

2009

Examining a multidimensional model of attitudinal commitment

Kyle W. Groff
University of South Florida

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/etd>

 Part of the [American Studies Commons](#)

Scholar Commons Citation

Groff, Kyle W., "Examining a multidimensional model of attitudinal commitment" (2009). *Graduate Theses and Dissertations*.
<http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/etd/1992>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at Scholar Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Graduate Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Scholar Commons. For more information, please contact scholarcommons@usf.edu.

Examining a Multidimensional Model of Attitudinal Commitment

by

Kyle W. Groff

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts
Department of Psychology
College of Arts and Sciences
University of South Florida

Major Professor: Russell Johnson, Ph.D.
Chu-Hsiang Chang, Ph.D.
Michael Brannick, Ph.D.

Date of Approval:
February 11, 2009

Keywords: organizational commitment; affective commitment; positive affect;
identification; willingness to exert effort

© Copyright 2009 , Kyle W. Groff

Dedication

This master's thesis is dedicated to my parents, Jake and Mary Groff, who taught me what hard-work really is and who continue to support me in every aspect of my life.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my major professor, Russ Johnson, Ph.D., for his guidance and consideration during the duration of this project. The following people also deserve acknowledgement for their contribution to the work presented here:

Cailin Huppert

Meng Taing

Ben Granger

Daisy Chang, Ph.D.

Mike Brannick, Ph.D.

Table of Contents

List of Tables.....	vi
Abstract.....	vii
Introduction.....	1
Organizational Commitment.....	3
Dimensionality of Affective Organizational Commitment.....	4
Positive Affect for the Organization.....	5
Identification with the Organization.....	6
Willingness to Exert Effort.....	6
Interrelationships among the Organizational Commitments.....	7
Positive Affect.....	7
Hypothesis 1.....	8
Identification with the Organization.....	8
Hypothesis 2.....	9
Willingness to Exert Effort on Behalf of the Organization.....	9
Hypothesis 3.....	10
Correlates of Organizational Commitment.....	10
Correlates of Positive Affect for the Organization.....	10
Job Satisfaction.....	11
Regulatory Focus.....	11

Hypothesis 4.....	12
Correlates of Identification with the Organization.....	12
Collectivism.....	12
Transformational Leadership.....	13
Procedural Justice.....	13
Hypothesis 5.....	14
Correlates of Willingness to Exert Effort.....	14
Perceived Organizational Support.....	14
Distributive Justice.....	15
Hypothesis 6.....	16
Outcomes of Organizational Commitment.....	16
Outcomes of Positive Affect for the Organization.....	16
OCB Directed at Individuals.....	17
Job Strain.....	17
Hypothesis 7.....	18
Outcomes of Identification with the Organization.....	18
OCB Directed at the Organization.....	18
Hypothesis 8.....	19
Outcomes of Willingness to Exert Effort on Behalf of the Organization.....	19
Task Performance.....	19
Hypothesis 9.....	20
Focal Behaviors.....	20

Hypothesis 10.....	20
Method.....	22
Participants and Procedure.....	22
Measures.....	24
Organizational Commitment.....	24
Job Satisfaction.....	24
Regulatory Focus.....	25
Collectivism.....	25
Transformational Leadership.....	25
Justice.....	25
POS.....	26
Strain.....	26
OCB.....	26
Task Performance.....	26
Turnover.....	27
Absenteeism.....	27
Results.....	28
Factor Structure of Attitudinal Organizational Commitment.....	28
Relationships among the Commitments (H1-H3).....	28
Regression and Relative Weights Analyses.....	31
Correlates of Attitudinal Commitment (H4-H6).....	32
Outcomes of Attitudinal Commitment (H7-H10).....	37
Discussion.....	40

Relationships among the Commitments.....	40
Attitudinal Commitment Based on Positive Affect.....	42
Attitudinal Commitment Based on Organizational Identification.....	43
Attitudinal Commitment Based on Willingness to Exert Effort.....	45
The Set of Attitudinal Commitment Dimensions.....	46
Implications and Future Research.....	47
Limitations.....	49
Conclusion.....	50
References.....	51
Appendices.....	59
Appendix A: Attitudinal Commitment.....	60
Appendix B: Meyer and Allen’s Commitment Scales.....	61
Appendix C: Continuance Commitment.....	62
Appendix D: Job Satisfaction.....	63
Appendix E: Regulatory Focus.....	64
Appendix F: Collectivism.....	65
Appendix G: Transformational Leadership.....	66
Appendix H: Justice.....	67
Appendix I: Perceived Organizational Support.....	68
Appendix J: Work Strain.....	69
Appendix K: Organizational Citizenship Behavior.....	70
Appendix L: Task Performance.....	71
Appendix M: Turnover Intentions.....	72

Appendix N: Absenteeism.....73

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	Summary of Hypotheses.....	21
Table 2	Descriptive Statistics and Correlations among Variables.....	29
Table 3	Incremental Prediction of Attitudinal Commitment based on Positive Affect.....	33
Table 4	Relative Weights Analysis Results for the Correlates of Attitudinal Commitment.....	35
Table 5	Relative Weights Analysis Results for the Outcomes of Attitudinal Commitment.....	35
Table 6	Incremental Prediction of Attitudinal Commitment based on Identification.....	36
Table 7	Incremental Prediction of Attitudinal Commitment based on Willingness to Exert Effort.....	37
Table 8	Regression Results for the Set of the Attitudinal Commitment Variables.....	39

Examining a Multidimensional Model of Attitudinal Commitment

Kyle W. Groff

ABSTRACT

Attitudinal commitment (AOC) to the organization is consistently viewed as the most desirable form of organizational commitment due to its consistently positive relationship with many desirable workplace outcomes. Though researchers tend to overlap considerably with their definitions of attitudinal commitment, consensus on how to define and operationalize this form of organizational commitment has yet to be reached.

Recently, Jaussi (2007) proposed a multidimensional model of AOC that borrows from the various conceptualizations of AOC in an attempt to form an all encompassing scale. The current study examined the utility of using a multidimensional measure of AOC by examining the unique relationships that the dimensions of AOC have with other forms of commitment as well important workplace correlates and outcomes. Bivariate correlations were used to examine the relationships that the dimensions of AOC have with other forms of organizational commitment. In addition, hierarchical regression analyses were used to examine the unique variance that particular dimensions of AOC account for in correlates and outcomes of organizational commitment. Finally, hierarchical regression was used to examine the variance that the set of AOC dimensions accounts for in focal behaviors (e.g., turnover intentions). Results indicate that using a multidimensional

model of attitudinal commitment could prove fruitful for both researchers and organizations. Implications for research and practice are discussed.

INTRODUCTION

Organizational commitment is a highly researched job attitude that is linked to several important workplace behaviors, such as turnover intentions, organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB), and job satisfaction (Cooper-Hamik & Viswesvaran, 2005; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch, & Topolnytsky, 2002). Though researchers typically identify three types of organizational commitment, attitudinal commitment to the organization tends to receive the most attention due to its consistently high positive correlation with many desirable workplace outcomes (Meyer, Becker, & Vandenberghe, 2004; Meyer et al., 2002). However, the construct of attitudinal organizational commitment has been defined and operationalized in a number of different ways (Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1979; O'Reilly & Chatman, 1986; Meyer & Allen, 1991) with some researchers focusing on the affective component while others focus on the cognitive component and still others focus on the behavioral component. Recently, Jaussi (2007) attempted to unify the literature on attitudinal commitment by developing a scale that encompasses the unique dimensions identified by previous researchers while also ensuring that all the components (affective, cognitive, and behavioral) are included in its operationalization. However, Jaussi (2007) neglected to empirically verify that the various dimensions of attitudinal commitment have unique relationships with workplace outcomes. Therefore, it is unclear whether or not a multidimensional model of attitudinal commitment is useful or necessary.

The purpose of the current study was to examine relationships between a multidimensional model of attitudinal organizational commitment and important workplace outcomes and correlates. In addition, relationships between the dimensions of attitudinal commitment and the other forms of organizational commitment (e.g., continuance) were examined. Examining these relationships is a required step in determining the utility of a multidimensional scale. It may be possible that past researchers have simply used different semantics while describing the same construct. In this case, teasing apart the possible dimensions of attitudinal commitment would not be warranted. However, it is plausible that while researchers “have clearly overlapped in their formulations and definitions of attitudinal commitment” (Jaussi, 2007, p. 52), the observed differences may reflect meaningful differences with the construct of attitudinal commitment. In this case, there is need for an integrated model of attitudinal organizational commitment that ties together the different conceptualizations that researchers have used.

Verifying whether a multidimensional conceptualization of attitudinal commitment is needed serves several purposes. For researchers in the area of organizational commitment, it is important to ensure that all aspects of the theory underlying the construct of attitudinal commitment are included in its operationalization. For practitioners, the ability to better predict important workplace outcomes such as turnover intentions and task performance may require a more elaborate measure that successfully taps the multiple dimensions of attitudinal commitment. A simple, yet important, use for the current study that can be utilized by both researchers and practitioners is determining what length is necessary to fully cover the construct of

attitudinal commitment. If the construct is adequately accounted for in its current unidimensional operationalization, then using a longer, more convoluted measure is inefficient in terms of time and effort. Finally, it is important to examine the relationship that Jaussi's (2007) multidimensional attitudinal commitment scale has with other measures of organizational commitment in order to ensure that existing measures are not already capturing the construct(s) in question.

Organizational Commitment

Organizational commitment is a psychological force that binds employees to their organization and makes turnover less likely (Allen & Meyer, 1990). High levels of commitment also contribute to the performance of required job tasks and OCB (Meyer et al., 2002). Because commitment results from qualitatively different mindsets (Meyer & Herscovitch, 2001), it is a multidimensional construct (Jaros, Jermier, Koehler, & Sincich, 1993; Meyer & Allen, 1984; O'Reilly & Chatman, 1986). It is commonly conceptualized as encompassing three forms: attitudinal (also called affective), normative, and continuance (Allen & Meyer, 1990). *Attitudinal* organizational commitment (AOC) involves an emotional attachment to, involvement in, and identification with one's organization, all of which are based on a desire to belong. *Normative* organizational commitment (NOC) derives from a perceived obligation to maintain membership, which is grounded in a sense of morality. Lastly, *continuance* organizational commitment (COC) is derived from the perceived costs of leaving, including the loss of desired investments and few job alternatives. Interestingly, there is increasing evidence that COC encompasses more than one dimension (Hackett, Bycio, & Hausdorf, 1994; Meyer, Allen, & Gellatly, 1990; Somers, 1993; McGee & Ford, 1987;

Jaros, 1997). Groff, Granger, Taing, Jackson, and Johnson (2008) and Granger, Taing, Groff and Johnson (2008) argue that COC is comprised of two dimensions: few alternatives (FA) and economic exchanges (EE). COC-few alternatives is defined as commitment that develops when an employee feels a sense of being trapped in their current position. COC-economic exchanges is defined as commitment that develops when an employee perceives desirable economic exchange opportunities at their current job. The distinction between COC-few alternatives and –economic exchanges has proven useful because they are differentially related to work attitudes and performance (Granger et al., 2008; Groff et al., 2008). In general, attitudinal commitment, normative commitment, and continuance commitment based on economic exchanges tend to be positively related to favorable attitudinal and behavioral outcomes (e.g., job satisfaction and citizenship behaviors), whereas continuance commitment based on few alternatives is weakly related or, in some cases, negatively related to such outcomes (Granger et al., 2008; Groff et al., 2008; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Meyer et al., 2002). In the following section, I elaborate on Jaussi's (2007) multidimensional conceptualization of attitudinal commitment.

Dimensionality of Attitudinal Organizational Commitment

Of the multiple dimensions of organizational commitment, attitudinal organizational commitment (AOC) receives the most attention due to its consistently strong relationship with desirable workplace outcomes, such as job performance and attendance (Meyer et al., 2004; Meyer et al., 2002). Although different researchers have comparable definitions of AOC (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Meyer et al., 1990; Porter, Steers, Mowday, & Boulian, 1974; Mowday, Porter, & Dubin, 1974), Jaussi (2007) pointed out

that the operationalization of AOC has been less consistent (see Mowday et al., 1979; O'Reilly & Chatman, 1986; Meyer & Allen, 1991). For example, willingness to exert effort on the organization's behalf is a component of the definitions for AOC set forth by Meyer and Allen (1991), Mowday et al. (1979), and O'Reilly and Chatman (1986), but is measured, only by one item, in Mowday et al.'s (1979) scale. A thorough review of the definitions and accompanying scales of AOC reveals that AOC is a multidimensional construct (Jaussi, 2007). The three dimensions of AOC are discussed below.

Positive Affect for the Organization

This dimension refers to a genuine liking for one's organization and what it represents. Due to the passive nature of both the positive affect and identification dimensions of AOC, they are often lumped together for measurement purposes (Mael & Ashforth, 1995). However, positive affect and identification are theoretically different from one another: identification refers to "an employee's sense of oneness with the organization as well as a sense of pride in the organization" (Jaussi, 2007, p. 55), whereas positive affect refers to "an overall liking for the organization and feelings of happiness about it" (Jaussi, 2007, p. 55). Thus, identification reflects a cognitive form of attachment, whereas positive affect is an emotional one. All of the common measures of AOC include items that tap the dimension of positive affect, yet many of the definitions put forth by researcher do not explicitly mention positive affect. Because items already exist that examine the dimension of affect, Jaussi (2007) adapted items from Mowday et al.'s (1979) OCQ as well as Allen and Meyer's (1996) Affective Commitment Scale (ACS): "I really can't imagine working anywhere else," "I almost always speak well of my organization," "I feel very close ties to my organization which would be difficult for

me to break,” and “I would recommend my organization to a friend as a good place to work”) to form the positive affect for the organization subscale.

Identification with the Organization

The concept of identification with and pride in the organization can be found in the scales developed by Meyer et al. (1990), Mowday et al. (1979), and O’Reilly and Chatman (1986). However, only Mowday et al. (1979) and O’Reilly and Chatman (1986) fully operationalize the dimension by addressing both pride and identification. Meyer et al.’s (1990) scale includes items that measure identification, but does not address the issue of pride in the organization. As such, Jaussi’s (2007) identification with the organization subscale includes four items adapted from O’Reilly and Chatman’s (1986) scale (“What happens to my organization really isn’t that important to me [reverse scored],” “I am proud of Company X’s products and services,” “I am proud to be a Company X employee,” and “It doesn’t bother me when I hear or read about someone criticizing my organization [reverse scored]”).

Willingness to Exert Effort

Being involved with and willing to exert effort on behalf of the organization is explicitly mentioned in the theoretical definitions of AOC by Meyer et al. (1990), Mowday et al. (1979), and O’Reilly and Chatman (1986). However, only Mowday et al. (1979) operationalize this dimension of AOC in their scale (Organizational Commitment Questionnaire or OCQ). In order to adequately cover this proposed dimension of AOC, Jaussi (2007) developed two items (“I am willing to put in extra time on my job because it means a lot to me” and “I am committed to helping Company X achieve its goals”) to

go with the one that is featured in the Mowday et al.'s (1979) OCQ ("I will go out of my way to help make my organization successful").

Interrelationships among the Organizational Commitments

A consistent pattern is usually found when interrelationships among AOC, NOC, and COC are examined. Based on Meyer et al.'s (2002) recent meta-analysis, AOC and NOC are highly correlated ($\rho = .63$) while COC is weakly correlated or unrelated to NOC ($\rho = .15$) and AOC ($\rho = .05$). Groff et al. (2008) found that when COC is separated into the dimensions of COC-few alternatives (FA) and COC-economic exchanges (EE), relationships between AOC and COC take on a different look: COC-FA is negatively correlated with AOC ($r = -.24, p < .01$) while COC-EE is positively correlated with AOC ($r = .41, p < .01$). The findings of Groff et al. (2008) hint at the possibility that the dimensions of AOC may have unique relationships with NOC and COC. As such, I will examine the relationship that Jaussi's (2007) multidimensional AOC scale has with NOC, COC-FA, and COC-EE. In the following section I propose hypotheses regarding potential relationships.

Positive Affect

The positive affect dimension of AOC is typically defined as "an overall liking for the organization and feelings of happiness about it" (Jaussi, 2007, p. 55). Because there are no specific affective components in either NOC or COC-economic exchanges, it is not reasonable to make predictions regarding potential relationships between these types of organizational commitment and the positive affect dimension of AOC. However, it does seem likely that a relationship exists between COC-few alternatives and the positive affect dimension of AOC. Those workers that are high on COC-FA feel trapped

in their current position and are seemingly more likely to develop *negative feelings* towards their organization that is the result of resentment. Thus, these workers are likely to develop fewer positive feelings towards their organization which would result in a negative relationship between positive affect as it relates to AOC and COC-FA.

Based on the reasoning outlined above, I offer the following:

Hypothesis 1

Positive affect for the organization will be negatively related to COC-FA.

Identification with the Organization

Jaussi (2007) refers to the identification dimension of AOC as a feeling of oneness with an organization. Normative organizational commitment (NOC) is often defined as resulting from socialization (both cultural and organizational) that leads to a need to reciprocate (Meyer et al., 2004; Scholl, 1981; Wiener, 1982). This reciprocation towards the organization is typically described as a feeling of *ought to* that is the result of a collective identity and associated with a greater likelihood of performing desirable workplace outcomes (Johnson, Groff, & Taing, 2008; Meyer et al., 2002). The socialization mechanism inherent in NOC serves to foster an employee's collective identity, and in doing so, builds an employee's feeling of oneness and unity with their organization (Bauer, Bodner, Erdogan, Truxillo, & Tucker, 2007). Because both NOC and the identification dimension of AOC are associated with a sense of oneness, unity, and an underlying collective identity (Jaussi, 2007), it seems likely that a relationship exists between the identification dimension of AOC and NOC. Continuance commitment based on few alternatives (COC-FA) is defined as a feeling of being trapped in an organization without any plausible work alternatives (Groff et al., 2008). Workers

high on this form of commitment have been found to be less likely to perform desirable workplace outcomes (see Groff et al., 2008). Considering that workers who exhibit high levels of COC-FA are characterized as doing the bare minimum to get by until new work opportunities can be discovered, this finding makes sense. In fact, it may be the case the workers who exhibit high levels of COC-FA are too concerned with finding alternative employment that they in no way identify with their organization. Thus, it seems likely that there is a negative relationship between the identification dimension of AOC and COC-FA. Based on the reasoning above, I offer the following:

Hypothesis 2

Identification with the organization will be (a) positively related to NOC, and (b) negatively related to COC-FA.

Willingness to Exert Effort on Behalf of the Organization

Jaussi (2007) defines the effort dimension of AOC as a willingness to exert a high level of effort on behalf of the organization. Continuance commitment based on economic exchanges is defined as a commitment based on a sense of satisfaction with the performance-reward relationship that a worker has with their organization (Groff et al., 2008). A worker that has a high level of COC-EE is likely to put forth maximum effort in an attempt to accrue as many valuable rewards as possible. As such, it is plausible that a relationship exists between the willingness to exert effort dimension of AOC and COC-EE.

Commitment researchers define COC-FA as a feeling of being trapped in an organization that leads to lower instances of positive workplace outcomes (Granger et al., 2008; Groff et al., 2008). Workers with a high level of COC-FA are characterized as

performing only the minimal amount of work required by their position. In other words, these workers do just enough not to get fired. As such, it seems plausible that a negative relationship exists between the effort dimension of AOC and COC-FA. Thus, I offer the following:

Hypothesis 3

Willingness to exert effort on behalf of the organization will be (a) positively related to COC-EE, and (b) negatively related to COC-FA.

Correlates of Organizational Commitment

Correlates of organizational commitment are variables that do not have a clear causal relationship with commitment, because either the causal order cannot be established or the relationship is bidirectional (see Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Meyer et al., 2002). However, this does not take away from the importance of examining the relationships such variables have with Jaussi's (2007) multidimensional model of attitudinal commitment. In the following section I examine possible relationships between the different dimensions of attitudinal commitment and common correlates of organizational commitment. Although each dimension of AOC is likely related to most if not all correlates, I suspect that specific dimensions are more relevant for certain correlates. I therefore make predictions that specific dimensions of AOC account for variance in certain correlates incremental to the other dimensions.

Correlates of Positive Affect for the Organization

Inherent in both the positive affect dimension of attitudinal commitment and correlates thought to be uniquely related to this dimension of attitudinal commitment is an underlying theme of positive affectivity. Specific relationships are described below.

Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction is traditionally defined as an affective response to one's job that results in a positive emotional state (Locke, 1976). Recently, researchers have begun to look at job satisfaction as a multidimensional psychological response to one's job (Hulin & Judge, 2003). However, even though a multidimensional conceptualization of job satisfaction has been adopted, a key dimension continues to be the broadly-defined positive affective component that is associated with more classical definitions of job satisfaction (Judge, Heller, & Mount, 2002; Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996). Similarly, researchers in the area of organizational commitment have found a strong positive relationship between affective types of organizational commitment and job satisfaction ($\rho = .65$; Meyer et al., 2002). As researchers agree that there is an affective component to job satisfaction and as the literature on organizational commitment consistently reports a positive relationship between affective organizational commitment and job satisfaction, it seems logical to predict that there would be relationship between the positive affect component of Jaussi's (2007) attitudinal commitment scale and job satisfaction.

Regulatory Focus

Regulatory focus theory, as proposed by Higgins (1997, 1998), states that two general motivation related orientations exist: promotion focus and prevention focus. *Promotion focus* is based on approach motivation, which revolves around sensitivity to rewards. The driving force behind this focus is a need for growth that results in setting goals which are tied to one's ideal self. *Prevention focus* is based on avoidance motivation, which relates to sensitivity to obligations and punishment. This focus is defined by a need to protect one's self from harm. As such, goals relating to this type of

regulatory focus relate to one's ought and feared selves (Johnson & Chang, 2007). As noted by Johnson, Chang, and Yang (2007), little empirical research exists that examines the relationship between regulatory focus and organizational commitment. However, Johnson and Chang (2007) did report a significant positive correlation ($r = .53$) between affective commitment and promotion focus. This finding, combined with the high-activation positive emotional states that coincide with promotion focus (e.g., happiness, excitement), hints at the possibility of a positive relationship between promotion focus and the positive affect dimension of AOC. Taken together, I predict the following:

Hypothesis 4. Positive affect for the organization will predict variance in (a) job satisfaction and (b) promotion focus incremental to the other dimensions of AOC (i.e., identification and exerting effort).

Correlates of Identification with the Organization

A sense of collective identity can be thought of as the unifying theme between the identification dimension of attitudinal commitment and its unique correlates. Specific relationships are discussed in detail below.

Collectivism

Workers that are highly collectivistic tend to view themselves as in-group members as opposed to an individual entity. In doing so, these workers tend to internalize group norms and goals (Triandis, 1995). In addition, these workers have a tendency to “emphasize their connectedness to other in-group members” (Jackson, Wesson, Colquitt, & Zapata-Phelan, 2006, p. 884). This feeling of connectedness or oneness with an organization is at the heart of Jaussi's (2007) identification with the organization dimension of attitudinal commitment, which parallels arguments by others that a

collective identity underlies AOC (Meyer, Becker, & Vandenberghe, 2004; Johnson & Chang, 2007).

Transformational Leadership

Transformational leaders are described as adaptive leaders that work well in changing environments and are well-versed in solving problems faced by themselves as well as their followers (Bass, 1985; Bass, Avolio, Jung, & Berson, 2003). In addition, a transformational leader possess the ability to work with their followers to create innovative solutions to difficult problems, while at the same time helping their followers to embrace collective goals (Bennis, 2001; Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1996; Schaubroeck, Lam, & Cha, 2007). With respect to commitment, Meyer et al. (2002) report a significant meta-analytic relationship ($\rho = .46$) between attitudinal organizational commitment and transformational leadership. As one of the key components of transformational leadership is the ability to form a cohesive, collective unit of subordinates, it is plausible that the significant correlation found by Meyer et al. (2002) is attributable to the attitudinal commitment dimension of identification, which focuses on a feeling of oneness with an organization (Jaussi, 2007).

Procedural Justice

As Cropanzano and Greenberg (1997) noted, organizational justice is one of my most highly researched areas in industrial and organizational psychology. According to justice researchers (e.g., Colquitt, Greenberg, & Zapata-Phelan, 2005; Folger & Cropanzano, 1998), organizational justice refers to workers' perceptions of outcome fairness (*distributive* justice; Adams, 1965), the fairness of decision-making rules and processes (*procedural* justice; Thibaut & Walker, 1975), and the fairness of interpersonal

treatment (*interactional* justice; Bies & Moag, 1986). Researchers have consistently found a positive relationship between organizational justice and attitudinal commitment (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter, & Ng, 2001), with a recent meta-analysis by Meyer et al. (2002) reporting a corrected correlation between procedural justice and attitudinal commitment of .38. Given the group focus inherent in both procedural justice (Johnson, Selenta, & Lord, 2006; Masterson, Lewis, Goldman, & Taylor, 2000) and the identification dimension of AOC (Jaussi, 2007) this finding makes sense. As such, it seems likely that a relationship exists between the identification dimension of AOC and procedural justice. Based on the reasoning outlined above, I offer the following:

Hypothesis 5. Identification with the organization will predict variance in (a) collectivism, (b) transformational leadership, and (c) procedural justice incremental to the other dimensions of AOC (i.e., positive affect and exerting effort).

Correlates of Willingness to Exert Effort

A perception of fair exchange is shared among the willingness to exert effort dimension of attitudinal commitment and its unique correlates. Specific relationships are described below.

Perceived Organizational Support (POS)

POS refers to employees' beliefs regarding the extent to which an organization values their contributions and cares about their general well-being (Eisenberger, Armeli, Rexwinkel, Lynch, & Rhoades, 2001; Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchinson, & Sowa, 1986; Rhoades, Eisenberger, & Armeli, 2001). Those workers that perceive a high level of organizational support are thought, by means of reciprocity theory, to feel a sense of obligation to reciprocate the positive feelings that they draw from the organization

(Eisenberger et al., 2001; Meyer & Allen, 1991; Rhoades et al., 2001). This reciprocation of positive feelings is often cited as the reason why attitudinal commitment is linked with POS (Meyer & Allen, 1991; Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982). Empirical evidence for such a link is provided by several researchers (e.g., Rhoades et al., 2001), and Meyer et al.'s (2002) meta-analysis concluded that the relationship is quite strong ($\rho = .63$). These findings follow the logic of the theory of reciprocity as those workers who perceive a higher level of organizational support are more likely to reciprocate such feelings through a number of mechanisms. One such mechanism could be increased effort to aid the organization that provides such a high level of support (Eisenberger et al., 1986; Maertz Jr., Griffeth, Campbell, & Allen, 2007; Mowday et al., 1982). As such, it seems highly plausible that a link exists between POS and the willingness to exert effort dimension of Jaussi's (2007) attitudinal commitment scale.

Distributive Justice

As previously noted, organizational justice is one of my most highly researched areas in industrial and organizational psychology (Cropanzano & Greenberg, 1997). Justice researchers (e.g., Colquitt, Greenberg, & Zapata-Phelan, 2005; Folger & Cropanzano, 1998), typically identify three types of organizational justice including distributive, interactional, and procedural justice. Distributive justice refers to workers' perceptions of outcome fairness (Adams, 1965). Researchers have consistently found a positive relationship between organizational justice and attitudinal commitment (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Colquitt, Conlon, Wesson, Porter, & Ng, 2001), with a recent meta-analysis by Meyer et al. (2002) reporting a corrected correlation between distributive justice and attitudinal commitment of .40. According to the equity theory that

is referred to in Adams' (1965) original conceptualization of distributive justice, this finding makes sense. Those workers that perceive fair distributions of rewards are more likely to put forth greater amounts of effort because they know that those efforts will be recognized and the justly rewarded by the organization. Based on this line of reasoning, it seems likely that Jausi's (2007) attitudinal commitment dimension of willingness to exert effort on behalf of the organization is likely to have a strong relationship with distributive justice. I therefore offer the following:

Hypothesis 6. Willingness to exert effort on behalf of the organization will predict variance in (a) POS and (b) distributive justice incremental to the other dimensions of AOC (i.e., positive affect and identification).

Outcomes of Organizational Commitment

Organizational commitment, and affective commitment in particular, have proven valuable for predicting various work criteria, such as task performance and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB; see Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Meyer et al., 2002). As such, examining the relationships that Jausi's (2007) multidimensional model of attitudinal commitment has with such criteria is necessary. In the following section, I discuss potential relationships between the different dimensions of attitudinal commitment and typical outcomes of organizational commitment. Due to the fact that all three dimensions of attitudinal commitment tap the same underlying construct, it is likely that all of the dimensions will be related to the outcomes described below. However, I suspect that specific dimensions are more relevant for certain outcomes. Therefore, I make predictions that specific dimensions of attitudinal commitment account for variance incremental to the other dimensions.

Outcomes of Positive Affect for the Organization

OCB Directed at Individuals

OCB is defined as “performance that supports the social and psychological environment in which task performance takes place” (Organ, 1997, p. 95). Over the years, OCB has been conceptualized in a number of different ways, beginning with Smith, Organ, and Nears’s (1983) two-dimensional model. Subsequent research produced a five-dimensional model (Organ, 1988), a five-dimensional model with subscales (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, & Fetter, 1990), and an alternative two-dimensional model that divided citizenship behaviors into those directed towards individuals (OCBI) and those directed towards the organization (OCBO; Williams & Anderson, 1991). Based on the results of meta-analysis, there is a moderate positive correlation between attitudinal organizational commitment and broadly-defined OCB ($\rho = .32$; Meyer et al., 2002). This relationship may be explained by the positive affect that underlies attitudinal commitment as there exists much theoretical and empirical support for the effects of positive affect on OCB (e.g., Miles, Borman, Spector, & Fox, 2002; Organ & Ryan, 1995; Spector & Fox, 2002), and OCBI in particular (Lee & Allen, 2002). This finding coincides with social psychology literature that consistently finds a connection between positive affect and examples of OCBI, such as altruism (e.g., Moore, Underwood, & Rosenhan, 1973). Thus, I predict that a unique relationship exists between the positive affect component of attitudinal commitment and OCBI.

Job Strain

Most research in the area of job stress defines stress as a process by which workers perceive an environmental stressor and have a reaction that affects their well-being (Spector, Chen, & O’Connell, 2000). Job stressors include, but are not limited to,

variables like workload, role conflict, and role ambiguity (Jackson & Schuler, 1985; Jex & Beehr, 1991; Spector & Jex, 1998). When a worker has an adverse reaction to a job stressor, job strain is said to take place. Researchers typically define three types of job strain: behavioral strains (e.g., consumption of alcohol while at work), physical strains (e.g., upset stomach while on the job), and psychological strains (e.g., anxiety; Jex & Beehr, 1991). Organizational scholars have disagreed somewhat as to how attitudinal models of commitment should theoretically relate to job strain. Some argue that employees with high levels of affective organizational commitment experience less job strain due to a shielding effect that prevents job stressors from causing job strain (Begley & Czajka, 1993). However, others have argued that affective commitment leads to higher levels of job strain due to the emotional attachment inherent in affective commitment (Reilly, 1994). Regardless of direction, implicit in these arguments is the presence of a unique relationship between affective commitment and job strain. A meta-analytic estimate of this relationship revealed that it is negative in direction ($\rho = -.21$; Meyer et al., 2002). Because strain is an emotional reaction to one's work circumstances, I hypothesize that the positive affect dimension of attitudinal commitment will be significantly related to job strain. Based on the reasoning outline above, I offer the following:

Hypothesis 7. Positive affect for the organization will predict variance in (a) OCBI and (b) job strain incremental to the other dimensions of AOC (i.e., identification and exerting effort).

Outcomes of Identification with the Organization

OCB Directed at the Organization

Citizenship behavior directed towards the organization is composed of three dimensions: civic virtue, conscientiousness, and sportsmanship. Empirical evidence

provided by Williams and Anderson (1991) supports the idea that behaviors aligned with these three dimensions target the organization as opposed to the individual. Employees who identify with their organization internalize its goals and norms, and work towards the organization's welfare rather than their personal welfare (Johnson & Chang, 2006; Meyer, Becker, & Vandenberghe, 2004). For this reason, I hypothesize that the identification dimension of AOC will be uniquely related to OCBO.

Hypothesis 8. Identification with the organization will predict variance in OCBO incremental to the other dimensions of attitudinal commitment (i.e., positive affect and exerting effort).

Outcomes of Willingness to Exert Effort on Behalf of the Organization

Task Performance

Researchers typically define task performance as behavior that directly impacts the production of goods, services, and activities that are part of the core processes of an organization (e.g., Borman & Motowidlo, 1993; Van Scotter, 2000; Van Scotter, Motowidlo, & Cross, 2000). Specific behaviors categorized as task performance related include using knowledge and technical skills to successfully complete a formal duty (Van Scotter et al., 2000). Commitment scholars typically report a significant relationship between attitudinal measures of commitment and task performance ($\rho = .16$; Meyer et al., 2002). As it seems logical that effort is a key component in task performance (completing job tasks requires some degree of effort), I suspect that the effort dimension of AOC will be related to task performance, more so than the other two AOC dimensions.

Hypothesis 9. Willingness to exert effort on behalf of the organization will predict variance in task performance incremental to the remaining dimensions of attitudinal commitment (i.e., positive affect and identification).

Focal Behaviors

Commitment scholars define focal behaviors as ones that are specifically implied by the terms of commitment (Gellatly, Meyer, & Luchak, 2006; Meyer & Herscovitch, 2001). Generally, withdrawal-related variables like actual turnover, turnover intentions, and absenteeism are considered focal behaviors for organizational commitment. As such, these variables should be equally related to all three dimensions of attitudinal commitment. Therefore, I do not offer hypotheses regarding unique relationships between focal behaviors and specific dimensions of attitudinal commitment. However, I do expect that, as a set, positive affect, identification, and effort will account for a significant proportion of variance in turnover intentions and absenteeism.

Hypothesis 10. As a set, the dimensions of AOC (i.e., positive affect, identification, and willingness to exert effort) will predict variance in the focal behaviors of turnover intentions and absenteeism.

To test these hypotheses, I collected data from employees regarding measures of attitudinal, normative and continuance commitment. In addition, data on important correlates and workplace outcomes were gathered. Finally, I collected data from supervisors on measures of employee OCB-I, task performance, and absenteeism. Measures and proposed analyses are discussed below.

Table 1. *Summary of Hypotheses*

Relationships among the Commitments

- H1. *Positive affect for the organization will be negatively related to COC-FA.*
- H2. *Identification with the organization will be (a) positively related to NOC, and (b) negatively related to COC-FA.*
- H3. *Willingness to exert effort on behalf of the organization will be (a) positively related to COC-EE, and (b) negatively related to COC-FA.*

Correlates of Attitudinal Commitment

- H4. *Positive affect for the organization will predict variance in (a) job satisfaction and (b) promotion focus incremental to the other dimensions of AOC (i.e., identification and exerting effort).*
- H5. *Identification with the organization will predict variance in (a) collectivism, (b) transformational leadership, and (c) procedural justice incremental to the other dimensions of AOC (i.e., positive affect and exerting effort).*
- H6. *Willingness to exert effort on behalf of the organization will predict variance in (a) POS and (b) distributive justice incremental to the other dimensions of AOC (i.e., positive affect and identification).*

Outcomes of Attitudinal Commitment

- H7. *Positive affect for the organization will predict variance in (a) OCBI and (b) job strain incremental to the other dimensions of AOC (i.e., identification and exerting effort).*
 - H8. *Identification with the organization will predict variance in OCBO incremental to the other dimensions of attitudinal commitment (i.e., positive affect and exerting effort).*
 - H9. *Willingness to exert effort on behalf of the organization will predict variance in task performance incremental to the remaining dimensions of attitudinal commitment (i.e., positive affect and identification).*
 - H10. *As a set, the dimensions of AOC (i.e., positive affect, identification, and willingness to exert effort) will predict variance in the focal behaviors of turnover intentions and absenteeism.*
-

METHOD

Participants and Procedure

Survey data were collected from 200 employees and 102 supervisors that combined to form 102 matched pairs (208 employee–supervisor survey packets were originally handed out). Hardcopies of the surveys were distributed in two different ways. The first method of distribution was done by recruiting employees who worked at least 20 hours a week from psychology courses (12%) at a large university in the Southeastern US. The second method of distribution utilized an online psychology research signup system (88%). Students who were enrolled in university courses received extra credit in exchange for participating.

Survey packets consisted of a subordinate portion and a supervisor portion. Subordinate surveys were completed by recruited employees and returned to a designated location during pre-specified times. The supervisor portion of the survey was to be passed along by employees to their immediate supervisor. Along with the supervisor survey, each packet contained a self-addressed, stamped envelope that could be used by supervisors to mail in their completed survey. In order to lessen the likelihood that subordinates completed both surveys, extra credit was only given for completing the self-report subordinate portion of the survey. As such, there was no incentive given for completing the supervisor portion of the survey other than as a courtesy to the researcher. Survey packets were coded prior to distribution so that it was possible to identify

matched employee–supervisor dyads. In order to keep responses anonymous and confidential, all data was kept separate from any personal identifying information.

Demographic information of the employees was as follows: 81% were female; average age was 22.2 years ($SD = 4.4$); 54% were Caucasian, 18.5% were African American, 13.0% were Hispanic, 6.0% were Asian, and 8.5% listed their ethnicity as ‘other’; average tenure at their current job was 21.5 months ($SD = 18.3$); they worked an average of 28.5 hours a week ($SD = 7.3$); and they were employed in professional jobs (14.4%), manufacturing jobs (1.0%), retail and service jobs (53.1%), technical jobs (2.1%), government agencies (1.0%), as well as other professions (e.g., research assistant; 28.4%).

Demographic information of the supervisors was as follows: 53.9% were female; the average age was 35.6 years ($SD = 10.2$); the average time they had known their employee was 18.2 months ($SD = 14.5$); they worked an average of 43.4 hours a week ($SD = 8.8$); and 63.7% were Caucasian while 17.6% were African American, 8.8% were Hispanic, 4.9% were Asian, and 4.9% described their ethnicity as ‘other’.

Because not all supervisors provided data for subordinates, I tested whether the two groups (i.e., employees with and without supervisor data) were equivalent with respect to demographics and organizational commitment. Examination of mean differences revealed that the two groups did not differ based on: age, $t(198) = 1.57$, *ns*; tenure, $t(192) = .72$, *ns*; AOC–positive affect, $t(198) = .09$, *ns*; AOC–identification, $t(198) = -.52$, *ns*; AOC–exerting effort, $t(198) = -.77$, *ns*; NOC, $t(196) = .52$, *ns*; COC–EE, $t(198) = 1.67$, *ns*; and COC–FA, $t(196) = .53$, *ns*. Based on these findings, it does not

appear that there are any meaningful differences between employees who had complete sets of surveys and those that did not.

Measures

Participants responded to all items using a 5-point Likert scale (from 1 = “Strongly Disagree” to 5 = “Strongly Agree”).

Organizational Commitment

Attitudinal commitment was measured using an 11 item scale developed by Jausi (2007) (see Appendix A). Of the 11 total items, 4 items ($\alpha = .80$) tap the positive affect dimension (“I almost always speak well of my organization”), 4 items ($\alpha = .82$) tap the identification dimension (“I am proud of my organization’s products and services”), and 3 items ($\alpha = .88$) tap the effort dimension (“I will go out of my way to help make my organization successful”). Normative commitment was measured using Meyer and Allen’s (1997) NOC scale ($\alpha = .86$) (see Appendix B). This scale consists of 6 items (“I would feel guilty if I left my organization now”). Continuance commitment was measured using Groff et al.’s (2008) multidimensional COC scale (see Appendix C). This scale consists of 6 items ($\alpha = .85$) that measure COC based on economic exchanges (“I am considering leaving my company because my effort and skills are not rewarded”) and 6 items ($\alpha = .83$) that measure COC based on few alternatives (“I cannot leave my organization until a new opportunity presents itself”).

Job Satisfaction

Satisfaction was measured using 3 items ($\alpha = .86$) from the Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire (Seashore, Lawler, Mirvis, & Cammann,

1982). An example item is “All in all, I like my job.” Please refer to Appendix D for a complete list of scale items.

Regulatory Focus

To measure work-based regulatory focus, Johnson and Chang’s (2008) 12 item measure was used (see Appendix E). Promotion focus was captured by 6 items ($\alpha = .86$) including “In general, I tend to think about positive aspects of my work.” Prevention focus was also captured by 6 items ($\alpha = .84$) including “I am focused on failure experiences that occur while working.”

Collectivism

Psychological collectivism was measured using Jackson et al.’s (2006) 15 item scale ($\alpha = .90$) (see Appendix F). Workers were instructed to think about current or past work groups and to answer the items that followed in regards to those groups. Sample items include “I cared about the well-being of those groups” and “I accepted the rules of those groups.”

Transformational Leadership

In order to measure leadership, a 22 item ($\alpha = .90$) scale developed by Herold, Fedor, Caldwell, and Liu (2008) was used (see Appendix G). Example items include “I believe my leader...provides a good model to follow” and “I believe my leader...seeks new opportunities for our organization.”

Justice

Distributive and procedural justice was measured using Colquitt’s (2001) measure (see Appendix H). Distributive justice was measured by 4 items ($\alpha = .97$) including “My

pay reflects the effort I put into my work.” Procedural justice was measured by 7 items ($\alpha = .88$) including “Decisions at my organization have been consistent.”

POS

POS was measured using a shortened version of the Survey of Perceived Organizational Support (Eisenberger et al., 1986). This 6 item ($\alpha = .93$) scale consists of the six items with the highest factor loadings from Eisenberger et al.’s (1986) full scale (see Appendix I). Previous studies have shown this scale to be both reliable and valid (Eisenberger et al., 1990; Shore & Wayne, 1993). An example item is “My organization takes pride in my accomplishments.”

Strain

To measure work strain, a 7 item ($\alpha = .84$) scale developed by House and Rizzo (1972) was used (see Appendix J). An example item is “I work under a great deal of tension.”

OCB

Organizational citizenship directed towards the organization (OCBO) was measured by 8 items ($\alpha = .90$) from Lee and Allen’s (2002) OCB scale (see Appendix K). An example item is “I keep up with developments in the organization.” To measure organizational citizenship directed towards individuals (OCBI), another 8 item ($\alpha = .84$) scale developed by Lee and Allen (2002) was used. An example item from this scale is “I help others who have been absent.”

Task Performance

Supervisors rated their subordinate's task performance using Williams and Anderson's (1991) measure ($\alpha = .74$) (see Appendix L). An example item is "Adequately completes assigned duties."

Turnover

Turnover cognition was measured using a hybrid 6-item ($\alpha = .82$) scale consisting of items developed by Mobley, Horner, and Hollingsworth (1978) and Mowday, Koberg, and McArthur (1984) (see Appendix M). An example item is "I am unlikely to leave my job soon."

Absenteeism

As archival based measures were not practical for the current study, supervisor reports of absenteeism ($\alpha = .77$) were utilized to tap how much work an employee missed for any of the following five reasons: certified sickness, uncertified sickness, family obligations, vacation, and other reasons (see Appendix N). This scale was adapted from a similar scale constructed by Sagie (1998). While researchers have made a distinction between voluntary and involuntary absences (March & Simon, 1958), empirical evidence supports the contention that the relation between organizational commitment and different forms of absenteeism do not differ significantly (Randall, 1990). Therefore, no such distinction was made in the proposed scale.

RESULTS

Factor Structure of Attitudinal Organizational Commitment

Prior to testing hypotheses, a confirmatory factor analysis was conducted using maximum likelihood estimation in order to check the factor structure of the proposed three-factor model. Results revealed that the model had acceptable fit based on commonly-used indices (e.g., Hu & Bentler, 1999; Kline, 2005): $\chi^2(41) = 168.26$; normed $\chi^2 = 4.10$; Comparative Fit Index = .92; Root Mean Square Error of Approximation = .08; and Standardized Root Mean Square Residual = .06. Factor loadings for the items ranged from .56 to .80 for positive affect, .52 to .90 for identification, and .78 to .91 for exerting effort. Overall, these factor analytic results are consistent with those reported by Jaussi (2007).

Relationships among the Commitments

Hypotheses 1-3 concerned the relationships between the dimensions of attitudinal commitment and other forms of organizational commitment. To test these hypotheses, bivariate correlations between attitudinal commitment, normative commitment, and continuance commitment were examined. Results of the correlation analyses are presented in Table 2 and described below.

Table 2. *Descriptive Statistics and Correlations among Variables.*

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. AOC- PA	(.80)									
2. AOC- I	.86*	(.82)								
3. AOC- WEE	.70*	.68*	(.88)							
4. AOC- Meyer & Allen	.80*	.73*	.73*	(.86)						
5. NOC- Meyer & Allen	.62*	.57*	.62*	.68*	(.86)					
6. COC- FA	-.38*	-.40*	-.36*	-.31*	-.29*	(.83)				
7. COC- EE	.45*	.43*	.35*	.44*	.33*	-.09	(.85)			
8. Job Satisfaction	.75*	.74*	.65*	.60*	.45*	-.36*	.48*	(.86)		
9. Distributive Justice	.46*	.37*	.30*	.36*	.33*	-.15*	.51*	.45*	(.97)	
10. Procedural Justice	.62*	.54*	.53*	.57*	.47*	-.26*	.38*	.49*	.45*	(.88)
11. Work Strain	-.13	-.13	.03	.02	.10	.21*	-.06	-.28*	-.21*	-.19*
12. Perceived Org. Support	.70*	.66*	.64*	.70*	.52*	-.34*	.45*	.65*	.46*	.70*
13. Prevention Focus	-.10	-.06	.06	.07	.17*	.27*	-.05	-.18*	-.15*	-.12
14. Promotion Focus	.60*	.65*	.62*	.64*	.47*	-.28*	.41*	.65*	.34*	.44*
15. Turnover Intentions	-.64*	-.62*	-.53*	-.50*	-.50*	.33*	-.49*	-.61*	-.42*	-.48*
16. OCB- O	.74*	.73*	.73*	.66*	.58*	-.29*	.44*	.65*	.30*	.62*
17. OCB- I	.15	.13	.19	.22*	.25*	.09	.08	-.02	.05	.24*
18. Collectivism	.32*	.36*	.36*	.36*	.37*	-.14*	.33*	.25*	.25*	.33*
19. Task Performance	.14	.18	.19	.09	.11	-.06	.11	.25*	.03	.07
20. Absenteeism	-.23*	-.21*	-.25*	-.22*	-.24*	.30*	-.10	-.23*	-.17	-.30*
21. Transformational Lead	.02	.08	-.04	.06	-.09	.03	.18	.01	-.07	-.06
Mean	3.40	3.58	3.71	2.97	3.03	3.07	3.08	4.05	3.15	3.29
SD	.91	.84	.93	.90	.95	.89	.96	.90	1.31	.87

Note: $N = 200$ for subordinate reported variables and $N = 102$ for supervisor reported variables. AOC-PA, -I, & -WEE = attitudinal commitment based on positive affect, identification and willingness to exert effort, respectively; AOC & NOC-Meyer & Allen = affective commitment & normative commitment, respectively; COC-FA & -EE = continuance commitment based on few alternatives and economic exchanges, respectively; OCBO & OCBI = organizational citizenship behavior directed at organizations and individuals, respectively. * $p < .05$

Table 2. *continued*

11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
(.84)										
-.26*	(.93)									
.57*	-.16*	(.84)								
-.08	.61*	-.05	(.86)							
.13	-.49*	.09	-.48*	(.82)						
.04	.65*	.02	.61*	-.60*	(.90)					
.15	.16	-.02	.09	-.04	.22*	(.84)				
-.05	.32*	-.02	.49*	-.25*	.36*	.19	(.90)			
-.14	.13	-.13	.16	-.18	.30*	.41*	-.03	(.74)		
.06	-.24*	.11	-.14	.29*	-.38*	-.24*	.00	-.49*	(.77)	
.06	.03	-.01	.10	.08	.04	.43*	.16	.21*	-.13	(.90)
2.15	3.66	2.41	3.89	2.70	3.47	4.19	3.49	4.68	1.59	4.39
.87	.94	.88	.76	.90	.85	.57	.67	.48	.72	.49

Full support for Hypothesis 1 was found as attitudinal commitment based on positive affect was negatively related to continuance commitment based on few alternatives ($r = -.38, p < .001$). Although not hypothesized, results indicated positive relationships of attitudinal commitment based on positive affect with normative commitment ($r = .62, p < .001$) and with continuance commitment based on economic exchanges ($r = .45, p < .001$).

In full support of Hypothesis 2, attitudinal commitment based on identification with the organization was positively related to normative commitment ($r = .57, p < .001$) and negatively related to continuance commitment based on few alternatives ($r = -.40, p < .001$). While other relationships were not hypothesized, there was a positive relationship between attitudinal commitment based on identification with the organization and continuance commitment based on economic exchanges ($r = .43, p < .001$).

Hypothesis 3 also received full support as attitudinal commitment based on willingness to exert effort was positively related to continuance commitment based on economic exchanges ($r = .35, p < .001$) and negatively related to continuance commitment based on few alternatives ($r = -.36, p < .001$). Though not hypothesized, a positive relationship between attitudinal commitment based on willingness to exert effort and normative commitment was also observed ($r = .62, p < .001$).

Regression and Relative Weights Analyses

Hypotheses 4-9 concerned the effectiveness of single dimensions of attitudinal commitment for predicting workplace criteria, while Hypothesis 10 concerned the effectiveness of the set of attitudinal commitment dimensions for predicting criteria. To

test Hypotheses 4-9, I examined both the incremental importance and relative importance of the specific dimensions of attitudinal commitment (see LeBreton, Hargis, Griepentrog, Oswald, & Ployhart, 2007). Incremental importance involves demonstrating that the hypothesized dimension of attitudinal commitment accounts for variance in the criteria above and beyond the remaining dimensions of attitudinal commitment. This was done by regressing each criterion on the set of covariates (i.e., age, gender, and tenure) as well as the two non-hypothesized dimensions of attitudinal commitment in Step 1, followed by the focal dimension of attitudinal commitment in Step 2. Support for the hypothesis was found if the ΔR^2 at Step 2 was significant. To test Hypothesis 10, each criterion was regressed on the set of covariates at Step 1, followed by the set of attitudinal commitment dimensions at Step 2. As before, support for the hypothesis was found if the ΔR^2 at Step 2 was significant.

In addition to utilizing regression analyses to examine incremental importance, relative importance was also examined via relative weights analyses. According to LeBreton et al. (2007), relative importance is defined as the contribution that that predictors make to R^2 . This contribution refers to both unique contributions and contributions made when other predictors are considered. In order to examine the relative importance of the different dimensions of attitudinal commitment in predicting various correlates and outcomes of interest, a relative weights analysis was performed (see Johnson, 2000). Using a relative weights analysis allows for predictors to be ranked according to their relative importance in predicting criteria.

Correlates of Attitudinal Commitment

As summarized in Table 3, partial support was found for Hypothesis 4 as attitudinal commitment based on positive affect accounted for variance in job satisfaction incremental to the remaining dimensions of attitudinal commitment, $\Delta F(1, 200) = 18.57$, $p < .001$ ($\Delta R^2 = .04$). In addition, relative weights analyses revealed that for job

Table 3. Incremental Prediction of Attitudinal Commitment based on Positive Affect.

Predictors	Criterion Variables			
	Job Sat	Prom Focus	OCB-I	Work Strain
Step 1				
<i>Covariates</i>				
Gender	-.12*	-.18***	-.05	.02
Age	-.01	.03	-.03	.17*
Tenure	-.02	-.09	.25*	.10
<i>Jaussi's AOC Scales</i>				
Identification	.54***	.44***	-.05	-.28**
Willingness to Exert Effort	.29***	.32***	.18	.20*
ΔF	59.23***	42.64***	1.97	3.73**
ΔR^2	.61	.53	.09	.09
Step 2				
<i>Remaining AOC Scale</i>				
Positive Affect	.39***	.10	.01	-.21
ΔF	18.57***	.82	.00	1.98
ΔR^2	.04	.00	.00	.01
Model F	57.06***	35.64***	1.62	3.45**
Model R^2	.64	.53	.09	.10

Note: $N = 200$ for subordinate reported variables and $N = 102$ for supervisor reported variables. Job Sat = job satisfaction; Prom Focus = promotion focus; OCBI = organizational citizenship behavior directed at the individual. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, and *** $p < .001$

satisfaction, attitudinal commitment based on positive affect was a more important predictor (relative weight percentage [RW%] = 37%) than was attitudinal commitment

based on identification (RW% = 35.6%) or attitudinal commitment based on willingness to exert effort (RW% = 27.4%). Unscaled (raw) relative weights for job satisfaction, which indicate the amount of the predicted criterion variance that is attributed to each predictor, are presented in Tables 4 and 5. However, attitudinal commitment based on positive affect did not account for a significant amount of variance in promotion focus incremental to the remaining dimensions of attitudinal commitment, $\Delta F(1, 200) = .82, ns$ ($\Delta R^2 = .00$). Additionally, relative weights analyses indicated that attitudinal commitment based on positive affect was the least important predictor (RW% = 26.7%) for promotion focus.

No support was found for Hypothesis 5 as attitudinal commitment based on identification with the organization did not account for a significant amount of variance in any of the criteria incremental to the remaining dimensions of attitudinal commitment: collectivism, $\Delta F(1, 200) = 2.63, ns$ ($\Delta R^2 = .01$); transformational leadership, $\Delta F(1, 102) = 3.30, ns$ ($\Delta R^2 = .03$); and procedural justice, $\Delta F(1, 200) = .09, ns$ ($\Delta R^2 = .00$). Please refer to Table 6 for full regression results. In addition, relative weights analyses revealed that attitudinal commitment based on identification was not the most important predictor for collectivism (RW% = 35.7% as compared to 41% for attitudinal commitment based on willingness to exert effort) and was the least important predictor for procedural justice (RW% = 26.9%).

Table 4. *Relative Weights Analysis Results for the Correlates of Attitudinal Commitment.*

Predictors	Job Sat		Prom Focus		Collectivism		Proced Justice		POS		Dist Just	
	RW	%	RW	%	RW	%	RW	%	RW	%	RW	%
AOC- PA	0.227	37	0.129	26.7	0.036	23.3	0.176	43.7	0.207	38.2	0.123	57.6
AOC- I	0.219	35.6	0.176	36.6	0.055	35.7	0.108	26.9	0.164	30.3	0.057	26.5
AOC- WEE	0.169	27.4	0.177	36.7	0.063	41	0.119	29.4	0.171	31.6	0.034	15.9
Model R2	0.615		0.482		0.153		0.403		0.542		0.214	

Note: RW = Relative weights; % = Rescaled relative weights (RW divided by model R^2).

Table 5. *Relative Weights Analysis Results for the Outcomes of Attitudinal Commitment.*

Predictors	Work Strain		OCB-O		Turn Intent		Absent	
	RW	%	RW	%	RW	%	RW	%
AOC- PA	0.018	35	0.209	32.2	0.175	40.2	0.02	29.2
AOC- I	0.017	32.3	0.199	30.6	0.152	34.9	0.015	21.5
AOC- WEE	0.017	32.6	0.242	37.2	0.108	24.8	0.034	49.3
Model R2	0.052		0.651		0.435		0.07	

Note: RW = Relative weights; % = Rescaled relative weights (RW divided by model R^2).

As presented in Table 7, partial support was found for Hypothesis 6 as attitudinal commitment based on willingness to exert effort accounted for a significant amount of variance in perceived organizational support incremental to the remaining dimensions of attitudinal commitment, $\Delta F(1, 200) = 16.70, p < .001 (\Delta R^2 = .04)$. In addition, relative weights analyses revealed that willingness to exert effort is an important predictor (RW% = 31.6%) for perceived organizational support. However, attitudinal commitment based on willingness to exert effort did not account for significant variance in distributive justice incremental to the remaining dimensions of attitudinal commitment, $\Delta F(1, 200) =$

Table 6. Incremental Prediction of Attitudinal Commitment based on Identification.

Predictors	Criterion Variables			
	Collectivism	Trans Lead	Proced Just	OCB-O
Step 1				
<i>Covariates</i>				
Gender	-.06	.01	-.04	.01
Age	-.17*	.02	-.15*	.05
Tenure	-.05	.16	.05	.04
<i>Jaussi's AOC Scales</i>				
Positive Affect	.14	.10	.46***	.47***
Willingness to Exert Effort	.26**	-.15	.21**	.41***
ΔF	8.31***	.63	28.87***	71.38***
ΔR^2	.18	.03	.43	.66
Step 2				
<i>Remaining AOC Scale</i>				
Identification	.22	.41	-.03	.20*
ΔF	2.63	3.30	.09	5.38*
ΔR^2	.01	.03	.00	.01
Model F	7.43***	1.09	23.96***	61.78***
Model R^2	.19	.06	.44	.67

Note: $N = 200$ for subordinate reported variables and $N = 102$ for supervisor reported variables.

Trans Lead = transformational leadership; Proced Just = procedural justice; OCBO = organizational citizenship behavior directed at the organization. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, and *** $p < .001$

.07, *ns* ($\Delta R^2 = .00$). Relative weights analyses revealed similar results as the willingness to exert effort dimension of attitudinal commitment was the least important predictor for distributive justice (RW% = 15.9%).

Outcomes of Attitudinal Commitment

As summarized in Table 3, no incremental importance support was found for Hypothesis 7 as attitudinal commitment based on positive affect did not account for a significant amount of incremental variance in any of the hypothesized criteria

Table 7. *Incremental Prediction of Attitudinal Commitment based on Willingness to Exert Effort.*

Predictors	Criterion Variables		
	POS	Dist Just	Task Perf
Step 1			
<i>Covariates</i>			
Gender	-.12*	-.15*	-.13
Age	-.05	-.16*	.10
Tenure	-.06	-.05	.02
<i>Jaussi's AOC Scales</i>			
Positive Affect	.53***	.54***	-.06
Identification	.21*	-.10	.23
ΔF	43.04***	14.40***	1.13
ΔR^2	.54	.28	.06
Step 2			
<i>Remaining AOC Scale</i>			
Willingness to Exert Effort	.29***	-.03	.13
ΔF	16.70***	.07	.63
ΔR^2	.04	.00	.01
Model <i>F</i>	41.68***	11.96***	1.04
Model <i>R</i> ²	.58	.28	.06

Note: $N = 200$ for subordinate reported variables and $N = 102$ for supervisor reported variables. POS = perceived organizational support; Dist Just = distributive justice; Task Perf = task performance. * $p < .05$ and *** $p < .001$

incremental to the remaining dimensions of attitudinal commitment: OCBI, $\Delta F(1, 102) = .00$, *ns* ($\Delta R^2 = .00$); and work strain, $\Delta F(1, 200) = 1.98$, *ns* ($\Delta R^2 = .01$). However, relative weights analyses for work strain revealed that the positive affect dimension of attitudinal commitment was in the fact the most important predictor (RW% = 35%). As such, there is partial support for Hypothesis 7.

Results provided full support for Hypothesis 8 as attitudinal commitment based on identification with the organization accounted for a significant amount of variance in OCBO incremental to the remaining dimensions of attitudinal commitment, $\Delta F(1, 200) = 5.38$, $p < .05$ ($\Delta R^2 = .01$). Please refer to Table 6 for full regression results. Relative weights analyses also indicated that the identification dimension of attitudinal commitment is an important predictor of OCBO (RW% = 30.6%).

No support was found for Hypothesis 9 (see Table 7) as attitudinal commitment based on willingness to exert effort did not account for significant variance in task performance incremental to the other dimensions of attitudinal commitment, $\Delta F(1, 102) = .63$, *ns* ($\Delta R^2 = .01$).

As reported in Table 8, full support was found for Hypothesis 10 as the set of attitudinal commitment dimensions accounted for a significant amount of variance in both turnover intentions, $\Delta F(3, 200) = 46.90$, $p < .001$ ($\Delta R^2 = .42$), and absenteeism, $\Delta F(3, 102) = 3.33$, $p < .05$ ($\Delta R^2 = .09$). While not hypothesized, it appears that the positive affect dimension of attitudinal commitment is the most important predictor for turnover intentions (RW% = 40.2%) while the willingness to exert effort dimension is the most important predictor for absenteeism (RW% = 49.3%).

Table 8. *Regression Results for the Set of the Attitudinal Commitment Variables.*

Predictors	Criterion Variables	
	Turn Intention	Absent
Step 1		
<i>Covariates</i>		
Gender	.10	.00
Age	.07	.07
Tenure	-.08	.13
ΔF	1.19	.77
ΔR^2	.02	.02
Step 2		
<i>Jaussi's AOC Scales</i>		
Identification	-.19	.08
Positive Affect	-.37**	-.14
Willingness to Exert Effort	-.15	-.26
ΔF	46.90***	3.33*
ΔR^2	.42	.09
Model F	24.48***	2.07
Model R^2	.44	.12

Note: $N = 200$ for subordinate reported variables and $N = 102$ for supervisor reported variables.

Turn Intention = turnover intentions; Absent = absenteeism.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, and *** $p < .001$

DISCUSSION

Researchers agree that attitudinal commitment is an important job attitude that merits examination owing to its consistently strong positive correlations with important workplace outcomes, including task performance and citizenship behaviors (Meyer et al., 2002). However, there is disagreement regarding the conceptualization and operationalization of attitudinal commitment (Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1979; O'Reilly & Chatman, 1986; Meyer & Allen, 1991). Recent research conducted by Jaussi (2007) has attempted to unify the literature on attitudinal commitment by developing a scale that ties together the various conceptualizations and operationalizations offered by previous researchers. In the process of developing her scale, Jaussi confirmed the multidimensional factor structure of the measure. While the expected pattern of inter-relationships among the dimensions of attitudinal commitment was supported, Jaussi did not examine whether the dimensions have differential relationships with work-related correlates and outcomes. I therefore extended Jaussi's initial work by testing whether it is useful to distinguish between attitudinal commitment based on organizational identification, positive affect, and willingness to exert effort when examining relationships of commitment with other variables. In the following sections I review my findings and present implications for research and practice.

Relationships among the Commitments

The first goal of the current study was to examine the relationships that the dimensions of attitudinal commitment, as defined by Jaussi (2007), have with other forms of organizational commitment. Specifically, I expected to find divergent and convergent relationships among the various forms of attitudinal commitment, normative commitment, and different forms of continuance commitment. In support of Hypotheses 1-3, I found support for the following relationships: attitudinal commitment based on positive affect was negatively related to continuance commitment based on few alternatives; attitudinal commitment based on identification with the organization was positively related to normative commitment and negatively related to continuance commitment based on few alternatives; and attitudinal commitment based on willingness to exert effort on behalf of the organization was positively related to continuance commitment based on economic exchanges and negatively related to continuance commitment based on few alternatives.

In addition to Hypotheses 1-3, the following non-hypothesized relationships were also observed: attitudinal commitment based on positive affect was negatively related to continuance commitment based on few alternatives; attitudinal commitment based on identification was positively related to continuance commitment based on economic exchanges; and attitudinal commitment based on willingness to exert effort was positively related to normative commitment. Though these relationships were not hypothesized, they likely emerged due to the high inter-correlations among the three dimensions of attitudinal commitment (r s ranged from .68-86; see Table 2). It should be noted that these correlations were very similar to those obtained by Jaussi (2007) in her initial study. As such, it is not surprising that all three forms of attitudinal commitment

were positively related to normative commitment and continuance commitment based on economic exchanges while being negatively correlated to continuance commitment based on few alternatives. In addition, as the three forms of attitudinal commitment were highly correlated with Meyer and Allen's (1997) measures of affective commitment, it should not be surprising that they share similar relationships with normative commitment and the various forms of continuance commitment as has been found with traditional measures of attitudinal commitment (see Groff et al., 2008). The final explanation for these non-hypothesized relationships is that even though Jaussi (2007) identifies three "separate" dimensions of attitudinal commitment, these dimensions are still tapping the same overriding construct of attitudinal commitment. As such, it is unlikely that the dimensions will have relationships with other forms of commitment that are completely unique (e.g., opposite directions).

Attitudinal Commitment Based on Positive Affect

The second goal of the current paper was to examine the relationships that the dimensions of attitudinal commitment have with important workplace outcomes. Specifically, I was interested in finding out whether or not certain dimensions of attitudinal commitment are more important for specific workplace outcomes. To do so I used a combination of regression and relative weights analyses. In partial support of Hypotheses 4 and 7, I found that attitudinal commitment based on positive affect was the most important predictor of the three dimensions of attitudinal commitment for job satisfaction and work strain. In addition, attitudinal commitment based on positive affect accounted for a significant amount of variance in job satisfaction incremental to the remaining dimensions of attitudinal commitment. This finding makes sense given the fact

that job satisfaction and job strain have substantial affective components (Judge, Heller, & Mount, 2002; Reilly, 1994; Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996). In addition, it is not surprising that no unique relationship was found between promotion based regulatory focus and positive affect based attitudinal commitment as Johnson, Chang, and Yang (2007) have noted that there is a very small amount of research on the relationship between regulatory focus and organizational commitment. As such, it is difficult to make definite suggestions as to the potential relationships between the dimensions of attitudinal commitment and regulatory focus. However, based on past research (e.g., Miles, Borman, Spector, & Fox, 2002; Organ & Ryan, 1995; Spector & Fox, 2002) it is unusual that a unique relationship between the positive affect dimension of attitudinal commitment and OCBI was not found. One possible explanation is that OCBI measures were taken from supervisors who may not have enough contact with subordinates to properly report OCBI or who may simply infer OCBI from task performance via a halo bias. Another possible explanation is that a disconnect exists between the focus of the predictor and outcome such that the predictor of attitudinal commitment is directed at the organization whereas the outcome of OCBI is directed at individuals. This would not only explain the lack of a significant relationship between the positive affect dimension of attitudinal commitment and OCBI, but also the lack of a significant relationship between any of the dimensions of attitudinal commitment and OCBI. Future research that examines relationships of attitudinal commitment based on positive affect with ratings of OCBI from non-supervisor sources would be useful.

Attitudinal Commitment Based on Organizational Identification

Overall, Hypothesis 5 received little support (i.e., attitudinal commitment based on identification did not have unique relationships with the proposed correlates of psychological collectivism, transformational leadership, and procedural justice). However, in support of Hypothesis 8, the identification dimension of attitudinal commitment accounted for significant incremental variance in OCBO. Based on previous research by Williams and Anderson (1991), it makes sense that a unique relationship between the identification dimension of attitudinal commitment and OCBO was found because of the match between the attitude target and the behavioral target (i.e., the organization). This matching of the attitude target and the behavioral target may also explain why every dimension of attitudinal commitment significantly predicted OCBO. An interesting finding that was revealed by the relative weights analysis was that identification was actually the least important dimension of attitudinal commitment in predicting OCBO while willingness to exert effort was the most important. A possible explanation for this finding is that OCBO is often defined as performing duties that aid in the functioning of an organization by going beyond the core tasks of a job (Miles et al., 2002). In order to engage in these “extra” duties, it is logical that “extra” effort must be put forth. Therefore, it is plausible that those workers that are high on attitudinal commitment based on willingness to exert effort are also more likely to put forth the effort necessary to perform OCBs directed at the organization.

Despite the expected relationship with OCBO, it is interesting that no unique relationship was found between attitudinal commitment based on identification and either collectivism, transformational leadership, or procedural justice. For collectivism, it is possible that the underlying collective identity that is found in general measures of AOC

(Meyer, Becker, & Vandenberghe, 2004; Johnson & Chang, 2007) is in fact part of all three dimensions of attitudinal commitment. For transformational leadership, it is quite surprising to find such low correlations with all three types of attitudinal commitment when previous researchers have reported high meta-analytic correlations ($\rho = .46$) between attitudinal organizational commitment and transformational leadership. For procedural justice, though a unique relationship was not found, relative weights analyses did reveal that attitudinal commitment based on identification accounts for 27% of the variance attributable to the set of attitudinal commitment dimensions. As such, it seems that identification may still be an important dimension of attitudinal commitment.

Attitudinal Commitment Based on Willingness to Exert Effort

Partial support was found for Hypothesis 6 as the willingness to exert effort dimension of attitudinal commitment seems to be an important and unique predictor of perceived organizational support. This relationship was expected because employees who perceive support from their organization are likely to exert effort on behalf of the organization. It is noteworthy that a stronger relationship between the willingness to exert effort dimension and distributive justice was not found. According to Adams' (1965) equity theory, it makes logical sense that those workers that perceive fair distribution of resources would be more likely to put forth greater amounts of effort as they know that their contributions will be rewarded. However, as the positive affect dimension was found to be the most important dimension in relation to distributive justice, it could be the case that high levels of distributive justice simply lead to workers "liking" their organization more. Though I did find partial support for Hypothesis 6, I did not find evidence to support Hypothesis 9 (suggesting that the willingness to exert effort

dimension of attitudinal commitment does not have a unique relationship with task performance). It should be pointed out that even though there was not a significant relationship between any of the dimensions of attitudinal commitment and task performance, the correlations between each dimension and task performance were roughly the same as has been reported by meta-analytic studies ($\rho = .16$; Meyer et al., 2002).

The Set of Attitudinal Commitment Dimensions

Full support was found for Hypothesis 10 as the set of attitudinal commitment dimensions accounted for a significant amount of variance in both turnover intentions and absenteeism. As these behaviors are defined as focal behaviors that are implied in the definition of organizational commitment, the results are not unusual (Gellatly, Meyer, & Luchak, 2006; Meyer & Herscovitch, 2001). Interestingly, though the set of attitudinal dimensions predicted significant variance in both of the focal behaviors that were examined, specific dimensions do seem to be more important for predicting each behavior. For turnover intentions, the results revealed that the positive affect dimension was the most important predictor. This finding could be due to the fact that the positive affect dimension of attitudinal commitment is conceptualized as an emotional form of attachment that is defined as “an overall liking for the organization and feelings of happiness about it” (Jaussi, 2007, p. 55). Accordingly, it is very likely that those workers that truly like their organization and have positive feelings towards it are less likely to entertain thoughts of quitting. Regarding absenteeism, results revealed that willingness to exert effort was the most important dimension for prediction purposes. One possible explanation for this finding is that in order to exert effort on behalf of the organization, a

worker would almost certainly need to be present on a regular basis. As such, those with high levels of attitudinal commitment based on willingness to exert effort would be more likely to attend work without fail and would be less likely to be absent.

Implications and Future Research

The results of the current study provide preliminary support for Jaussi's (2007) multidimensional measure of attitudinal commitment. Though several of the hypotheses were not supported, the fact that at least partial support was obtained for a majority of the hypotheses and that several interesting non-hypothesized relationships were found suggests that examining attitudinal commitment as a multidimensional construct may prove fruitful in the future. As such, there are several noteworthy implications.

An important implication of the current study is that by using a multidimensional measure of attitudinal commitment, researchers can be assured that they are not missing any of the dimensions inherent in conceptualizations developed by previous researchers (Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1979; O'Reilly & Chatman, 1986; Meyer & Allen, 1991). This implication mirrors the sentiments of Jaussi (2007) whose purpose for developing a multidimensional scale was to focus on the "strengths and consistencies of prior research" (p. 60). In addition, results indicate that a multidimensional model is not only needed for conceptual purposes, but is also needed to ensure that unique contributions made by the specific dimensions of attitudinal commitment are not overlooked. For example, if a researcher were to use the attitudinal commitment scale developed by O'Reilly and Chatman (1986) to predict turnover intentions, they would miss a large portion of variance as the O'Reilly and Chatman (1986) measure focuses almost exclusively on the identification dimension of attitudinal commitment. However, if the

same researcher was to use Jaussi's (2007) multidimensional scale, they would not only account for the variance explained by the identification dimension, but also the willingness to exert effort dimension and positive affect, the most important dimension.

Another possible direction for future research would be to examine potential interactional relationships that the different dimensions of attitudinal commitment have with other forms of organizational commitment. For example, recent research by Johnson et al. (in press) suggests that workers can have commitment to an organization based on different levels of the various types of organizational commitment and these different forms of commitment can interact with one another to affect how they relate to important workplace outcomes. Perhaps applying this line of reasoning to a multidimensional model of attitudinal commitment could result in some interesting findings. Another possible direction for future research could be applying a multidimensional model of attitudinal commitment to foci other than the organization. Examples of alternate foci could include co-workers and supervisors. For example, is it possible for workers to identify with only the organization or could workers also identify with co-workers? If so, what types of outcomes would be affected by this identification? The same line of reasoning could be applied to all three dimensions of attitudinal commitment and a multitude of outcomes and correlates.

In addition to research oriented implications, the current study also offers several practical implications. To begin with, the current study suggests that using a multidimensional scale to measure attitudinal commitment will allow practitioners to better predict important workplace outcomes, especially focal behaviors such as turnover intentions, when compared to traditional single dimension scales (e.g., Meyer & Allen,

1997). This is done by ensuring that all potential sources of variance attributable to the various conceptualizations of attitudinal commitment are accounted for by one unified scale. Another potential implication of the current study is that by breaking attitudinal commitment into distinct dimensions, practitioners could potentially only use specific dimensions to predict those outcomes that most strongly related to that dimension. For example, suppose a practitioner needs to administer a short survey to examine relationships between several predictors and important workplace outcomes in their organization as they relate to distributive justice. If so, then they may choose to use the positive affect dimension (4 items) as it had the strongest relationship with distributive justice in the current study, and cut out the remaining dimensions (7 total items) in order to save space. On the same topic, future research may want to examine ways to promote specific dimensions of attitudinal commitment.

Limitations

Though the findings of the current study are encouraging, there were several limitations that could be addressed by researchers in the future. One limitation is the use of college students as participants. Although all students were employed and worked nearly 30 hours a week, they worked primarily in retail and service positions which may limit the generalizability of the findings. In addition, employees represented young workers who may not have had time to develop the types of commitment that underlie the dimensions of attitudinal commitment. Future research should focus on employing a working sample of full-time employees from a wider variety of organizations. By doing so, researchers could make sure that findings are applicable to wider range of professions and workers. Limitations aside, results did indicate significant relationships between the

different dimensions of attitudinal commitment and many of the hypothesized (and several non-hypothesized) correlates and outcomes. As such, it is possible that effects were attenuated.

Conclusion

The current study offers empirical evidence to support the usefulness of Jaussi's (2007) multidimensional model of attitudinal commitment. By utilizing a scale that taps the unique conceptualizations of attitudinal commitment that have been offered over the years, I have been able to uncover some unique relationships that exist between specific dimensions of attitudinal commitment and important workplace outcomes and correlates. In addition, by using a multidimensional scale to measure attitudinal commitment, future researchers can be assured that all aspects of attitudinal commitment are being covered and practitioners can be assured that they will not overlook any unique relationships. Overall, the findings of the current study are very encouraging not only for what they suggest about using a multidimensional conceptualization of attitudinal organizational commitment, but also for applications that this multidimensional conceptualization may have for other types of commitment. Therefore, it is suggested that future researchers utilize Jaussi's (2007) multidimensional scale as opposed to traditional measures of attitudinal commitment.

REFERENCES

- Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 267-299). New York: Academic Press.
- Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63, 1-18.
- Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1996). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: An examination of construct validity. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 49, 252-276.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: Free Press.
- Bass, B. M. (1998). *Transformational leadership: Individual, military and educational impact*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Bass, B. M., Avolio, B. J., Jung, D. I., & Berson, Y. (2003). Predicting unit performance by assessing transformational and transactional leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, 207-218.
- Bauer, T. N., Bodner, T., Erdogan, B., Truxillo, D. M., & Tucker, J. S. (2007). Newcomer adjustment during organizational socialization: A meta-analytic review of antecedents, outcomes, and methods. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92, 707-721.
- Begley, T. M., & Czajka, J. M. (1993). Panel analysis of the moderating effects of commitment on job satisfaction, intent to quit, and health following organizational change. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78, 552-556.
- Bennis, W. (2001). Leading in unnerving times. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 42, 97-102.
- Bies, R. J., & Moag, J. F. (1986). Interactional justice: Communication criteria of fairness. In R. J. Lewicki, B. H. Sheppard, & M. H. Bazerman (Eds.), *Research on negotiations in organizations* (Vol. 1, pp. 43-55). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

- Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1993). Expanding the criterion domain to include elements of contextual performance. In N. Schmitt & W. Borman (Eds.), *Personnel selection in organizations* (pp. 71-98). New York: Jossey-Bass.
- Cohen-Charash, Y., & Spector, P. E. (2001). The role of justice in organizations: A meta-analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 86, 278-321.
- Cooper-Hamik, A. and C. Viswesvaran (2005). 'The construct of work commitment: Testing an integrative framework', *Psychological Bulletin*, 131, pp.241-259.
- Colquitt, J. A. (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: A construct validation of a measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 386-400.
- Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C. O., & Ng, K. Y. (2001). Justice at the millennium: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 425-445.
- Colquitt, J. A., Greenberg, J., & Zapata-Phelan, C. P. (2005). What is organizational justice? A historical overview. In J. Greenberg & J. A. Colquitt (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational justice* (pp. 3-56). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Cropanzano, R., & Greenberg, J. (1997). Progress in organizational justice: Tunneling through the maze. In C. Cooper & I. Robertson (Eds.), *International review of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 317-372). New York: Wiley.
- Eisenberger, R., Armeli, S., Rexwinkel, B., Lynch, P. D., & Rhoades, L. (2001). Reciprocation of perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 42-51.
- Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchinson, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71, 500-507.
- Folger, R., & Cropanzano, R. (1998). *Organizational justice and human resource management*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Gellatly, I. R., Meyer, J. P., & Luchak, A. A. (2006). Combined effects of the three commitment components on focal and discretionary behaviors: A test of Meyer and Herscovitch's propositions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 69, 331-345.
- Groff, K., Granger, B. P., Taing, M.U., Jackson, E. & Johnson, R.E. (2008, August). *Exploring Continuance Commitment: A Multidimensional Approach*. Paper accepted at the annual conference of the Academy of Management, Anaheim, CA.

- Hackett, R. D., Bycio, P., & Hausdorf, P. A. (1994). Further assessments of Meyer and Allen's (1990) three component model of organizational commitment. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 79*, 15-23.
- Herold, D. M., Fedor, D. B., Caldwell, S., & Liu, Y. (2008). The effects of transformational and change leadership on employees' commitment to a change: A multilevel study. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 93*, 346-357.
- Higgins, E. T. (1997). Beyond pleasure and pain. *American Psychologist, 52*, 1280-1300.
- Higgins, E. T. (1998). Promotion and prevention: Regulatory focus as a motivational principle. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (vol. 30, pp. 1-46). New York: Academic Press.
- House, R. J. & Rizzo, J. R. (1972). Role conflict and ambiguity as critical variables in a model of organizational behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 7*, 467-505.
- Hu, L., & Bentler, P.M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indices in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling, 6*, 1-55.
- Hulin, C. L., & Judge, T. A. (2003). Job attitudes. In W. C. Borman, D. R. Ilgen, & R. J. Klimoski (Eds.), *Handbook of psychology* (Vol. 12, pp. 255-276). Hoboken: Wiley.
- Jackson, S. E., & Schuler, R. S. (1985). A meta-analysis and conceptual critique of research on role ambiguity and role conflict in work settings. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 36*, 16-78.
- Jackson, C. L., Colquitt, J. A., Wesson, M. J., & Zapata-Phelan, C. P. (2006). Psychological collectivism: A measurement validation and linkage to group member performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91*, 884-899.
- Jaros, S. J. (1997). An assessment of Meyer and Allen's (1991) Three-Component Model of organizational commitment and turnover intentions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 51*, 319-337.
- Jaros, S. J., Jermier, J. M., Koehler, J. W., & Sincich, T. (1993). Effects of continuance, affective, and moral commitment on the withdrawal process: An evaluation of eight structural equation models. *Academy of Management Journal, 36*, 951-995.
- Jaussi, K. S. (2007). Attitudinal commitment: A three-dimensional construct. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 80*, 51-61.

- Jex, S. M., & Beehr, T. A. (1991). Emerging theoretical and methodological issues in the study of work-related stress. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management, 9*, 311-365.
- Johnson, J. W. (2000). A heuristic method for estimating the relative weight of predictor variables in multiple regression. *Multivariate Behavioral Research, 35*, 1-19.
- Johnson, R. E., & Chang, C.-H. (2007, April). Integrating organizational commitment with self-concept and regulatory focus: A four-factor model. In R. E. Johnson & C.-H. Chang's (Chairs), *Self-based individual differences in organizations: Implications for employee behaviors*. Paper presented at the 22nd Annual Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology Conference, New York, New York.
- Johnson, R. E., & Chang, C.-H. (2008, April). *Development and validation of a work-based regulatory focus scale*. Paper presented at the 23rd Annual Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology Conference, San Francisco, California.
- Johnson, R. E., Chang, C.-H., & Yang, L. (2007, August). Motivation and organizational commitment: Support for a four-factor model. In R. E. Johnson & D. Ispas (Chairs), *Taking measure of organizational commitment*. Paper presented at the 67th Academy of Management Annual Meeting, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
- Johnson, R. E., Groff, K. W., & Taing, M. U. (in press). Nature of the interactions among organizational commitments: Complementary, competitive, or synergistic? *British Journal of Management*.
- Johnson, R. E., Selenta, C., & Lord, R. G. (2006). When organizational justice and the self-concept meet: Consequences for the organization and its members. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 99*, 175-201.
- Judge, T. A., Heller, D., & Mount, M. K. (2002). Five-factor model of personality and job satisfaction: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*, 237-249.
- Kirkpatrick, S. A., & Locke, E. A. (1996). Direct and indirect effects of three core charismatic leadership components on performance and attitudes. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 81*, 36-51.
- Kline, R. B. (2005). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling, 2nd Ed*. New York: Guilford Press.
- LeBreton, J. M., Hargis, M. B., Griepentrog, B., Oswald, F. L., & Ployhart, R. E. (2007). A multidimensional approach for evaluating variables in organizational research and practice. *Personnel Psychology, 60*, 475-498.

- Lee, K., & Allen, N. J. (2002). Organizational citizenship behavior and workplace deviance: The role of affect and cognitions. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*, 131-142.
- Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 1293-1349). Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Mael, F. A., & Ashforth, B. E. (1995). Loyal from day one: Biodata, organizational identification, and turnover among newcomers. *Personnel Psychology, 48*, 309-333.
- Maertz Jr., C. P., Griffeth, R. W., Campbell, N. S., & Allen, D. G. (2007). The effects of perceived organizational support and perceived supervisor support on employee turnover. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 28*, 1059-1075.
- March, J., & Simon, H. (1958). *Organizations*. New York: Wiley.
- Masterson, S. S., Lewis, K., Goldman, B. M., & Taylor, M. S. (2000). Integrating justice and social exchange: The differing effects of fair procedures and treatment on work relationships. *Academy of Management Journal, 43*, 738-748.
- Mathieu, J. E. and D. M. Zajac (1990). 'A review and meta-analysis of the antecedents, correlates, and consequences of organizational commitment', *Psychological Bulletin, 108*, 171-194.
- McGee, G. & Ford, R. (1987). Two (or more?) dimensions of organizational commitment: Reexamination of the continuance and affective scales. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 72*, 642-648.
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1984). Testing the "side-bet theory" of organizational commitment: Some methodological considerations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 69*, 372-378.
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review, 1*, 61-89.
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. (1997). *Commitment in the workplace: Theory, research, and application*. California: Sage.
- Meyer, J. P., Allen, N. J., & Gellatly, I. R. (1990). Affective and continuance commitment to the organization: Evaluation of measures and analysis of concurrent and time-lagged relations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 75*, 710-720.

- Meyer, J. P., Becker, T. E., & Vandenberghe, C. (2004). Employee commitment and motivation: A conceptual analysis and integrative model. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*, 991-1007.
- Meyer, J. P., & Herscovitch, L. (2001). Commitment in the workplace: Toward a general model. *Human Resource Management Review, 11*, 299-326.
- Meyer, J. P., D. J. Stanley, L. Herscovitch, and L. Topolnytsky (2002). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: A meta-analysis of antecedents, correlates, and consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 61*, 20-52.
- Miles, D. E., Borman, W. E., Spector, P. E., & Fox, S. (2002). Building an integrative model of extra role work behaviors: A comparison of counterproductive work behavior with organizational citizenship behavior. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 10*, 51-57.
- Mobley, W. H., Horner, S. O., & Hollingsworth, A. T. (1978). An evaluation of precursors of hospital employee turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 63*, 493-522.
- Moore, R. S., Underwood, B., & Rosenhan, D. L. (1973). Affect and altruism. *Developmental Psychology, 8*, 99-104.
- Mowday, R. T., Koberg, C. S., & McArthur, A. W. (1984). The psychology of withdrawal process: a cross-validated test of Mobley's intermediate linkages model of turnover in two samples. *Academy of Management Journal, 27*, 79-94.
- Mowday, R. T., Porter, L. W., & Dubin, R. (1974). Unit performance, situational factors, and employee attitudes in spatially separated work units. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 12*, 231-248.
- Mowday, R. T., Porter, L. W., & Steers, R. M. (1982). *Organizational linkages: The psychology of commitment, absenteeism, and turnover*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Mowday, R. T., Steers, R. M., & Porter, L. W. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 14*, 224-227.
- O'Reilly, C. A., & Chatman, J. (1986). Organizational commitment and psychological attachment: The effects of compliance, identification, and internalization on prosocial behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 71*, 492-499.
- Organ, D. W. (1988) *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

- Organ, D. W. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior: It's construct clean-up time. *Human Performance, 10*, 85-97.
- Organ, D. W., and Ryan, K. (1995). A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology, 48*, 775-802.
- 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*, 107-142.
- 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. (1990). The consequences of organizational commitment: Methodological investigation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 11*, 361-378.
- Reilly, N. P. (1994). Exploring the paradox: Commitment as a moderator of the stressor-burnout relationship. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 24*, 397-414.
- Rhoades, L., Eisenberger, R., & Armeli, S. (2001). Affective commitment to the organization: The contribution of perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*, 825-836.
- Sagie, A. (1998). Employee absenteeism, organizational commitment, and job satisfaction: Another look. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 52*, 156-171.
- Scholl, R. W. (1981). Differentiating organizational commitment from expectancy as a motivating force. *Academy of Management Review, 6*, 589-599.
- Schaubroeck, J., Lam, S. K., & Cha, S. E. (2007). Embracing transformational leadership: Team values and the impact of leader behavior on team performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*, 1020-1030.
- Seashore, S. E., Lawler, E. E., Mirvis, P., & Cammann, C. (1982). *Observing and measuring organizational change: A guide to field practice*. New York: Wiley.
- Smith, C. A., Organ, D. W., & Near, J. P. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 68*, 653-663.
- Somers, M. J. (1993). A test of the relationship between affective and continuance commitment using non-recursive models. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 66*, 185-192.

- Spector, P. E., Chen, P. Y., & O'Connell, B. J. (2000). A longitudinal study of relations between job stressors and job strains while controlling for prior negative affectivity and strains. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85*, 211-218.
- Spector, P. E., & Fox, S. (2002). An emotion-centered model of voluntary work behavior: Some parallels between counterproductive work behavior and organizational citizenship behavior. *Human Resource Management Review, 12*, 269-292.
- Spector, P. E., & Jex, S. M. (1998). Development of four self-report measures of job stressors and strain: Interpersonal Conflict at Work Scale, Organizational Constraints Scale, Quantitative Workload Inventory, and Physical Symptoms Inventory. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 3*, 356-367.
- Steers, R. M. (1977). Antecedents and outcomes of organizational commitment. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 22*, 46-56.
- Triandis, H. C. (1995). *Individualism and collectivism*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Thibaut, J., & Walker, L. (1975). *Procedural justice: A psychological analysis*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Van Scotter, J. R. (2000). Relationships of task performance and contextual performance with turnover, job satisfaction, and affective commitment. *Human Resource Management Review, 10*, 79-95.
- Van Scotter, J. R., Motowidlo, S. J., & Cross, T. C. (2000). Effects of task performance and contextual performance on systemic rewards. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85*, 526-535.
- Weiss, H. M., & Cropanzano, R. (1996). An affective events approach to job satisfaction. In B. M. Staw & L. L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (Vol. 18, pp. 1-74). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Wiener, Y. (1982). Commitment in organizations: A normative view. *Academy of Management Review, 7*, 418-428.
- Williams, L. J., & Anderson, S. E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. *Journal of Management, 17*, 601-617.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Attitudinal Commitment

Positive Affect

1. I really can't imagine working anywhere else.
2. I almost always speak well of my organization.
3. I feel very close ties to my organization which would be difficult for me to break.
4. I would recommend my organization to a friend as a good place to work.

Identification

1. What happens to my organization really isn't that important to me.
2. I am proud of my organization's products and services.
3. I am proud to be an employee of my organization.
4. It doesn't bother me when I hear or read about someone criticizing my organization.

Willingness to Exert Effort

1. I will go out of my way to help make my organization successful.
2. I am willing to put in extra time on my job because it means a lot to me.
3. I am committed to helping my organization achieve its goals.

Appendix B: Meyer and Allen's Commitment Scales

Affective Organizational Commitment:

1. I would be happy to spend the rest of my career with my current organization.
2. I really feel as if my organization's problems are my own.
3. I do not feel like "part of the family" at my organization.
4. I do not feel "emotionally attached" to my organization.
5. My organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me.
6. I feel a strong sense of belonging to my organization.

Normative Organizational Commitment:

1. I do not feel any obligation to remain with my current employer.
2. Even if it were to my advantage, I do not feel it would be right to leave my organization now.
3. I would feel guilty if I left my organization now.
4. My organization deserves my loyalty.
5. I would not leave my organization right now because I have a sense of obligation to the people in it.
6. I owe a great deal to this organization.

Appendix C: Continuance Commitment

Few Alternatives:

1. I would not consider leaving my current employer because there are just not alternative job opportunities.
2. I cannot leave my organization until a new opportunity presents itself.
3. There is no reason for me to stay with my organization other than the lack of available alternatives.
4. The major drawback to leaving my organization would be the difficulty I would face in finding a new employer.
5. Even if I wanted to quit, it would be hard to find another job.
6. I remain at my company because I have nowhere else to go.

Economic Exchanges

1. If I left my current job, I would lose out on a number of great benefits and perks.
2. Leaving my current employer would be foolish because not many companies could offer the same pay and benefits
3. If I left my current organization, I would not lose much- the pay and benefits are lacking.
4. It would be very difficult to leave my current organization because of the high level of economic support they offer.
5. Although I may not identify with my organization, the manner in which they compensate me provides plenty of incentive to stay.
6. I am considering leaving my company because of the effort and skills are not rewarded.

Appendix D: Job Satisfaction

1. In general, I like working for my current employer.
2. In general, I don't like my job.
3. All in all, I am satisfied with my job.

Appendix E: Regulatory Focus

Prevention Focus:

1. I am focused on failure experiences that occur while working.
2. I am fearful about failing to prevent negative outcomes at work.
3. In general, I tend to think about negative aspects of my work.
4. I think about negative outcomes associated with losing my job.
5. I feel anxious when I cannot meet my responsibilities at work.
6. I sometimes feel anxious at work.

Promotion Focus:

1. My goal at work is to fulfill my potential to the fullest in my job.
2. I am focused on successful experiences that occur while working.
3. In general, I tend to think about positive aspects of my work.
4. I see my job as a way for me to fulfill my hopes, wishes, and aspirations.
5. I think about the positive outcomes that my job can bring me.
6. I feel happy when I have accomplished a lot at work.

Appendix F: Collectivism

1. I preferred to work in those groups rather than working alone.
2. Working in those groups was better than working alone.
3. I wanted to work with those groups as opposed to working alone.
4. I felt comfortable counting on group members to do their part.
5. I was not bothered by the need to rely on group members.
6. I felt comfortable trusting group members to handle their tasks.
7. The health of those groups was important to me.
8. I cared about the well-being of those groups.
9. I was concerned about the needs of those groups.
10. I followed the norms of those groups.
11. I followed the procedures used by those groups.
12. I accepted the rules of those groups.
13. I cared more about the goals of those groups than my own goals.
14. I emphasized the goals of those groups more than my individual goals.
15. Group goals were more important to me than my personal goals.

Appendix G: Transformational Leadership

1. As a leader, I seek new opportunities for our organization.
2. As a leader, I paint an interesting picture of the future of our work group.
3. As a leader, I lead by “doing” rather than simply “telling”.
4. As a leader, I foster collaboration among work groups.
5. As a leader, I show subordinates that I expect a lot from them.
6. As a leader, I act without considering individual’s feelings.
7. As a leader, I provide individuals with new ways of looking at things which are puzzling to them.
8. As a leader, I have a clear understanding of where we are going.
9. As a leader, I provide a good model to follow.
10. As a leader, I encourage employees to be team players.
11. As a leader, I insist on only the best performance from my organization.
12. As a leader, I show respect for individuals’ feelings.
13. As a leader, I have ideas that have forced individuals to rethink some of their own ideas.
14. As a leader, I inspire others with my plans for the future.
15. As a leader, I lead by example.
16. As a leader, I get the group to work together toward the same goal.
17. As a leader, I do not settle for second best from subordinates.
18. As a leader, I behave in a manner that is thoughtful of individuals’ personal needs.
19. As a leader, I stimulate individuals to think about old problems in new ways.
20. As a leader, I am able to get others to commit to my dream(s) for the future.
21. As a leader, I develop a team attitude and spirit among my employees.
22. As a leader, I treat people without considering their personal feelings.

Appendix H: Justice

Distributive Justice:

1. My pay reflects the effort I put into my work
2. My pay is appropriate for the work I have completed.
3. My pay reflects what I have contributed to my organization.
4. My pay is justified, given my performance.

Procedural Justice:

1. I have been able to express my feelings and views concerning decisions made by my organization.
2. I have had influence over the decisions arrived at by my organization.
3. Decisions at my organization have been consistent.
4. Decisions at my organization have been free or bias.
5. Decisions at my organization have been based on accurate information.
6. I have been able to appeal decisions made at my organization.
7. Decisions at my organization have upheld ethical and moral standards.

Appendix I: Perceived Organizational Support

1. My organization takes pride in my accomplishments.
2. My organization really cares about my well-being.
3. My organization values my contributions to its well-being.
4. My organization strongly considers my goals and values.
5. My organization shows little concern for me.
6. My organization is willing to help me if I need a special favor.

Appendix J: Work Strain

1. My job tends to directly affect my health.
2. I work under a great deal of tension.
3. I have felt fidgety or nervous as a result of my job.
4. If I had a different job, my health would probably improve.
5. Problems associated with my job have kept me awake at night.
6. I have felt nervous before attending meetings in the company.
7. I often “take my job home with me” in the sense that I think about it when doing other things.

Appendix K: Organizational Citizenship Behavior

OCB directed at the organization:

1. I attend functions that are not required but help my organization's image.
2. I keep up with developments in my organization.
3. I defend my organization when other employees criticize it.
4. I show pride when representing my organization in public.
5. I offer ideas to improve the functioning of my organization.
6. I express loyalty toward the organization.
7. I take action to protect my organization from potential problems.
8. I demonstrate concern about the image of my organization.

OCB directed at the individual:

1. Helps others who have been absent.
2. Willingly gives their time to help others who have work-related problems.
3. Adjusts their work schedule to accommodate other employees' request for time off.
4. Goes out of the way to make newer employees feel welcome in the work group.
5. Shows genuine concern and courtesy toward coworkers, even under the most trying business or personal situations.
6. Gives up time to help others who have work or nonwork problems.
7. Assists others with their duties.
8. Shares personal property with others to help their work.

Appendix L: Task Performance

1. Adequately completes assigned duties.
2. Fulfills responsibilities specified in job description.
3. Performs tasks that are expected of him/her.
4. Meets formal performance requirements of the job.
5. Engages in activities that will directly affect his/her performance evaluation.
6. Neglects aspects of the job he/she is obligated to perform.
7. Fails to perform essential duties.

Appendix M: Turnover Intentions

1. I constantly think about quitting.
2. All things considered, I would like to find a comparable job in a different organization.
3. I will probably look for a new job in the near future.
4. I will probably find an acceptable alternative if I look for a new job.
5. I am unlikely to leave my job soon.
6. I don't have any intention to look for a new job.

Appendix N: Absenteeism

Please rate how often this subordinate misses work because of the following reasons, relative to other subordinates:

1. certified sickness.
2. uncertified sickness.
3. family obligations
4. vacation.
5. other reasons.