used the responses from 279 managers, and recorded coefficient alpha scores of .86, .84, .92 for all three subscales, and .94 for the total scale.

This study also included the question, "Overall, how committed are you to your career?", selected from the 1984 Gilbert & Holahan study. This question was used to gauge the subject's other responses, and used a Likert scale ranging from 1 (not committed) to 7 (very committed).

Overall Job Satisfaction. Warr, Cook, and Wall (1979) developed the Overall Job Satisfaction Scale that was used in this study. This scale was designed to measure extrinsic and intrinsic job features, and approaches job satisfaction from a global perspective. It includes such items as: How would you describe, "Your fellow workers", "Your rate of pay", "The industrial relations between management and workers in your firm", and "Your job security". Respondents used a Likert scale ranging from 1 (I'm extremely dissatisfied) to 7 (I'm extremely

satisfied). Warr, Cook, & Wall used samples of 200 and 390 male, blue-collar manufacturing employees in the United Kingdom, and reported coefficient alpha scores of .85, and .88 for the two samples.

Role Conflict Scales. The Role Conflict Scale was adapted by this author from the Gilbert and Holahan (1979) scale measuring role conflict for pairs of life roles, like worker and spouse. The coefficient alphas for the original subscales of worker versus spouse, worker versus family, and worker versus self were .87, .76, and .79. The total conflict scale had an alpha of .92.

The scale developed for this study included items like: "Do you feel a conflict when: You are asked to put your work before your family?" And, "Do you feel a conflict when: You let your work consume nearly all your time and energy instead of devoting time to the development of outside interests?" The pilot sample of 41 subjects reported an alpha of .83.

Ethics Questions. The Ethics Questions were written by this author to measure how subjects perceived ethical behaviors occurring at their workplace. The Ethics Questions were written within the guidelines of the

based on their replication of Baumhart's 1961 study of business ethics. Both surveys were conducted among Harvard Business Review readers.

Other ethics questions were written from subtopics in chapter ten of Clinard and Yeager's Corporate Crime book (1980) entitled, "The Failure of Business Ethics".

The ethics questions included items like: "An employee should overlook someone else's wrong doing if it is in the best interest of the company." Plus, "It is not unusual for employees to experience a conflict between their own beliefs of social responsibility and company requirements." The pilot sample of 42 subjects reported an alpha level of .84 for the revised survey.

Procedure

Each subject completed a questionnaire evaluating their organizational commitment, job satisfaction, role conflict between work and home, and some ethical work considerations. (See Appendix G for the complete questionnaire as it was administered.) 270 surveys were distributed and 225 were returned with usable data.

All completed questionnaires were scored and entered into a correlational analysis to see what relationships existed between organizational commitment and job

satisfaction, role conflict, and ethical behavior. Because the belief that a curvilinear relationship could exist between organizational commitment and the other variables, regression using a quadratic term was also used.

THESIS STUDY

Results

Sample Measurements

Basic summary descriptive statistics were computed for each of the measurement scales including means and standard deviations. Next, Cronbach coefficient alphas were calculated to measure reliability. Finally, multiple regressions were run to determine if any correlations existed between the criterion variable (organizational commitment) and the predictor variables (role conflict, job satisfaction, and ethics).

Organizational Commitment Scale. This scale originally consisted of 24 items. Items numbered 13 and 21 were deleted because they did not appear to be contributing to the scale. The final alpha measured .90 (N = 225) for all of the respondents, and the revised scale was used to test the hypothesis. (The means are reported in Table 1.)

Job Satisfaction Scale. This scale originally had 15 items. Item 3, was deleted because it did not appear to be contributing to the scale. The original alpha was .90 (N =225). After the deletion, alpha equaled .90 (N =225) and this revised scale was used for the analysis of the

hypothesis. (The means are reported in Table 1.)

Ethics Scale. This scale originally contained 16 items. Items 6, 10, 11, 14, and 15 were deleted because these items did not appear to be contributing to the scale. After the deletions, an alpha of .89 (N = 225) was obtained and this revised scale was used to test the hypothesis. (The means are reported in Table 1.)

Role Conflict Scale. This scale originally consisted of 20 items. Item number 14 was deleted because it did not appear to be contributing to the scale. The final alpha of the overall revised scale was .87 (N =225), and was used to test the hypothesis. (The means are reported in Table 1.)

Table 1

Thesis Study Scale Statistics

Scale	Mean	Standard Deviation	Range
Organizational Commitment	91.023	21.746	34 -147
Job Satisfaction	63.157	16.084	19 - 98
Ethics	58.157	12.348	13 - 77
Role Conflict	54.848	12.964	20 - 82

Test of Hypotheses

Hypothesis one. Hypothesis one set out to see if there was a correlation between a worker's perceived role conflict and how committed the person sees him/herself. The regression information resulted in a r of .11 (r squared of .01, n.s.). No support was found for hypothesis one.

Table 2

Regression of Organizational Commitment and Role Conflict

Variable	Beta	F	Sig F
Role Conflict	-.031	.366	.466

Hypothesis two. Hypothesis two looked to see if a relationship existed between perceived job satisfaction and commitment. The correlation coefficient was an r of .67 (r squared of .45 $p < .001$). Therefore, support was found for hypothesis two.

Table 3

Regression of Organizational Commitment and Job Satisfaction

Variable	Beta	F	Sig F
Job Satisfaction	.668	170.647	.001

Table 4

Correlations of Organizational Commitment Subscales with
Job Satisfaction Subscales

	Identification	Job Involvement	Loyalty
Extrinsic	.57	.38	.61
Intrinsic	.53	.42	.62

Hypothesis three. Hypothesis three was intended to determine if there were differences in ethical perceptions of committed workers. The correlation coefficient was .11 (r squared of .01, n.s.) indicating no support for this hypothesis.

Table 5

Regression of Organizational Commitment and Ethics

Variable	Beta	F	Sig F
Ethics	.057	1.25	.265

In addition, because a curvilinear relationship was expected a quadratic effect was tested. A regression using organizational commitment as the dependent variable was run, entering Ethics first and then a quadratic term second. As can be seen from Table 6, the quadratic effect did not significantly contribute to the prediction of organizational commitment. Hence, the hypothesis of a curvilinear relationship between organizational commitment and ethics was not supported.

Table 6

Regression Table Quadratic Effect

Variables	Beta	Partial Corr	F	Sig F
Ethics	-.399	-.067	.993	.320
Ethic Squared	.539	.090	1.814	.179

THESIS STUDY

Discussion

This thesis was designed to examine the three linear relationships between organizational commitment and role conflict, job satisfaction, and ethical behaviors at work. It was also intended to assess the possibility of a curvilinear relationship between commitment and ethics. Unfortunately, only partial support was found. Organizational commitment was statistically related to job satisfaction, but no support was found for relationships with role conflict or ethical work behaviors. No support could be found for the curvilinear relationship between organizational commitment and ethics either.

Hypothesis one. The relationship between organizational commitment and role conflict was not statistically significant. There are a number of possible reasons for this result. It is theoretically possible that the two constructs are not related. It is also possible that the two measurement devices did not correlate. Or it could have been due to sample biases like a predominately young subject pool with small amounts of time in the workforce. Role conflict probably

was not seem to be a problem for young respondents who may still have been living with parents. However, because this survey did not ask about living arrangements, it was not possible to assess this concept. Possible areas for future research should include the subjects' level of personal responsibility, as well as their level of occupation and the extent of their work responsibility. The amount of control a subject feels he/she can exercise over his/her own life could greatly impact the amount of conflict being reported.

This author would like to conclude that this is a good finding, indicating that committed workers do not necessarily have to experience conflicts between work and home. However, no such conclusion can be drawn from this data. More research is needed in this area to verify this finding.

Hypothesis two. The relationship between organizational commitment and job satisfaction was statistically significant. This finding was expected. Organizational commitment and job satisfaction have been correlated many times in the past (especially in the area of turnover). Plus, the two scales used for this measurement have been previously tested and proven.

Hypothesis three. The third hypothesis sought to examine if the subjects reported more of a willingness to sacrifice individual judgement on behalf of their organization. This finding was not statistically significant. There are a number of possible reasons for this result as well. Once again, the two variables of organizational commitment and ethics may not be related. However, there are many cases of unethical work behaviors being performed by overly committed employees cited in a variety of disciplines throughout the literature and the lay press (for specific examples, refer to the Introduction). So, any evidence supporting this viewpoint would need to be very comprehensive.

Another explanation is that once again, the two scales may not have shared enough variance to be correlated.

It is also possible that because the subjects comprised a relatively young group, their tendency toward unethical behaviors, while not significant, could have reflected their lack of experience.

In addition, the subjects might have responded as they believed they should and not as they really had experienced ethical or unethical behaviors at their jobs. A tendency to respond in a way that will "please" an

authority figure (which in this case was probably the teacher who was asking them to volunteer), has been known to occur in situations where power is unilaterally one-sided.

Another explanation could involve the concept of compartmentalization which basically states that because people categorize sections of their lives, what is considered ethical in one area does not necessarily transfer over to any of the other sections. Therefore, while a person might be very honest at home, he/she might not feel it is wrong to lie about a product at work when this latter behavior is simply considered a "good business practice".

Finally, it should also be mentioned that this author received the same complaint from several of the private sector employees about the difficulty of the survey. They felt they had to "think too hard" about some of the items. If this type of survey were to be used in the workforce again, it might need to be worded less scholastically.

Hypothesis four. Because no relationship was established between organizational commitment and ethics, no curvilinear relationship could be found.

Despite the problems inherent in this thesis, more research is warranted. Time and again, throughout the research, throughout management text books, throughout business ethics chapters, one theme predominates:

"...a central facet of all careers is balancing commitment to the organization with the maintenance of a sense of independence. Pure rebellion, which rejects all organizational values and norms, can end only in departure; pure conformity, which accept everything, means loss of self" (Hampton, Summer, & Webber, 1987, p.86).

THESIS STUDY

Summary

This thesis investigated the relationships between organizational commitment and role conflict, job satisfaction, and ethical behaviors at work. This study also looked for a curvilinear relationship between organizational commitment and ethics. Regression scores were calculated for the various variables. Support was found for the organizational commitment and job satisfaction relationship. However, no support was found for the other relationships (organizational commitment and role conflict and organizational commitment and ethical behavior), or for the curvilinear relationship.

Appendix A

Pilot Study #1 Questionnaire (Ethics Scale)

BEHAVIORAL STUDY

This is a pilot study designed to measure your reaction to the following behavioral items. Please respond to these items as they apply to the organization you are presently employed at. Your responses will be kept completely anonymous and your participation is voluntary. Please answer all the questions because every response you make is important. Thank you very much for your time and input.

Responses: 1=strongly agree, 2=somewhat agree, 3=agree, 4=I'm not sure, 5=disagree, 6=somewhat disagree, 7=strongly disagree.

(1). At work, employees can expect to experience a conflict between what is required of them as workers and what they believe is right as ethical people.

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly disagree

(2). It is okay for a supervisor to ask an employee to support someone else's incorrect viewpoint.

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly disagree

(3). An employee may need to lie to a customer/client to protect the company.

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly disagree

(4). It is sometimes necessary for the company to engage in shady practices because the competition is doing so.

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly disagree

(5). An employee should overlook someone else's wrongdoing if it is in the best interest of the company.

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly disagree

(6). Organizations occasionally misrepresent products to make them look better to the consumer.

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly disagree

(7). An employee should be asked to do business with a supervisor's friends.

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly disagree

(8). A supervisor should not care how results are achieved as long as the desired outcome occurs.

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly disagree

(9). Any organization should have a clearly defined ethical code for how all employees should perform their jobs.

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly disagree

(10). There is nothing wrong with a supervisor asking an employee to falsify a document.

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly disagree

(11). The customer should always come before profit.

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly disagree

(12). It is not unusual for employees to experience a conflict between their own beliefs of social responsibility and company requirements.

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly disagree

(13). Pollution is a by-product of many companies' need to stay in business.

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly disagree

(14). An employee may need to lie to a co-worker to protect the company.

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly disagree

(15). An employee may have to deal with others (outside of the company) without company permission because s/he feels it would be in the best interest of the company.

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly disagree

(16). Profits should be given a higher priority than the safety of a product.

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly disagree

(17). It is a good business practice to plan for a product's obsolescence.

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly disagree

(18). An employee may need to lie to a supervisor/manager to protect the company.

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly disagree

(19). Employees are entitled to receive gifts or kickbacks for doing their jobs.

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly disagree

(20). An organization should be concerned about protecting the community against possible harm from its operations.

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly disagree

(21). An employee may need to lie to another company's representative to protect the company.

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly disagree

If anyone would like a copy of the results from this pilot study, please contact me through the Psychology Dept. located at PS 214, or Dr. Janet Kottke at 880-5585. Once again, thank your for your time and input.

Kristina Froelich

Appendix B

Pilot Study #2 Questionnaire (Role Conflict Scale)

ATTITUDE SURVEY

This is a pilot study designed to measure your reactions to the following items which will ask you about some specific attitudes. Please respond to these items as they apply to you in your present situation. Your responses will be kept completely anonymous and your participation is voluntary. Please answer all the questions because every response you make is important. Thank you for your time and input.

RESPONSES: 1=causes no conflict, 2=causes slight conflict. 3=I'm not sure, 4=causes moderate conflict, 5=causes high conflict.

DO YOU FEEL A CONFLICT WHEN:

(1). You are asked to put your work before your family.
causes no conflict 1 2 3 4 5 causes high conflict

DO YOU FEEL A CONFLICT WHEN:

(2). You want to be highly recognized at work while still wanting to maximize your personal development.

causes no conflict 1 2 3 4 5 causes high conflict

DO YOU FEEL A CONFLICT WHEN:

(3). Supporting recreational activities takes time away from your career development.

causes no conflict 1 2 3 4 5 causes high conflict

DO YOU FEEL A CONFLICT WHEN:

(4). Your desire to take a long vacation coincides with being needed at work.

causes no conflict 1 2 3 4 5 causes high conflict

DO YOU FEEL A CONFLICT WHEN:

(5). Your need for time with your family coincides with your work's demand for time from you.

causes no conflict 1 2 3 4 5 causes high conflict

DO YOU FEEL A CONFLICT WHEN:

(6). You are asked to give priority to your family rather than to yourself.

causes no conflict 1 2 3 4 5 causes high conflict

DO YOU FEEL A CONFLICT BETWEEN:

(7). Wanting to advance career-wise and still have a family.

causes no conflict 1 2 3 4 5 causes high conflict

DO YOU FEEL A CONFLICT WHEN:

(8). You end up spending most evenings on work-related activities instead of with your family.

causes no conflict 1 2 3 4 5 causes high conflict

DO YOU FEEL A CONFLICT WHEN:

(9). You devote recreational time to yourself instead of devoting extra time to your work.

causes no conflict 1 2 3 4 5 causes high conflict

DO YOU FEEL A CONFLICT WHEN:

(10). You handle the household management yourself even though you feel that your family should share the household responsibilities.

causes no conflict 1 2 3 4 5 causes high conflict

DO YOU FEEL A CONFLICT WHEN:

(11). You want to be alone but your family wants to be with you.

causes no conflict 1 2 3 4 5 causes high conflict

DO YOU FEEL A CONFLICT WHEN:

(12). You feel overloaded by household responsibilities but do not trust others to perform them.

causes no conflict 1 2 3 4 5 causes high conflict

DO YOU FEEL A CONFLICT WHEN:

(13). You quit working in a satisfying work environment because of family obligations.

causes no conflict 1 2 3 4 5 causes high conflict

DO YOU FEEL A CONFLICT WHEN:

(14). You spend time with your family instead of spending time with your co-workers.

causes no conflict 1 2 3 4 5 causes high conflict

DO YOU FEEL A CONFLICT WHEN:

(15). You let your work consume nearly all your time and energy instead of devoting time to the development of outside interests.

causes no conflict 1 2 3 4 5 causes high conflict

DO YOU FEEL A CONFLICT WHEN:

(16). You want to be a "good" family member but feel unable to risk taking time from your work.

causes no conflict 1 2 3 4 5 causes high conflict

DO YOU FEEL A CONFLICT WHEN:

(17). You devote a large percentage of time to your family instead of devoting a large percentage of your time to your work.

causes no conflict 1 2 3 4 5 causes high conflict

DO YOU FEEL A CONFLICT WHEN:

(18). You advance your career goals instead of developing meaningful relationships.

causes no conflict 1 2 3 4 5 causes high conflict

DO YOU FEEL A CONFLICT WHEN:

(19). You do what you know needs to be done to advance in your work instead of what you would prefer to do in your work.

causes no conflict 1 2 3 4 5 causes high conflict

(20). In general, how much total role conflict do you experience?

1	2	3	4	5
no	slight	not	moderate	high
conflict	conflict	sure	conflict	conflict

GENDER: F M

AGE: 18-25 26-35 36-45 46-55 56-65

HOW MANY YEARS EMPLOYED? _____ years

If anyone would like a copy of the results from this pilot study, please contact me through the Psychology Dept. located at PS 214, or Dr. Janet Kottke at 880-5585. Once again, thank you for your time and input.

Kristina Froelich

Appendix C

Pilot Study Descriptive Statistics (Ethics Scale)

	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
<u>SEX:</u>		
Female	19	45.2
Male	20	47.6
Missing	<u>3</u>	<u>7.1</u>
	N = 42	100.0

AGE GROUP

18 - 25	13	31.0
26 - 35	18	42.9
36 - 45	10	23.8
46 - 55	1	2.4
55 - 65	0	0.0

YEARS EMPLOYED

<u>MEAN</u>	<u>STANDARD DEVIATION</u>	<u>RANGE</u>
9.69	5.94	1 - 22

Appendix D

Pilot Study Descriptive Statistics (Role Conflict Scale)

	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
<u>SEX:</u>		
Female	18	43.9
Male	20	48.8
Missing	<u>3</u>	<u>7.3</u>
	N = 41	100.0

AGE GROUP

18 - 25	13	31.7
26 - 35	17	41.5
36 - 45	10	24.4
46 - 55	1	2.4
55 - 65	0	0.0

YEARS EMPLOYED

<u>MEAN</u>	<u>STANDARD DEVIATION</u>	<u>RANGE</u>
9.71	5.96	1 - 22

Appendix E

Pilot Study Reliability Analysis (Ethics Scale)

SCALE	ORIGINAL	REVISED
	Corrected Item-	Corrected Item-
	Total <u>Correlation</u>	
Item 1	.159	----
Item 2	.437	.514
Item 3	.605	.593
Item 4	.567	.727
Item 5	.442	.588
Item 6	.337	.267
Item 7	.243	.418
Item 8	.396	.522
Item 9	-.220	----
Item 10	.404	.602
Item 11	-.165	----
Item 12	.255	----
Item 13	.290	.211
Item 14	.558	.554
Item 15	.078	----
Item 16	.433	.594
Item 17	-.102	----
Item 18	.507	.643

Item 19	.359	.320
Item 20	-.180	----
Item 21	<u>.439</u>	<u>.481</u>

alpha = .685

alpha = .839

N = 42

N = 42

Appendix F

Pilot Study Reliability Analysis (Role Conflict Scale)

Scale	ORIGINAL Corrected Item- Total Correlation	REVISED Corrected Item- Total Correlation
Item 1	.394	.423
Item 2	.380	.404
Item 3	.512	.528
Item 4	.570	.582
Item 5	.406	.423
Item 6	.263	.301
Item 7	.565	.572
Item 8	.168	----
Item 9	.403	.370
Item 10	.207	----
Item 11	.267	.261
Item 12	.346	.319
Item 13	.435	.433
Item 14	.192	----
Item 15	.481	.449
Item 16	.633	.629
Item 17	.311	.301

Item 18	.380	.338
Item 19	.324	.319
Item 20	<u>.582</u>	<u>.591</u>

Alpha = .82

Alpha = .83

N of cases = 41

N of cases = 41

Appendix G

Thesis Study Demographic Descriptions

<u>Percent</u>	<u>SEX:</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	
Female		122	54.2
Male		102	45.3
Missing		<u>1</u>	<u>0.4</u>
		N = 225	100.0
<u>AGE GROUP</u>			
18 - 25		127	56.3
26 - 35		44	19.7
36 - 45		34	14.9
46 - 55		13	5.6
55 - 65		3	1.2
Missing		4	1.8
<u>YEARS EMPLOYED</u>			
1 - 10		156	69.3
11 - 20		42	18.7
21 - 30		16	6.6
31 - 40		6	2.5
Missing		5	2.2

WORK HOURS

Full Time	110	48.9
Part Time	70	31.1
Missing	45	20.0

CLASS LEVEL

Freshman (and below)	93	41.3
Graduate	50	22.2
Sophomore	44	19.6
Senior	9	4.0
Junior	7	3.1
Missing	44	19.6

Appendix H

Thesis Study Cover Letter

ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

The purpose of this study is to examine the effects that job satisfaction, role conflict, and some ethical behaviors and attitudes have on a worker's organizational commitment. Please respond to the items as you believe they apply to you, and please answer all of the items because your opinions and experience are very important. Everything on this survey will be kept confidential, and your participation is voluntary. In addition, I want to say that I appreciate your cooperation.

If you would like information about this study's results, please fill in your name and address at the bottom of this page. Or you can contact me through the Psychology Dept. at PS 214, or through my advisor Dr. Janet Kottke at 880-5585.

Thank you very much for your time and input.

Kristina Froelich

NAME _____

ADDRESS _____

Appendix I

Thesis Study Survey

First, please tell us about yourself:

SEX: M F

AGE: _____

CLASS: Fr So Jr Sr Grad

YEARS WORKED SINCE HIGH SCHOOL: _____

FULL /PART TIME?

Please use the following responses for items 1-23:

(Responses: 1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=somewhat disagree, 4=I'm not sure, 5=somewhat agree, 6=agree, 7=strongly agree)

* 1. This organization has a fine tradition of public service.

strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly agree

2. If I had my life to live over again, I would still choose to work for this organization.

strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly agree

3. I really feel as if this organization's problems are my problems.

strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly agree

4. I feel a sense of pride in working for this organization.

strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly agree

5. The record of this organization is an example of what dedicated people can achieve.

strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly agree

6. I would advise a young college graduate to choose a management career in this organization.

strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly agree

7. The major satisfaction in my life comes from my job.

strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly agree

8. I do what my job description requires: this organization does not have the right to expect more.

strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly agree

9. I don't mind spending a half-hour past quitting time if I can finish a task.

strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly agree

10. The most important things that happen to me involve my work.

strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly agree

11. I live, eat, and breathe my job.

strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly agree

12. Most things in life are more important than my work.

strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly agree

13. As long as I am doing the kind of work I enjoy, it doesn't matter what particular organization I work for.

strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly agree

14. I feel a strong sense of loyalty toward this organization.

strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly agree

15. If another organization offered me more money for the same kind of work, I would almost certainly accept.

strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly agree

16. I have always felt that this organization was a cold, unfriendly place to work.

strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly agree

17. Over the years I have grown fond of the organization as a place to work.

strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly agree

18. Generally speaking, my career in this organization has been satisfactory.

strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly agree

19. I have warm feelings toward this organization as a place to work.

strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly agree

20. I have no particular feelings or sentiments toward this organization at all.

strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly agree

21. My loyalty is to my work, not to any particular organization.

strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly agree

22. Few organizations can match this one as a good place to work.

strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly agree

23. Based on what I know now and what I believe I can expect, I would be quite willing to spend the rest of my career with this organization.

strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly agree

Please use the following responses for item 24:

(Response: 1=extremely not committed, 2=very not committed, 3=not committed, 4=I'm not sure, 5=committed, 6=very committed, 7=totally committed)

24. Overall, how committed are you to your career?

extremely not 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 totally committed

Please use the following responses for items 25-39:

(Responses: 1=I'm extremely dissatisfied, 2=I'm very dissatisfied, 3=I'm moderately dissatisfied, 4=I'm not sure, 5=I'm moderately satisfied, 6=I'm very satisfied, 7=I'm extremely satisfied)

HOW WOULD YOU DESCRIBE YOUR FEELINGS ABOUT:

25. The physical working conditions at your job?

extremely dissatisfied 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 extremely satisfied

26. The freedom to choose your own method of working?

extremely dissatisfied 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 extremely satisfied

* 27. Your fellow workers?

extremely dissatisfied 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 extremely satisfied

28. The recognition you get for good work?

extremely dissatisfied 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 extremely satisfied

29. Your immediate boss?

extremely dissatisfied 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 extremely satisfied

30. The amount of responsibility you are given?
 extremely dissatisfied 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 extremely satisfied
31. Your rate of pay?
 extremely dissatisfied 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 extremely satisfied
32. Your opportunity to use your abilities?
 extremely dissatisfied 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 extremely satisfied
33. The industrial relations between management and workers in your firm?
 extremely dissatisfied 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 extremely satisfied
34. Your chance of promotion?
 extremely dissatisfied 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 extremely satisfied
35. The way your firm is managed?
 extremely dissatisfied 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 extremely satisfied
36. The attention paid to suggestions you make?
 extremely dissatisfied 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 extremely satisfied
37. Your hours of work?
 extremely dissatisfied 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 extremely satisfied
38. The amount of variety in your job?
 extremely dissatisfied 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 extremely satisfied
39. Your job security?
 extremely dissatisfied 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 extremely satisfied

Please use the following responses for items 40-58:

RESPONSES: (1=causes no conflict, 2=causes slight conflict, 3=I'm not sure, 4=causes moderate conflict, 5=causes high conflict)

DO YOU FEEL A CONFLICT WHEN:

40. You are asked to put your work before your family.

causes no conflict 1 2 3 4 5 causes high conflict

DO YOU FEEL A CONFLICT WHEN:

41. You want to be highly recognized at work while still wanting to maximize your personal development.

causes no conflict 1 2 3 4 5 causes high conflict

DO YOU FEEL A CONFLICT WHEN:

42. Supporting recreational activities takes time away from your career development.

causes no conflict 1 2 3 4 5 causes high conflict

DO YOU FEEL A CONFLICT WHEN:

43. Your desire to take a long vacation coincides with being needed at work.

causes no conflict 1 2 3 4 5 causes high conflict

DO YOU FEEL A CONFLICT WHEN:

44. Your need for time with your family coincides with your work's demand for time from you.

causes no conflict 1 2 3 4 5 causes high conflict

DO YOU FEEL A CONFLICT WHEN:

45. You are asked to give priority to your family rather than to yourself.

causes no conflict 1 2 3 4 5 causes high conflict

DO YOU FEEL A CONFLICT BETWEEN:

46. Wanting to advance career-wise and still have a family.

causes no conflict 1 2 3 4 5 causes high conflict

DO YOU FEEL A CONFLICT WHEN:

47. You end up spending most evenings on work-related activities instead of with your family.

causes no conflict 1 2 3 4 5 causes high conflict

DO YOU FEEL A CONFLICT WHEN:

48. You devote recreational time to yourself instead of devoting extra time to your work.

causes no conflict 1 2 3 4 5 causes high conflict

DO YOU FEEL A CONFLICT WHEN:

49. You handle the household management even though you feel that your family should share the household responsibilities.

causes no conflict 1 2 3 4 5 causes high conflict

DO YOU FEEL A CONFLICT WHEN:

50. You want to be alone but your family wants to be with you.

causes no conflict 1 2 3 4 5 causes high conflict

DO YOU FEEL A CONFLICT WHEN:

51. You feel overloaded by household responsibilities but do not trust others to perform them.

causes no conflict 1 2 3 4 5 causes high conflict

DO YOU FEEL A CONFLICT WHEN:

52. You quit working in a satisfying work environment because of family obligations.

causes no conflict 1 2 3 4 5 causes high conflict

DO YOU FEEL A CONFLICT WHEN:

* 53. You spend time with your family instead of spending time with your co-workers.

causes no conflict 1 2 3 4 5 causes high conflict

DO YOU FEEL A CONFLICT WHEN:

54. You let your work consume nearly all your time and energy instead of devoting time to the development of outside interests.

causes no conflict 1 2 3 4 5 causes high conflict

DO YOU FEEL A CONFLICT WHEN:

55. You want to be a "good" family member but feel unable to risk taking time from your work.

causes no conflict 1 2 3 4 5 causes high conflict

DO YOU FEEL A CONFLICT WHEN:

56. You devote a large percentage of time to your family instead of devoting a large percentage of your time to your work.

causes no conflict 1 2 3 4 5 causes high conflict

DO YOU FEEL A CONFLICT WHEN:

57. You advance your career goals instead of developing meaningful relationships.

causes no conflict 1 2 3 4 5 causes high conflict

DO YOU FEEL A CONFLICT WHEN:

58. You do what you know needs to be done to advance in your work instead of what you would prefer to do in your work.

causes no conflict 1 2 3 4 5 causes high conflict

59. In general, how much total role conflict do you experience?

1	2	3	4	5
no conflict	slight conflict	not sure	moderate conflict	high conflict

Please use the following responses for items 60-75:

(Responses: 1=strongly agree, 2=agree, 3=somewhat agree, 4=I'm not sure, 5=somewhat disagree, 6=disagree, 7=strongly disagree)

* 60. At work, employees can expect to experience a conflict between what is required of them as workers and what they believe is right as ethical people.

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly disagree

61. It is okay for a supervisor to ask an employee to support someone else's incorrect viewpoint.

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly disagree

62. An employee may need to lie to a customer/client to protect the company.

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly disagree

63. It is sometimes necessary for the company to engage in shady practices because the competition is doing so.

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly disagree

64. An employee should overlook someone else's wrongdoing if it is in the best interest of the company.

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly disagree

* 65. Organizations occasionally misrepresent products to make them look better to the consumer.

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly disagree

66. An employee should be asked to do business with a supervisor's friends.

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly disagree

67. A supervisor should not care how results are achieved as long as the desired outcome occurs.

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly disagree

68. There is nothing wrong with a supervisor asking an employee to falsify a document.

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly disagree

69. It is not unusual for employees to experience a conflict between their own beliefs of social responsibility and company requirements.

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly disagree

* 70. Pollution is a by-product of many companies' need to stay in business.

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly disagree

71. An employee may need to lie to a co-worker to protect the company.

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly disagree

72. Profits should be given a higher priority than the safety of a product.

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly disagree

* 73. An employee may need to lie to a supervisor/manager to protect the company.

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly disagree

* 74. Employees are entitled to receive gifts or kickbacks for doing their jobs.

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly disagree

75. An employee may need to lie to another company's representative to protect the company.

strongly agree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 strongly disagree

* Items were deleted

Appendix J

Thesis Study Reliability Analysis

(Organizational Commitment)

ITEM	MEAN	MINIMUM	MAXIMUM	RANGE	MAX/MIN	VARIANCE
MEANS	4.08	2.360	5.565	3.204	2.358	.836

ITEM	MEAN	MINIMUM	MAXIMUM	RANGE	MAX/MIN	VARIANCE
VARIANCES	3.06	2.029	4.190	2.161	2.065	.287

INTER-ITEM	MEAN	MINIMUM	MAXIMUM	RANGE	MAX/MIN	VARIANCE
CORRELATIONS	.257	-.028	.758	.786	-27.56	.021

SCALE	ORIGINAL SCALE		REVISED	
	MEAN	CORRECTED	SCALE	
IF ITEM	ITEM-	ALPHA	ALPHA	
DELETED	TOTAL	IF ITEM	IF ITEM	
	CORRELATION	DELETED	DELETED	
01	92.729	.354	.890	.895
02	93.431	.568	.884	.890
03	94.227	.462	.888	.894
04	92.916	.709	.882	.897
05	92.996	.533	.886	.891

06	94.253	.530	.886	.891
07	94.622	.547	.885	.891
08	93.436	.314	.891	.898
09	92.698	.366	.890	.896
010	94.747	.464	.887	.893
011	95.493	.336	.890	.896
012	94.742	.295	.892	.898
013	94.924	.213	.894	----
014	93.204	.671	.882	.888
015	95.067	.376	.890	.897
016	92.289	.347	.890	.896
017	93.236	.667	.883	.888
018	93.049	.603	.884	.890
019	93.142	.755	.881	.886
020	93.018	.572	.885	.891
021	94.187	.225	.893	----
022	94.084	.630	.883	.890
023	94.978	.600	.884	.890
024	93.160	.358	<u>.890</u>	<u>.896</u>
		ALPHA =	.891	.897

Appendix K

Thesis Study Reliability Analysis (Job Satisfaction)

ITEM	MEAN	MINIMUM	MAXIMUM	RANGE	MAX/MIN	VARIANCE
MEANS	4.617	3.739	5.329	1.600	1.429	.248

ITEM	MEAN	MINIMUM	MAXIMUM	RANGE	MAX/MIN	VARIANCE
VARIANCES	3.037	1.686	3.681	1.995	2.183	.401

INTER-ITEM	MEAN	MINIMUM	MAXIMUM	RANGE	MAX/MIN	VARIANCE
CORRELATIONS	.374	.077	.681	.604	8.880	.017

	ORIGINAL SCALE		REVISED	
SCALE	CORRECTED		SCALE	
MEAN	ITEM-	ALPHA	ALPHA	
IF ITEM	TOTAL	IF ITEM	IF ITEM	
DELETED	CORRELATION	DELETED	DELETED	
J1	64.249	.435	.899	.902
J2	64.218	.574	.895	.897
J3	63.920	.329	.902	----
J4	64.893	.715	.889	.891
J5	64.347	.605	.894	.896

J6	64.124	.666	.892	.893
J7	65.520	.530	.897	.899
J8	64.707	.683	.891	.892
J9	65.058	.650	.892	.894
J10	65.338	.644	.892	.893
J11	65.258	.654	.892	.893
J12	64.773	.694	.891	.892
J13	64.169	.416	.901	.903
J14	64.653	.633	.893	.894
J15	64.258	.480	<u>.899</u>	<u>.901</u>
ALPHA =			.901	.902

Appendix L

Thesis Study Reliability Analysis (Ethics)

ITEM	MEAN	MINIMUM	MAXIMUM	RANGE	MAX/MIN	VARIANCE
MEANS	4.914	3.280	6.240	2.960	1.902	.846

ITEM	MEAN	MINIMUM	MAXIMUM	RANGE	MAX/MIN	VARIANCE
VARIANCE	3.604	2.406	5.247	2.841	2.181	.548

INTER-ITEM	MEAN	MINIMUM	MAXIMUM	RANGE	MAX/MIN	VARIANCE
CORRELATIONS	.270	-.0364	.633	.669	-17.39	.034

	ORIGINAL SCALE		REVISED	
	SCALE	CORRECTED	ALPHA	SCALE
	MEAN	ITEM-	IF ITEM	ALPHA
	IF ITEM	TOTAL	DELETED	IF ITEM
	DELETED	CORRELATION	DELETED	DELETED
E1	75.022	.112	.856	.870
E2	72.964	.533	.834	.871
E3	73.880	.616	.829	.865
E4	73.142	.638	.829	.861
E5	73.364	.702	.825	.880
E6	75.351	.233	.853	----

E6	75.351	.233	.853	----
E7	73.471	.475	.837	.880
E8	73.373	.542	.834	.872
E9	72.391	.629	.831	.864
E10	75.204	.224	.850	----
E11	74.636	.226	.855	----
E12	73.378	.620	.829	.871
E13	72.538	.470	.838	.875
E14	73.031	.674	.828	----
E15	74.222	.369	.844	----
E16	73.498	.596	<u>.831</u>	<u>.872</u>
ALPHA =			.846	.882

Appendix M

Thesis Study Reliability Analysis (Role Conflict)

ITEM	MEAN	MINIMUM	MAXIMUM	RANGE	MAX/MIN	VARIANCE
MEANS	2.800	1.604	3.702	2.098	2.308	.269

ITEM	MEAN	MINIMUM	MAXIMUM	RANGE	MAX/MIN	VARIANCE
VARIANCES	1.649	.946	1.991	1.046	2.106	.087

INTER-ITEM	MEAN	MINIMUM	MAXIMUM	RANGE	MAX/MIN	VARIANCE
CORRELATIONS	.247	-.002	.574	.576	-255.63	.013

	ORIGINAL SCALE		REVISED	
	SCALE	CORRECTED	SCALE	SCALE
	MEAN	ITEM-	ALPHA	ALPHA
	IF ITEM	TOTAL	IF ITEM	IF ITEM
	DELETED	CORRELATION	DELETED	DELETED
C1	52.302	.447	.864	.864
C2	53.107	.404	.866	.866
C3	53.516	.413	.865	.866
C4	52.773	.456	.864	.864
C5	52.556	.610	.858	.858
C6	53.538	.428	.865	.866

C7	53.373	.580	.859	.859
C8	52.836	.525	.861	.861
C9	54.071	.303	.869	.870
C10	53.120	.427	.865	.866
C11	53.298	.512	.866	.862
C12	53.222	.444	.864	.865
C13	53.018	.514	.862	.852
C14	54.400	.250	.870	----
C15	52.529	.543	.861	.860
C16	53.036	.627	.857	.857
C17	53.947	.386	.866	.867
C18	53.009	.386	.866	.867
C19	53.236	.449	.864	.865
C20	53.200	.549	<u>.861</u>	<u>.864</u>
		ALPHA =	.870	.870

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Angle, H. L., & Perry, J.L. (1981). An empirical assessment of organizational commitment and organizational effectiveness. Administrative Science Quarterly, 26, 1-14.
- Ball, G. (1965). Memo to Lyndon Johnson dated July, 1965.
- Baumhart, R.C. (1961). How ethical are businessmen? Harvard Business Review. 39, (July-August), 5-176.
- Becker, H.S. (1960). Notes on the concept of commitment. American Journal of Sociology, 66, 32-42.
- Blau, G.J., & Boal, K.B. (1987). Conceptualizing how job involvement and organizational commitment affect turnover and absenteeism. Academy of Management Review. 12, 288-300.
- Brenner, S.N., & Molander, E.A. (1977). Is the ethics of business changing? Harvard Business Review. 55, (January-February), 57-71.
- Buchanan, B. (1979). Building organizational commitment: The socialization of managers in work organizations. Administrative Science Quarterly, 19, 533-546.
as cited in : Cook, J.D., Hepworth, S. J., Wall, T.D., & Warr, P.B. (1981). The experience of work. London: Academic Press.
- Clinard, M.B., & Yeager, P.C. (1980). Corporate Crime. New York: The Free Press.
- Cook, J.D., Hepworth, S.J., Wall, T.D., & Warr, P.B. (1981). The experience of work. London: Academic Press.
- Cook, F.J. (1966). The corrupted land: The social morality of modern America. New York: Macmillan.
as cited in: Clinard, M.B., & Yeager, P.C. (1980). Corporate crime. New York; The Free Press.
- Drucker, P.F. (1972). Concept of the corporation. Revised edition. New York: Mentor.
as cited in: Clinard, M.B., & Yeager, P.C. (1980). Corporate crime. New York: The Free Press.

- Elman, M., & Gilbert, L. (1984). Coping strategies for professional women with children. Family Relations, 33, 317-327.
- Etziol, F.A. (1975). A comparative analysis of complex organizations: On power, involvement and their correlates. New York: Free Press.
- Fisher, K.K. (1989). Managing in the high-commitment workplace. Organizational Dynamics, Winter, 31-50.
- Geis, G. (1982). On white-collar crime. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Gibson, J.L., Ivancevich, J.M., & Donnelly, Jr., J.H. (1985). Organization: Behavior, structure, processes. (5th ed.) Plano, Texas: Business Publications, Inc.
- Graddick, M.M., & Farr, J.L. (1983). Professionals in scientific disciplines: Sex-related differences in working life commitments. Journal of Applied Psychology, 68, 641-645.
- Greenhaus, J. & Beutell, N. (1985). Sources of conflict between work and family roles. Academy of Management Review, 10, 76-88.
- Hacker, A. (1978). Loyalty-and the whistle-blower. Across the Board, 15(11) 4,5,8,9,67.
- Hampton, D.R., Summer, C.E., & Webber, R.A. (1987). Organizational Behavior and the Practice of Management. Glenview: Illinois. Scott, Foresman, & Company.
- Hoffer, E. (1963). The true believer. New York: Time.
- Holahan, C.K., & Gilbert, L.A. (1979). Interrole conflict for working women: Careers versus jobs. Journal of Applied Psychology, 64, 86-90.
- Hom, P.W., Katerberg, R., & Hulin, C.L. (1979). Comparative examination of three approaches to the prediction of turnover. Journal of Applied Psychology, 64, 280-290.

- Hrebiniak, L. G., & Alutto, J.A. (1972). Personal and role-related factors in the development of organizational commitment. Administrative Science Quarterly, 17, 555-573.
- Kanter, R. (1977). Men and women of the corporation. New York: Basic Books.
- Katz, D., & Kahn, R.L. (1966). The social psychology of organizations. New York: Wiley.
- Korman, A., & Korman, R. (1980). Career success/personal failure. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Larson, E.W., & Fukami, C.V. (1984). Relationships between worker behavior and commitment to the organization and union. Proceedings of the Academy of Management, 222-226.
- Lawrence, P.R. (1958). The changing of organizational behavior patterns, a case study of decentralization. Boston: Harvard Business School.
- Meyer, J.P., Paunonen, S.V., Gellatly, I.R., Goffin, R.D., & Jackson, D.N. (1989). Organizational commitment and job performance: It's the nature of the commitment that counts. Journal of Applied Psychology, 24, 152-156.
- Morrow, P.C., & McElroy, J.C. (1987). Work commitment and job satisfaction over three career stages. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 30, 330-345.
- Morrow, P.C. (1983). Concept redundancy in organizational research: The case of work commitment, Academy of Management Review, 8, 486-500.
- Mowday, R.T., Porter, L.W., & Steers, R.M. (1982). Employee-organizational linkages: The psychology of commitment, absenteeism, and turnover. New York: Academic Press.
- Mowday, R.T., Porter, R.M., & Porter, L.W. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 14, 224-247.
- Mullen, W.F. (1976). Presidential power and politics. New York: St. Martin's Press.

- Nunnally, J.C. (1978). Psychometric Theory, (Second Edition), New York: McGraw Hall.
- O'Reilly, C., & Caldwell, D. (1980). Job choice: The impact of intrinsic and extrinsic factors on subsequent satisfaction and commitment. Journal of Applied Psychology, 65, 559-569.
- Porter, L.W., Crampon, W.J., & Smith, F.W. (1976) Organizational commitment and managerial turnover: A longitudinal study. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 15, 87-98.
- Porter, L.W., Steers, R.M., Mowday, R.T., & Boulian, P.V. (1974). Organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover among psychiatric technicians. Journal of Applied Psychology, 59, 603-609.
- Randall, D.M. (1987). Commitment and the organization: The organization man revisited. Academy of Management Review, 12, 460-471.
- Reichers, A.E. (1986). Conflict and organizational commitments. Journal of Applied Psychology, 71, 508-514.
- Robbins, S.P. (1983). Organizational behavior: Concepts, controversies, and applications. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Romzek, B.S. (1989). Personal consequences of employee commitment. Academy of Management Journal, 32, 649-661.
- Ritzer, G., & Trice, H.M. (1969). An empirical study of Howard Becker's side-bet theory. Social Forces, 47, 475-479.
- Rowan, R. (1981, February 9). Rekindling corporate loyalty. Fortune, pp. 54-58.
- Saal, F.E., & Knight, P.A. (1988). Industrial/organizational psychology: Science and practice. Pacific Grove, Ca.: Brooks/Cole Publishing.

- Salancik, G.K. (1977). Commitment and the control of organizational behavior. In B.M. Staw & G.K. Salancik (Eds.) New Directions in organizational behavior, (pp. 1-54). Chicago: St. Clair.
- Staw, B.M., & Ross, J. (1978). Commitment to a policy decision: A multi-theoretical perspective. Administrative Science Quarterly, 23, 41-64.
- Steers, R.M. (1977). Organizational effectiveness: A behavioral view. Santa Monica, Ca: Goodyear.
- Stevens, J.M., Beyer, J.M., & Trice, H.M. (1978). Assessing personal, role, and organizational predictors of managerial commitment. Academy of Management Journal, 21, 380-396.
- Stumpf, S.A., & Hartman, K. (1984). Individual exploration to organizational commitment or withdrawal. Academy of Management Journal, 27, 308-329.
- Thompson, V. (1965). Bureaucracy and innovation. Administrative Science Quarterly, 10, 1-20.
- Whyte, W. (1956). The organization man. New York, New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Wright, J. (1980). On a clear day you can see General Motors. New York: Avon Books.