

SOURCES OF ATTACHMENT IN
POLITICALLY-ORIENTED ORGANIZATIONS:
CONGRUENCE AND DIFFERENCE

BY

C2007
Rebecca Powers Mank

Submitted to the graduate degree program in Communication Studies
and the Faculty of the Graduate School of the University of Kansas
In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Master's of Arts

Chairperson

Committee members

Date defended: _____

The Thesis Committee for Rebecca Powers Mank certifies
That this is the approved Version of the following thesis:

SOURCES OF ATTACHMENT IN
POLITICALLY-ORIENTED ORGANIZATIONS:
CONGRUENCE AND DIFFERENCE

Committee:

Chairperson

Date approved: _____

Sources of attachment in politically-oriented organizations:
Congruence and difference

Rebecca Mank

University of Kansas

Abstract

Organizational attachment is a phenomenon that has compelled scholars to spend countless hours examining how and why people feel the need to “attach” to their organizations. While much of the research on organizational attachment focuses on traditional, private sector organizations, this study argues that much can also be gained by understanding attachment in politically-oriented organizations; of particular importance is the level of understanding about political/public employees and their choice to remain in this career/organization.

With this exploratory approach employed herein, the research design seeks to identify the presence of identification and commitment among political/public employees, the correlation of these constructs, their relationship with employee beliefs, and the role of variables such as party affiliation, gender, and legislative division (i.e., state, federal). Important findings from this study address three specific questions: the presence of identification, commitment, and intensity; the differences in affective, continuance, and normative commitment; and the influence of demographics.

DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to the memory of my grandfather Dr. James H. Christie who taught me that the stars were never out of reach.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

These past two years in graduate school have been an incredible journey, and there are several people who deserve recognition for their support and encouragement.

First, I would like to thank my advisor, Dr. Mary Banwart. There are no words to thank you for all that you have done for me over the last two years. Your guidance and constant support have made this project possible. I will carry the lessons you have taught me into every adventure I encounter throughout life. You are the true definition of an exceptional teacher. To my committee members, Dr. Tracy Russo and Dr. Jay Childers, I also extend my thanks. Dr. Russo, your organizational attachment class was the source of inspiration for this project. Thank you for your thorough comments and suggestions that helped to shape this thesis into what it is today. Dr. Childers, thank you for your thoughtful and stimulating questions during this process.

My family and friends deserve so much praise for their constant encouragement over the past two years. First, I would like to thank my Mom. Words can not begin to express how grateful I am to have you in my life. Thank you for teaching me that with hard work and a little persistence you can make any dream possible. Without your love and support I would not be the person I am today. Dad, you are the best father a girl could ask for. Thank you for teaching me to “look outside the box”. I truly admire your strength to endure life’s unexpected surprises and keep pushing forward. Jim, you are an amazing brother. Thank you for teaching

me the value of a true friend. I have spent my life looking up to you and I am truly proud of the man you have become. Grandma Pat, thank you for being my number one fan. Your faith in me has provided the self-confidence to become the person I am today and for that I am forever grateful. Nana, thank you for your love and support. You are an incredible woman and I am proud to be your granddaughter. Ramsey, you have taught me what it means to truly love someone. Thank you for your never-ending patience and constant encouragement. You always know the right thing to say and for that I am truly thankful. Lindsey, you are the best friend a person could ask for. You are the true definition of a “selfless person”. You always think of those around you and do all that you can to help them, even if it means sacrificing your needs. I am honored to be your friend. And last, but certainly not least, I want to thank God. I am so incredibly fortunate to have you in my life and I want to thank you for your support, strength, and never-ending faith.

Index

Introduction.....	1
A Review of the Literature	4
Organizational identification defined	4
Organizational identification operationalized and conceptualized.....	7
Organizational commitment defined.....	8
Organizational commitment operationalized and conceptualized.....	9
Affective commitment	9
Continuance commitment	10
Normative commitment	10
Similarities and differences in OI and OC	11
Research questions.....	12
Method.....	13
Participants and Procedures	13
Instruments.....	14
Data Analysis	16
Results.....	17
Discussion.....	22
Strengths and Limitations	34
Conclusions and Suggestions for Future Research	35
Bibliography	37

Appendix A	44
Appendix B	51

Introduction

Emily's day started like any other, filled with voicemails, emails, and never-ending meetings. After a long day at work Emily and her co-workers decided to stop by a local pub on their way home. When they arrived it was extraordinarily busy; eventually they found a place to sit and began to escape their worries. Time seemed to slip away as Emily and her friends reminisced about their day. Suddenly the bar became eerily quiet as attention was drawn toward the television. The local news reporter's voice overtook the bar, announcing, "The results are in...the Dems have taken control of the Senate." Just then Emily's phone rang with the news she had been dreading for months: "He lost...we lost." And with that, Emily was out of a job. As the news began to sink in one question remained on her mind, "What now?"

Emily's story is not uncommon for many employees in politically-oriented careers. The structure of our governmental system allows citizens to vote for their elected officials every two, four, or six years. Thus, those in careers dependent on officeholders' successful re-election must expect the possibility of frequent organizational change, both for the elected official and his/her employees. Even a change of administration—gubernatorial or presidential—may mark the end of a public servant's job or create uncertainty that his or her job may change dramatically. With over 5.1 million new jobs available in the U.S. in the last three years (Whitehouse.gov, 2006) why are people attracted to and continue careers that can contain this high level of uncertainty? What about this context encourages them to stay? Arguably, these employees are attached to these organizations. More

specifically, are they attached to the person for whom they work, to a specific policy they feel passionately about, to their coworkers, to a certain belief they consider significant, to the idea of participating in government, or is it something else?

This study suggests that the construct of organizational attachment may in fact offer a particularly important level of understanding about political/public employees, and their choice to remain in this career and with their specific organization.

Organizational attachment has been studied in a wide variety of contexts (see, for example, Ravasi & Rekom, 2003; Sass & Canary, 1991; Scott, 1997; Zeffane, 1994). However, in their broader study of attachment, communication scholars have focused largely on an employee's identification and commitment to the global organization (Barge & Schlueter, 1988). This is an important linkage, as Sass and Canary (1991) note that "[i]dentification and commitment are reflected in a person's assessment of his or her attachment to the organization" (p. 281).

Beyond contributing to employees' tenure, organizational attachment—and the constructs of identification and commitment—is associated with outcomes that benefit both the organization and the individual. For instance, organizational *identification* is correlated with decision-making that reflects organizational interests (Tompkins & Cheney, 1983; Tompkins & Cheney 1985), career orientation and goals (Lee, 1969), attitudes, perceptions, and motivations (Lee, 1971), corporate citizenship behavior (Meyer & Allen, 1984), and performance (Angle & Perry, 1981).

Organizational *commitment* is related to an employees' loyalty (Rousseau, 1990), tenure (Barge & Schlueter, 1988), and identification (Lee, 1971). Clearly these are

important outcomes for any organizational context. Yet, they remain untested in the political/public context, a context in which career-related change is perhaps more likely and frequent when compared to the organizational contexts traditionally examined by scholars.

Thus, this study offers an exploratory examination of the influence of organizational identification and commitment in the political/public context. With this exploratory approach, the research design seeks to identify the presence of identification and commitment among political/public employees, the correlation of these constructs, their relationship with employee beliefs, and the role of such variables as party affiliation, gender, and level of employment (i.e., state, federal). This initial examination of attachment in political/public organization contexts may not only provide such organizations with insight into their workplace dynamics, but also encourage further study of this important organizational context.

Literature Review

One of the central issues in the study of organizational attachment has been an employee's targets or sources of identification and commitment (Larson & Pepper, 2003; Lee, 1969; Morgan, Reynolds, Nelson, Johanningmeier, Griffin & Andrad, 2004; Russo, 1998; Scott, 1997). Although scholars differ in how they conceptualize and operationalize the definitions of organizational identification and commitment, both focus on connection between employees and some component of the workplace. In the organizational setting individuals can attach to other people, groups, and/or the organization itself (Ravasi & Rekom, 2003). Acknowledging the relationship of context to the complex nature of attachment, researchers believe that the study of an employee's organizational identification can help explain how these attachments adjust and change over time (Scott, 1997). In order to explore how the public/political context might influence organizational identification and commitment, it is first important to understand how scholars have defined these concepts.

Organizational Identification Defined

Organizational identification (OI) has been subject to numerous definitions over time. In one of the landmark definitions, Brown (1969) said, "identification is a self-defining response, set in a specific relationship" (p. 347). For Brown (1969), "self-defining" refers to when an individual describes himself/herself as a part of something else, such as an organization. In early research, the key relationship was between the employee and the organization taken as a global entity. Brown further centralized the relationship component in the organizational identification as a

process, but more specifically he identified the relationship as between the employee and employer. More recent scholars have defined organizational identification as being enacted in the choices an employee makes that ultimately promote the interests of the organization due to the shared interests of both parties (Tompkins & Cheney, 1985). Yet, the element of values plays a key role in how some scholars view identification, suggesting that it results from the discovery of shared beliefs and values between the employee and their organization (Lee, 1971) or more simply as the acceptance of the organization's goals and values as one's own (Barge & Schlueter, 1988).

Introducing the concept of a more targeted identification process, Ashforth and Mael (1989) argue that organizational identification arises from a particular perspective of social identification. From a social identification perspective, the authors suggest "identification is the perception of oneness with or belongingness to a group, involving direct or vicarious experiences of its successes and failures" (p. 34). Similarly, Becker (1992) states that identification occurs when individuals adapt/modify behaviors and attitudes to match those of people and groups they consider beneficial and positive. These studies demonstrate the connection between feelings of attachment and employee behaviors, especially those that go above and beyond an individual's position description. This may be especially salient in political organizations that are chronically under-funded and under-staffed.

The target or source of identification may be the organization as a whole, but individuals may identify instead or simultaneously with a workgroup or department,

the people one goes to lunch with, or the group who were hired at the same time (Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Morgan et al., 2004; Scott, 1997; Russo, 1998). Sources of identification also may be outside constituencies, such as customers or clients (Reichers, 1985). Finally, employees may report the strongest identification with their profession or with a set of ideals (Russo, 1998).

Relatedly, Dutton, Dukerich, and Harquail, in an analysis of components of organizational identity, (1994) explain that “when a person’s self-concept contains the same attributes as those in the perceived organization identity, we define this as organizational identification” (p. 239). This view suggests that identification with the organization represents a congruency between personal attributes and the organization’s values and goals. Due to the nature of politics—particularly the influence of political party affiliation and ideological perspectives—this study argues that public/political employees are as likely, if not more likely, to work in an organizational setting that represents this congruency. For instance, if an individual believes strongly in a woman’s right to choose, that individual would be more likely to work with a congressional member who is pro-choice than for a staunchly pro-life elected official. Therefore, this study adopts Dutton et al.’s (1994) definition of organizational identification based upon their reflective approach, in that the connection lies in the match between the employee’s inherent values and the organization’s values.

OI Operationalized and Conceptualized

Organizational identification has intrigued scholars through the years. Brown (1969) was one of the first theorists to attempt to characterize the phenomenon. He argued that attachment occurs when an individual's needs are met in an organization. The resulting attachment can benefit both the individual and the organization. Barker and Tompkins (1994) agreed with Brown (1969) by arguing that identification is beneficial for both the members and the organization. This is because it increases the likelihood that the members will act in the best interest of the organization. Thus, employees are no longer considered an extension of the product they produce but a member of the organization; the research that focuses on this shift in perspective consistently indicates that as a result of that relationship, the organization *and* the employee benefit. Several studies have revealed the importance of such a relationship (Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Brown, 1969; Barker & Tompkins, 1994; Sass & Canary, 1991; Tett & Meyer, 1993).

Ravasi and Rekom (2003) state that “identity appears a promising concept to bridge different levels of analysis and to analyze apparent paradoxes that arise when organizations confront simultaneous pressures from similarity and uniqueness, sameness, and differentiation” (p. 118). Identification allows employees to express a certain level of individuality and transform that individuality into an advantage for the organization (Dutton et al., 1994).

Identification often has been conceptualized as an emotional attachment, one that cannot be viewed by others (Cheney, 1983; Tompkins & Cheney, 1985). In

contrast, organizational commitment has been conceptualized as behavioral, the enactment of the emotional connection. The next section provides a review of the literature to further differentiate the construct of organizational commitment.

Organizational Commitment Defined

During the 1960's scholars began to refine the notion of organizational commitment (OC) (Sass & Canary, 1991). Porter, Steers, Mowday and Boulian (1974) defined organizational commitment as an individual's involvement in the organization and the strength of that involvement. Allen and Meyer (1996) defined organizational commitment as a link created between the employee and the organization that causes the employee to be less likely to terminate their employment. For the purposes of this study, organizational commitment is defined as the connection between an employee and their organization that causes the employee to be less likely to leave. In the ever-changing world of politics, employees may be constantly tempted with other job offers and opportunities, and thus it may contribute both to individuals and to political organizations to explore how different types of commitment contribute to longevity and, perhaps more importantly, to go the extra mile for their organizations

Allen and Meyer (1996) posited three distinct forms of commitment to explain the varied motivations that cause people to stay with their organizations. The first form is known as affective commitment, which is defined as an emotional attachment and identification to the organization. Continuance commitment, the second form, is described as a weighing of the cost and benefits of leaving the organization by the

employee. Last, normative commitment is described as a sense of obligation by the employee to the organization (Allen & Meyer, 1996). Bergman (2006) simplified the meanings of the three components of organizational commitment by labeling affective commitment as “wanting,” continuance commitment as “needing,” and normative commitment as a feeling of “obligation.”

OC Operationalized and Conceptualized

Organizational commitment is central to both the individual and the organization and thus is a critical component of organizational life (Zeffane, 1994). By understanding the various levels of commitment and which ones dominate as a source of attachment for each employee, organizations may better contribute to their success (Johnson & Chang, 2006).

Each individual component of commitment reflects a prominent characteristic an individual may possess and thus find more attracting. Research has revealed that the three component model of organizational commitment is a good predictor of both organizational work behavior and professional activity (Meyer, Allen, & Smith, 1993). While most organizations seek to implement uniform “practices and procedures” that foster a committed work environment, studies have shown that certain employees react better to different types of organizational commitment (Johnson & Chang, 2006).

Affective Commitment. Affective commitment appeals to the emotional side of an employee to their organization. Bergman (2006) defines affective commitment as “a desire to belong to the organization” (p. 645). This type of commitment is

shown to correlate with job-related characteristics, work experiences, personal characteristics and structural characteristics of the organization (Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1982). Meyer, Allen and Smith (1993) explain that “employees whose experiences within the organization are consistent with their expectations and satisfy their basic needs tend to develop a stronger affective attachment to the organization than do those whose experiences are less satisfying” (p.540). Herrbach (2006) found that there is, in fact, a relationship demonstrated between affective commitment and positive affective character identification, thus affirming that there is a relationship between one’s sense of identification in an organization and the feeling of positivity associated with that relationship (Meyer et al., 1993).

Continuance Commitment. When employees consider the costs and benefits of leaving an organization, they are exhibiting characteristics of continuance commitment. Continuance commitment also relates to variables that reflect a sense of an investment in the organization (Herrbach, 2006; Meyer et al., 1993).

Employees who have continuance commitment may stay with the organization because they feel certain needs are being satisfied or that they desire to remain so as not to lose all that they have already invested into the organization (Johnson & Chang, 2006). Continuance commitment also is evoked to describe staying with an organization because an employee sees no viable alternatives.

Normative Commitment. Normative commitment is present in employees who feel a sense of obligation to remain at the organization (Allen & Meyer, 1996; Bergman, 2006). Weiner (1982) considers organizational commitment from entirely

a normative perspective by stating, “Organizational commitment is viewed as the totality of internalized normative pressures to act in a way that meets organizational goals and interests” (p. 421). Normative commitment, however, relates to positive work experiences and a sense of obligation to the organization (Meyer et al., 1993).

Similarities and differences in OI & OC

Although several studies have suggested that organizational identification and commitment are independent constructs (Edwards, 2005; Sass & Canary, 1991), others have argued that they essentially reflect the same construct (Miller, Allen, Casey, & Johnson, 2000). After examining several scales by which to study organizational identification and commitment, Barge and Schlueter (1988) determined that there are differences in their development and overall implications and that it is important to study the two concepts separately. One distinct difference that relates specifically to the scales used in this study is that the OCQ and OCI scales “incorporate exertion of effort into their measures, while Cheney’s OIQ does not” (p. 129). In other words, although Allen and Meyer’s (1990) OCQ and Cheney’s OIQ have been shown to measure similar constructs, Barge and Schlueter (1988) concluded that they do in fact measure separate characteristics and thus the incorporation of both scales is necessary. Therefore, this study incorporates both the Allen and Meyer OCQ and Cheney’s OIQ to measure organizational identification and commitment in order to develop a more detailed understanding of employees’ perceptions of attachment in their organization.

Organizational identification and commitment have been examined in numerous contexts in the past, but this paper argues that one situation that has been omitted is the organizational setting known as politics. The organizational members of the public/political sector offer a new perspective on these constructs based on the nature of their careers. In the field of politics, it might be argued that organizational members are much more likely to choose their positions or employing organizations based on their personal beliefs and values. In most organizational settings employees are responsible for working toward a goal that benefits the overall organization, and their work may not require them to fight for and perhaps defend a deep-seated personal belief and/or value on a daily basis as does a career in politics. An examination of organizational identification and commitment in this particular context—political/public—can increase the knowledge and understanding of not only the degree to which they are present but also their influence. Therefore, the following research questions are posed:

Research Questions

RQ1: To what extent do political organizational workers report identification and commitment with their global organizations?

RQ2: To what extent are scores for identification and commitment correlated?

RQ3: What levels of intensity do participants report for their beliefs in organizational policies, in their leaders, and in their political party?

RQ4: In what ways do reports of identification, commitment and belief intensity vary based on demographics?

Method

Participants and Procedures

Subjects for this study were recruited using a snowball sample method (Frey, Botan, Friedman, & Kreps, 1991). The purpose of this data collection was to examine organizational members in political careers; thus, employees who work for a political figure—elected or appointed—were contacted by email to complete the survey and also encouraged to forward the email on to others fitting the same criteria. The survey completed by the participants was developed and administered using a professional online software program, SurveyMonkey. The survey remained available online for four weeks in an attempt to elicit a large sample of participants. Reminder emails were sent to the original participants two weeks after the initial contact date, in an attempt to encourage any additional participants.

A total of 47 participants responded to this survey; two participants were removed from the database due to incomplete responses. Therefore, a total of 45 completed the survey in its entirety. Of these, 22 were female (49%) and 23 were male (51%). The mean age was 32.29 years (range = 22-61), and respondents had worked at their current organizations 4.74 years on average (range = 1 month – 26.1 years). Regarding party affiliation, 11 (24%) participants were Democrats, 31 (69%) participants were Republican, and 3 (7%) participants were Independents. Most participants had completed an Associates (2, 4%) or Bachelor's Degree (37, 82%), while six (13%) held Masters Degrees.

Instruments

The questionnaire completed by the participants included three scales: Cheney's (1983) Organizational Identification Questionnaire, Allen & Meyer's (1990) three-component organizational commitment scale (affective, continuance, normative), and a three-item intensity of beliefs scale. Additional demographic questions were included.

Cheney's (1983) organizational identification scale (OIQ) contained 30 questions, which were later shortened to the 25 used in this study. This 25-item questionnaire, which targets the global organization, has been employed by several studies examining organizational identification (Barker & Tompkins, 1994; Russo, 1998), and uses a 5-point Likert scale (1=strongly disagree, 5=strongly agree). This questionnaire yields consistently acceptable levels: $\alpha = .92$ (Russo, 1998); $\alpha = .94$ (Barker & Tompkins, 1994); $\alpha = .95$ (Cheney, 1983). Similarly, Cronbach's alpha for the OIQ in this current study was .91.

Participants were then asked to rate their sense of commitment to their organization using the Organization Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) developed by Allen & Meyer (1990). This questionnaire has been widely used to examine organizational commitment (Randall, Fedor, & Longenecker, 1990; Reilley & Orsak, 1991; Somers, 1993; Dunham, Grube, & Castaneda, 1994; Hackett, Bycio, & Hausdorf, 1994). The scale contains 24 items, reported on a 5-point Likert scale (1=strongly disagree, 5=strongly agree). Cronbach's alpha for the OCQ is typically reported separately for each of the three components: affective, continuance, and

normative. Randall, Fedor, and Longeneck (1990) reported the following reliability scores: affective, $\alpha = .88$; continuance, $\alpha = .83$; and, normative, $\alpha = .52$. Reilley and Orsak (1991) reported similar results for affective and continuance, but stronger reliability for normative: affective, $\alpha = .84$; continuance, $\alpha = .80$; and, normative, $\alpha = .76$. The questionnaire designers, Allen and Meyer (1990), reported Cronbach's alpha levels similar to Reilley and Orsak: affective, $\alpha = .87$; continuance, $\alpha = .75$; and, normative, $\alpha = .79$. In this current study, alpha levels were acceptable as follows: affective: $\alpha = .86$; continuance: $\alpha = .76$; normative: $\alpha = .77$.

Participants were then asked to rate the intensity of their beliefs in their organization's policies, their leader(s), and their political party. The questions were specifically designed to identify to what extent participants believe in specific targets commonly related to jobs in public service ("I would describe the intensity of my beliefs in my organization's policies as..."; "I would describe the intensity of my beliefs in my leader as..."; "I would describe the intensity of my beliefs in my political party as..."). Participants rated the intensity of their beliefs to that particular target on a 5-point Likert scale (1=very low, 5 = very high). The Cronbach's alpha for this scale was .73.

Participants were also asked to respond to one open-ended question to obtain specific information about their attachment to their organization ("People attach to a variety of things in their organization. What is it for you?"). This question was developed to elicit more information about their attachment, isolate that with which they specifically identify, and explain why.

Data Analysis

Because of the sample size and exploratory nature of this study, one-sample t tests and Pearson's r were the primary tests used in data analysis. Specifically, to answer research questions one, two, and three, overall mean scores on the OIQ were calculated, as were overall mean scores for the three components of the OCQ and overall mean scores for the beliefs scale; one-sample t tests were then used to analyze the data. In order to determine if there is a correlation between the three components of organizational commitment and organizational identification, Pearson's r were used to analyze the calculated mean scores. To answer research question four, which asks if demographic variables influence identification, commitment, or intensity, frequencies and means, where appropriate, were calculated.

Results

This study examined the relationships among organizational identification, commitment, intensity, and demographics in a snowball sample of employed adults. Results are reported according to each corresponding research question.

Research question 1 asked: to what extent do political organizational workers report identification and commitment with their global organizations? To test employee identification, a one-sample t test was conducted on the overall OIQ mean score to evaluate whether the mean was significantly different from 3, considered the neutral mean for employees in general. The sample mean of 3.83 ($SD = .50$) was significantly different from 3, $t(44) = 11.27, p > .001$. The effect size d of 1.68 indicates a large effect. The results indicate that employees of politically-oriented organizations have higher levels of organizational identification than would be considered neutral.

In order to test employee commitment, one-sample t tests were conducted on each of the three components of commitment (affective, continuance, and normative) to evaluate whether the mean scores were significantly different from 3, the neutral mean for employees in general. For affective commitment, the sample mean of 3.54 ($SD = .67$) was significantly different from 3, $t(44) = 5.43, p > .001$. The effect size d of .81 indicates a large effect. For continuance commitment, the sample mean of 3.18 ($SD = .72$) was not significantly different from 3, $t(44) = 1.72, p = .093$. For normative commitment, the sample mean of 3.08 ($SD = .58$) was not significantly different from 3, $t(44) = .86, p = .394$. Therefore, the results of these analyses

suggest that while employees of politically-oriented organizations are significantly higher than neutral on their levels of affective commitment, they are significantly lower than neutral on their levels of continuance and normative commitment.

Research question 2 asked: to what extent are scores for identification and commitment correlated? Correlation coefficients were computed among organizational identification and the three components of organizational commitment (see Table 1). Using the Bonferroni approach to control for Type 1 errors across the 4 correlations, a p value of less than .005 ($.05 / 10 = .005$) was required for significance. The results of the correlational analyses show that 2 out the 3 correlations were statistically significant. The correlation between identification and affective commitment ($r = .84$) and the correlation between identification and normative commitment ($r = .50$) were both positive and significant. The correlation between identification and continuance commitment ($r = -.14$) was not significant. In general, the results suggest that if employees say that they are highly identified with their organization, they tend to state that they have higher levels of affective and normative commitment.

Research question 3 asked: what levels of intensity do participants report for their beliefs in organizational policies, in their leaders, and in their political party? A one-sample t test was conducted on intensity to evaluate whether the mean was significantly different from 3, the expected mean for employees in general. The sample mean of 4.0 ($SD = .62$) was significantly different from 3, $t(44) = 10.9$, $p > .001$. The effect size d of 1.62 indicates a large effect. The results support the

conclusion that employees of politically-oriented organizations have higher levels of intensity than would be considered neutral.

Research question 4 asked: in what ways do reports of identification and commitment vary based on demographics? The demographic variables examined were gender, party affiliation, and legislative division (see Table 2). In order to determine to what extent gender influences identification, commitment, and intensity, mean scores for males and females were compared across all variables. Although sample sizes were too small to claim statistical differences, males and females appear to have differing levels of normative, affective, and continuance commitment, as well as intensity. Specifically, males reported higher levels of affective commitment ($M = 3.67$, $SD = .59$) than did females ($M = 3.41$, $SD = .74$) and higher levels of normative commitment ($M = 3.27$, $SD = .61$; females: $M = 2.88$, $SD = .50$). Female participants reported higher levels of continuance commitment ($M = 3.28$, $SD = .68$) than did males ($M = 3.09$, $SD = .75$) and higher levels of intensity ($M = 4.11$, $SD = .69$; males: $M = 3.90$, $SD = .54$). Females ($M = 3.78$, $SD = .54$) and males ($M = 3.88$, $SD = .46$) reported similar levels of identification.

In order to determine to what extent political party identification influences identification, commitment, and intensity, mean scores for Democrats, Republicans, and Independents were compared across all variables. Although samples sizes were too small to claim statistical difference, Democrats, Republicans, and Independents appear to have differing levels of affective, continuance, and normative commitment, as well as identification and intensity. Specifically, Democrats reported higher levels

of continuance commitment ($n = 11, M = 3.32, SD = .62$) than Independents ($n = 3, M = 3.17, SD = .95$) and Republicans ($n = 31, M = 3.14, SD = .74$). Republican participants reported higher levels of affective commitment ($n = 31, M = 3.67, SD = .49$) than did Democrats ($n = 11, M = 3.39, SD = .91$) and Independents ($n = 3, M = 2.83, SD = 1.01$) and higher levels of normative commitment ($n = 31, M = 3.13, SD = .59$) than did Independents ($n = 3, M = 3.04, SD = .26$) and Democrats ($n = 11, M = 2.94, SD = .64$). Republican participants also reported higher levels of identification ($n = 31, M = 3.96, SD = .34$) than did Democrats ($n = 11, M = 3.70, SD = .54$) and Independents ($n = 3, M = 3.01, SD = .90$) and higher levels of intensity ($n = 31, M = 4.11, SD = .57$) than did Democrats ($n = 11, M = 3.91, SD = .56$) and Independents ($n = 3, M = 3.22, SD = .84$).

In order to determine to what extent the legislative division—state or federal—of the participant influences identification, commitment, and intensity, mean scores for federal and state employees were compared across all variables. Although samples sizes were too small to claim statistical differences, federal and state employees appear to have differing levels of identification and intensity, as well as affective, continuance, and normative commitment. Specifically, federal employees reported higher levels of affective commitment ($n = 21, M = 3.65, SD = .53$) than did state employees ($n = 21, M = 3.46, SD = .79$), higher levels of identification ($n = 21, M = 3.98, SD = .42$) than did state employees ($n = 21, M = 3.72, SD = .55$) and higher levels of intensity ($n = 21, M = 4.25, SD = .61$) than did state employees ($n = 21, M = 3.84, SD = .54$). State employees reported higher levels of continuance commitment

($n = 21$, $M = 3.33$, $SD = .77$) than did federal employees ($n = 21$, $M = 3.10$, $SD = .66$). Federal ($n = 21$, $M = 3.10$, $SD = .64$) and state ($n = 21$, $M = 3.01$, $SD = .56$) employees reported similar levels of normative commitment.

Two open-ended questions were included in the survey to provide further explanation regarding participants' organizational identification. The first question ($n = 45$) asked, "Consider the following scenario: you are approached by friend who asks, "Where do you work?" What do you say?" Based on an analysis of the responses, five response categories emerged. The most frequently mentioned category was the participant's specific branch/state (15, 33%), followed by: specific member (11, 24%), department (8, 18%), Capitol Hill (6, 13%), and miscellaneous (5, 11%).

The second open-ended question ($n = 43$) asked, "People attach to a variety of things in their organization. What is it for you?" The analysis of these responses revealed the emergence of 10 distinct categories; however 60 % of the participants' responses fell within more than one category. Overall, "people in the organization" (17, 20%) was mentioned most frequently, followed by: job-leader (16, 18%), job-responsibility (12, 14%), self-career (7, 8%), specific issue(s) (7, 8%), position in the organization (7, 8%), salary (6, 7%), organization (6, 7%), state the employee is representing (5, 6%), and constituents (4, 5%).

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship among employees of politically-oriented organizations and their organizational attachment. The scales used in this study were consistent with those most frequently used in communication studies, specifically Cheney's (1982) OIQ and Meyer and Allen's (1990) three-component organizational commitment scale. Noteworthy findings from this study address three specific questions: the presence of identification, commitment, and intensity; the differences in affective, continuance, and normative commitment; and the influence of demographics. Following a discussion of this study's findings, strengths and limitations will be addressed as will be suggestions for additional research.

The results regarding research question one revealed that employees of politically-oriented organizations do report high levels of identification and commitment. These results are consistent with prior research wherein high levels of organizational identification (Lee, 1971; Scott, 1997) and commitment (Johnson & Chang, 2006; Porter, Steers, Mowday & Boulian, 1974) were discovered, and particularly among public sector employees (Scott, 1997; Zeffane, 1994). This current study suggests, however, that in an organizational culture as fluid as politics it is not surprising that the participants rated their identification and commitment as higher than average. It may be assumed that employees who are willing to stay in an environment that is constantly consumed by change must find a "sense of belonging" in their organization that outweighs the sense of uncertainty that is inherent in such a

career. Based on these findings it might also be assumed that in a career where beliefs and values are perceived to be more visible or “known” (i.e., due to party affiliation, public support of policy, etc.), identification with and commitment to that organization would be certainly higher than average.

The results regarding the first research question also confirmed the importance of examining commitment as a three-component model (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Barge & Schlueter, 1998; Edwards, 2005; Sass & Canary, 1991). The results indicated that participants have high levels of affective commitment to their organization but do not report high levels of continuance and normative commitment. While the exploratory nature of this study limits further comparisons, these results do raise the question of why employees of politically-oriented organizations do not report significant levels of continuance and normative commitment.

In order to begin to address this differential, context must be revisited. As this paper has argued, the nature of a career in politics is fluid. To an outsider that constant uncertainty may seem daunting, but, it may in fact be argued that such an environment can well explain why the participants did not report significantly high levels of continuance and normative commitment. An individual who holds high levels of continuance commitment believes that they have no other options or alternatives available (Allen & Meyer, 1990,) and in a career that is constantly consumed by change, participants may feel a certain level of security that some job will always be available if the current one does not work out. Perhaps, employees of politically-oriented organizations do not see the constant change consuming their

environment as a negative consequence of their career. Instead, they may well believe it to be a benefit and a reassurance that when one door closes, several windows will be opened; therefore, the sense of having no other alternative escapes them.

The question then becomes why they do not feel the strong sense of obligation that is associated with normative commitment. To argue this point, the results and explanation must once again consider the fluid nature of a career in politics. It might be assumed that a majority of people who enter a career in politics understand that it is going to be constantly surrounded by change, and thus a person who is attracted to such a career may just not be the type of person who commits to the immediate employer at hand but to a larger cause. This same explanation also provides insight as to why these participants do not report feelings of continuance commitment. If an employee reports high levels of continuance commitment, they are said to believe that they have no other options or alternatives available and thus they remain at their organizations (Allen & Meyer, 1990). Therefore, due to the fluid nature of politics, individuals who enter this field may already know that it is constantly consumed by change and therefore they view that aspect of change as a normal occurrence in their organizational tenure. Although such a claim cannot be supported by statistical data from this study, one participant's open-ended response illustrates this point:

Politics was a hobby until it became my job. I feel lucky to work in a career that I consider fun. I've worked for honest people and never felt ashamed to be associated with them or their platforms and although I doubt this is a

lifestyle that I'll lead for the rest of my life, as there's little stability from job to job, but it's a great fit right now and provides me with excellent opportunities for my age and experience level.

The implications of these results—high affective commitment but average normative and continuance commitment—present an interesting finding for organizational research and for political organizations. This study provides politically-oriented organizations with the knowledge that their employees may be more affectively and emotionally committed to their organizations, but that they may both see other job opportunities as viable options and are perhaps less invested in the immediate employing organization as they are to working in “politics,” for their party, or “on the Hill,” for instance. In fact, responses to the first open-ended question provide support for this argument. When respondents were asked to identify where they worked, 33% identified a specific branch and/or state office (for example Kansas Legislature, Kansas Senate, etc.), 24% identified a specific member, 18% specified a specific department, 13% reported “on Capitol Hill”, and 11% were categorized as miscellaneous. For those organizations seeking continuity and consistency among their staff, such findings become increasingly important. Although research has revealed that an organization cannot change a person's type of commitment, they may be able to tailor their organizational activities to the antecedents that produce ideal outcomes (Edwards, 2005).

Research question two addressed whether there is a correlation between organizational identification and commitment. The results did indicate that for

politically-oriented employees identification is correlated with both affective and normative commitment. These findings are consistent with past research (Edwards, 2005; Miller et al, 2000; Sass & Canary, 1991) that has found affective commitment exhibits a strong relationship to organizational identification. For instance, Sass and Canary (1991) conducted a study examining organizational identification and commitment—operationalizing commitment as a one-factor construct as opposed to the three-factor construct used in this study—and concluded that there was in fact a statistically significant correlation between the two key concepts. Further, Edwards (2005) and Miller et al. (2000) both identified a relationship between organizational identification and affective commitment. The findings of the present study are consistent with the literature that typically finds affective commitment is statistically correlated to organizational identification. Further, results from a recent study indicated that normative commitment was statistically correlated to identification (Russo, Beck, Asbury, Faimon, Beach, Carver, Mank, Markward, Spain, Villamil & Osborn, 2007). Granted, it might be argued that such a relationship exists due to the similarity of language used in several OCQ affective and normative survey questions with several OIQ survey questions. It might also be argued that there is a relationship between the characteristics that are produced by the similar nature of employees who have affective commitment that is said to produces employees’ who “want to stay” and normative commitment that is said to produce employees’ who “believe they should stay” (Russo et al., 2007). Both levels—affective and normative—create a sense of commitment that stems from either wanting or believing they should stay

whereas continuance commitment is viewed as feeling of necessity. As such, it would not be unexpected for a relationship to develop.

The third research question addressed the participants' measurement of their belief intensity on three distinct variables: their political party, their leader, and/or their organization's policies. The results of this question revealed that employees of political/public organizations report high levels of intensity in their beliefs. Although the variables were summed, it is worth noting that based on individual-item mean scores employees rated their belief in their political party ($M = 4.11$) as the highest, followed by a similar rating for their belief in the leader ($M = 3.96$) and the organization's policies ($M = 3.93$). Such a finding may further validate the argument that employees do not report high levels of normative commitment because they may feel a stronger sense of connection to their political party than to their employing organization. If employees feel that their belief in their political party outweighs their belief in their personal leader (boss) and their organization's policies, then it might be argued that employees view the overall success of their political party more highly than the success of their employing organization.

Such a finding may assist politically-oriented organizations in knowing what aspect of their organization they should promote in order to develop the most "passionate" employees. By knowing that employees rate the success of their party over the success of their leader, it may then be argued that organizations should promote the importance of their leader in the overall success of the party. This links the employee to the beneficial contribution of the organization, to the leader, and to

the party, thus potentially fostering a sense of support for all three factors simultaneously. It might also be beneficial to the organization to make their political figure more available to their office staff. If the employees feel a real connection to their respective leaders, then the intensity of their beliefs in their leader and possibly in the organization's policies may increase and thus benefit the organizations as a whole.

Research question four addressed the influence of specific demographics on organizational identification and commitment. While several factors were examined, three key findings emerged. The following sections will examine the influence of the participants' gender, political party identification, and legislative division and their influence on identification, commitment, and intensity.

First, these results suggest participant gender influences the various components of their public sector organizational attachment, a finding that is inconsistent with research examining private organizations (Angel & Perry, 1981; Marsden et al, 1993; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Russo, 1998; Sass & Canary, 1991; Steers, 1977). Specifically, in this study, men reported higher levels of identification, affective commitment, and normative commitment; women reported higher levels of continuance commitment and overall intensity. Although earlier work does indicate a gender influence, these specific results contradict some earlier work (Angel & Perry, 1981; Sass & Canary, 1991), wherein men reported lower levels of identification and commitment than females. Although the sample size is too low to conclude any significant findings, one may assume that in a field largely dominated by men, males

may in fact identify much more easily with their organization than their female counterparts. Further, due to the male-dominated nature of politics, men may also feel more secure in their jobs and in their opportunity for advancement, perceptions that allow them to more closely identify with their respective positions and the organization. The findings from this research suggest that the organizational environment may influence those characteristics we allow ourselves to emphasize in our daily lives. Further research comparing employee responses in traditionally masculine-oriented organizations and traditionally feminine-oriented organizations could provide both clarity and important insights as to the interaction between the sex of the employee and organizational identification.

In an attempt to explain why men have lower levels of commitment, Marthieu and Zajac (1990) argue that this might be due to the fact that women have to work harder than men. Furthermore, Marsden et al. (1993) state that another possible explanation for this occurrence lies in the argument that women hold jobs that contain fewer commitment-related responsibilities. This study's inconsistent findings—in comparison to other research—may lie in the fact that society has labeled men as the “bread-winners” and females as the “caregivers.” In such a society it may make sense that men feel a stronger sense of obligation due to the fact that they feel they must hold a career to support their families; in that same society women may feel as though they must maintain a balance between their family lives and their careers. Thus, their commitment for the organization lies more in the measurement of what they might lose if they leave based on the sacrifices they made to remain employed.

A second argument may lie in the competitive nature of politics. Competition is present in virtually every organization at some level, but the degree to which that competition is publicly observable is often low. However, in the organizational setting of politics, competition is visible and necessary for survival. The competition is viewed through the modern day mediated campaigns necessary for officeholders to first be elected or re-elected, and continues as the news media covers policy debates on the floors of the House and Senate, features officeholders and their surrogates on Sunday morning news shows debating policies and events, and covers press briefings and press conferences. In our society it has been argued that men are perceived to be more competitive—and generally more comfortable with openly competitive environments—than women (Hackman & Johnson, 2004). Consequently this study's unusual finding that men in politically-oriented organizations report higher levels of identification might also be explained by their comfort with the openly competitive nature of this organizational environment.

The results of research question four also indicated that the participant's political party membership influenced organizational identification, commitment, and intensity. Democrats were most likely to report high levels of continuance commitment, and Republicans were most likely to report high levels of identification, intensity, affective commitment, and normative commitment. Independents reported higher levels of continuance commitment than did Republicans, and higher levels of normative commitment than did Democrats; Independents reported the lowest levels of affective commitment, identification, and intensity. As mentioned earlier, this

study was conducted immediately following the 2006 midterm elections, and thus the results of this particular question raise several possible explanations along with several implications.

Steers (1977) found that when personal characteristics of an employee, such as affiliation and need for achievement, are measured against commitment, a significant relationship develops. Although Steers was not referring to the affiliation this study focuses on, it is apparent that the influence of personal demographics does influence an employees' level of commitment. Due to the timing of this study, it may come as a surprise that Republicans reported such high levels of identification, intensity, and affective and normative commitment. To the outsider it may be assumed that if one's party loses control in the House and the Senate, then one's identification, commitment, and intensity to the organization would suffer; however, this study revealed the exact opposite. One possible explanation may focus on where politically-oriented employees feel true power resides in Washington D.C.—at least for the moment. In other words, Republicans may feel that they really did not lose power per se, but that because they still hold the power of the executive office the loss of a majority in the House and Senate can be reasoned as less detrimental. A second possible argument may lie in the assumption that due to the recent loss of power that occurred with the 2006 midterm election results, Republicans feel the need to “stand together and stand strong”; thus, the higher level of commitment they reported may reflect the manner in which they have chosen to cope in order to survive

until the next major election. Some refer to this initial survival tactic as the “bunker mentality”.

Also, it may be argued that the reason that Democrats feel such high levels of continuance commitment may lie in the fact that their victory is still in its preliminary stages and thus they have not truly had the opportunity to appreciate the opportunity of success. Also, the midterm elections may not offer the job opportunities that the presidential election year typically brings, and the job opportunities may not be as plentiful as one might initially assume. A second possible explanation may lie in the organizational environment of politics and the notion of network connections. With the Republicans holding control of Congress for the last 12 years, it may be difficult for Democrats to make the initial connections necessary to sustain various employment opportunities. These jobs opportunities that might have initially created a sense of security may have already been filled by the campaign staff of the newly elected officials, thus only furthering the argument that Democrats must not feel confident in other possible job possibilities.

The participant’s level of legislative division proved to also influence the overall rating of their organizational attachment. These results are consistent with a study conducted by Craig Scott (1997) on identification with dispersed organizations, wherein which he found that the location of the specific office did affect employees’ assessment of their organizational identification. Scott (1997) concluded that although there are several “potential” targets for identification by the organizational member, “one’s specific level (i.e., county office, area office, or state office) should

play a strong role in shaping identification” (p. 499). The results of this study show that federal employees hold higher levels of identification and intensity, along with affective and normative commitment, and state employees held higher levels of continuance commitment. Participants who identified themselves as working for Senator X at the federal level were considered federal employees, while participants who identified themselves as working for State Attorney General Y or Governor Z, were considered state employees.

Scott (1997) concluded that one possible explanation for his results may be that to a majority of the organizational members, the federal level is all but invisible. However, the county and state levels are far more visible and thus allow the employee to identify with something that is a constant presence in their daily lives. With regard to this study, federal employees may also invest more of themselves in their career (i.e., substantial move away from their home state, long hours, heavy work loads, constantly changing environments, frequent loss of friends and co-workers) and thus their levels of specific types of commitment, identification and intensity would be higher. It might be assumed that a majority of the participants who identified themselves as federal employees live in Washington D.C. and work in the office of the elected member they identified. If a person is willing to pack up and move to a new city in an attempt to work for a specific political figure in the nation’s Capitol, then it might be argued that they would feel higher levels of the previously mentioned characteristics. It might also be assumed that a life in Washington D.C. is more action-oriented than a life in the state of X, thus making participants who work at the

federal level feel more “attached” to their organization due to the sacrifices they made to be there and the constant presence of the member for which they work.

The implications of research question five’s findings for the organization are plentiful. While an organization cannot theoretically (in an ethical world) control the specific demographics of their employees, knowing that women are more intense than men or that federal employees identify more strongly with their organization than state employees may affect how the organization functions on a daily basis. By being aware of these differences, an organization can foster certain practices that may cater to the specific characteristics they wish to promote in their organization.

Strengths and Limitations

The survey method this study employed led to a unique perspective by which to examine politically-oriented employees. The use of both open and close ended questions helped the researcher to not only monitor the initial responses of the participant but allowed for further explanation on what they view as the primary attachment. Employees’ accounts of their individual attachment provided a context in which to understand the role of identification, commitment and intensity in their overall attachment.

The four-week timeframe should have allowed the study to elicit participation via the snowball methodology from a large sample of organizational members. However, a major limitation of this study is the small sample size. Although the study was conducted during a congressional and legislative session, with the expectation that response times would be quicker and employees would be likely to

be in the office (as opposed to traveling with the officeholder or on vacation), securing the expected sample size proved difficult. While this study did not obtain a sufficient number of participants to report statistically significant findings with all research questions, the time period allocated and methodology employed did allow the researcher to contact a large sample pool. Future research with this population needs to consider additional steps to ensure a more sizeable response set. Even with this limitation, the responses gathered do provide exploratory results that can lead to further research in this understudied organizational environment.

Within the small sample size additional limitations arise. First, the unequal representation of political party affiliation must be acknowledged. The snowball sample methodology does require that particular attention be paid to the initial contacts made and ongoing demographic analysis as the data collection progresses. An additional limitation is the “no survey” policy established by several political offices; while this cannot be overcome, future research should be aware of this policy and seek to avoid needlessly contacting those individuals. While this study faced several limitations, these exploratory findings suggest the importance of future research in this complex organizational context.

Conclusions and suggestions for future research

The goal of this exploratory study was to examine the political/public organizational setting, whose environment and culture is constantly consumed by change, and thus provides a unique look at why these employees choose to remain. In order to explain this trend, this study sought to examine employees’ perceptions of

their organizational attachment. Organizational attachment was categorized into three sub-categories; organizational identification, commitment and intensity. Due to the limited scope of research of politically-oriented employees, this study sought to prompt future studies by presenting findings that offer a preliminary explanation as to why political/public employees might report high levels of organizational identification, commitment, and intensity.

The results of the study confirm that politically-oriented employees do report higher than average levels of identification, affective commitment, and intensity. Specific attention should be given to the correlation discovered between affective and normative commitment and identification, as well as the influence of specific demographics. This paper's findings suggest that future research is needed in order to determine the true implications of identification, commitment and intensity on politically-oriented employees. It is only through their experiences and responses that we can truly begin to understand the unique and intricate organizational life of political employees.

Bibliography

- 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.
- Angel, H. L., & Perry, J. L. (1981). An empirical assessment of organizational commitment and organizational effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *26*(1).
- Ashforth, B. E. & Mael, F. (1989). Social identity theory and the organization. *The Academy of Management Review*, *14*, 20-39.
- Barge, J. K., & Schlueter, D. W. (1988). A critical evaluation of organizational commitment and identification. *Management Communication Quarterly*, *2*, 116-133.
- Barker, J.R. & Tompkins, P. K. (1994). Identification in the self-managing organization: Characteristics of target and tenure. *Human Communication Research*, *21*, 223-240.
- Becker, T. E. (1992). Foci and bases of commitment: Are they distinctions worth making? *The Academy of Management Journal*, *35*, 232-244.

- Bergman, M. E. (2006). The relationship between affective and normative commitment: Review and research agenda. *Journal of Occupational Behavior, 27*, 645–663.
- Brown, M. E. (1969). Identification and some conditions of organizational involvement. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 14*, 346-355.
- Cheney, G. (1983) On the various and changing meanings of organizational membership: A field study of organizational identification. *Communication Monograph, 50*, 342-362.
- Dunham, R. B., Grube, J. A., & Casteneda, M. B. (1994). Organizational commitment: The utility of an integrative definition. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 79*(3).
- Dutton, J. E., Dukerich, J. M. & Harquail, C. V. (1994). Organizational images and member identification. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 39*, 239-263.
- Edwards, M. R. (2005). Organizational identification: A conceptual and operational view. *International Journal of Management Review, 7*, 207-230.
- Frey, L.R., Botan, P. G., Friedman, P. G., & Kreps, G. L. (1991). *Investigating communication: An introduction to research methods*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Hackett, R. D., Bycio, P., & Hausdorf, P. A. (1994). Further assessments of Meyer and Allen's (1991) three-component model of organizational commitment. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 79*, 15 – 23.

- Hackman, M. Z., & Johnson, C. E. (2004). *Leadership: A communication perspective* (4th Ed.). Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press, Inc.
- Herrbach, O. (2006). A matter of feeling? The affective tone of organizational commitment and identification. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 27, 629-643.
- Johnson, R. E., & Chang, C. H. (2006). “I” is to continuance as “We” is to affective: The relevance of the self-concept for organizational commitment. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 27, 549-570.
- Larson, G. S., & Pepper, G. L. (2003). Strategies for managing multiple organizational identification: A case of competing identities. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 16, 528-557.
- Lee, S. M. (1969). Organizational identification of scientists. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 12, 327-337.
- Lee, S. M. (1971). An empirical analysis of organizational identification. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 14, 213-226.
- Marsden, P. V., Kalleberg, A. L., & Cook, C. R. (1993). Gender differences in organizational commitment: Influences of work positions and family roles. *Work and Occupations*, 20, 368-390.
- Mathieu, J. E., & Zajac, D. M. (1990). A review and meta-analysis of the antecedents, correlates, and consequences of organizational commitment. *Psychological Bulletin*, 108, 171 – 194.

- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1984). Testing the “side-bet theory” of organizational commitment: Some methodological considerations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 3*, 372-378.
- Meyer, J. P., Allen, N. J., & Smith, C. A. (1993). Commitment to organizations and occupations: Extensions and test of a three component- conceptualization. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 78*, 538-551.
- Miller, V. D., Allen, M., Casey, M. K., & Johnson, J. R. (2000). Reconsidering the organizational identification questionnaire. *Management Communication Quarterly, 13*(4), 626–658.
- Morgan, J. M., Reynolds, C. M., Nelson, T. J., Johanningmeir, A. R., Griffin, M., & Andrade, P. (2004). Tales from the fields: Sources of employee identification in agribusiness. *Management Communication Quarterly, 17*(3), 360–395.
- Mowday, R. T., Steers, R. M., & Porter, L. W. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 14*, 224–247.
- Porter, L. W., Steers, R. M., Mowday, R. D., & Boulian, P. (1974). Organizational commitment, job satisfaction and turnover among psychiatric technicians. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 59*, 606–609.
- Randall, D. M., Fedor, D. B., & Longenecker, C. O. (1990). The behavioral expression of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 36*, 210–224.
- Ravasi, D. & Rekom, J. V. (2003). Key issues in organizational loyalty and identification theory. *Corporate Reputation Review, 6*, 118-128.

- Reichers, A. E. (1985). A review and reconceptualization of organizational commitment. *Academy of Management Review, 10*(3).
- Reilly, N. P., & Orsak, C. L. (1991). A career stage analysis of Howard Becker's side-bet theory. *Social Forces, 47*, 475–479.
- Rousseau, D. M. (1990). New hire perceptions of their own and their employer's obligations: A study of psychological contracts. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 11*, 389-400.
- Russo, T. C. (1998). Organizational and professional identification: A case of newspaper journalists. *Management Communication Quarterly, 12*(1), 72–111.
- Russo, T. C., Beck, S., Asbury, M. E., Faimon, S., Beach, S. K., Carver, L., Mank, R., Markward, L., Spain, A., Villamil, A., & Osborn, K. (2007). Organizational attachment: A multi-disciplinary comparison of operationalizations. Paper submitted to the annual conference of the National Communication Association.
- Sass, J. S., & Canary, D. J. (1991). Organizational commitment and identification: An examination of conceptual and operational convergence. *Western Journal of Speech Communication, 55*, 275–293.
- Scott, C. (1997). Identification with multiple targets in a geographically dispersed organization. *Management Communication Quarterly, 10* (4).

- 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.
- Steers, R. M. (1977). Antecedents and outcomes of organizational commitment. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 22(1).
- Tett, R. P., & Meyer, J. P. (1993). Job satisfaction, organizational commitment, turnover intention and turnover: Path analyses based on meta-analytic findings. *Personnel Psychology*, 46, 259–293.
- Tompkins, P. K., & Cheney, G. (1983). Account analysis of organizations: Decision making and identification. In L.L. Putnam and M.E. Pacanowsky (Eds.) *Communication and organizations: A interpretive approach*, (pp. 123-146). Beverly Hills, Sage.
- Tompkins, P. K., & Cheney, G. (1985). Communication and unobtrusive control in contemporary organizations. In R.D. McPhee and P. K. Tompkins (Eds.) *Organizational communication: Reviews and new direction*, (pp. 179-210). Beverly Hills, Ca: Sage.
- Whitehouse.gov (2006, May 3). President Bush discusses strong and growing U.S. economy. [Television broadcast]. Washington, DC. Retrieved from, <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2006/05/20060503-4.html>
- Wiener, Y. (1982). Commitment in organizations: A normative view. *The Academy of Management Review*, 7, 418-428.

Zeffane, R. (1994). Patterns of organizational commitment and perceived management style: A comparison of public and private sector employees. *Human Relations*, 47, 977-1011.

Appendix A

Questionnaire

1. How many years have you been in the workforce, as a full time employee, in total (after the age of 18)?

Less than 1 ____ 1 – 5 ____ 6 – 10 ____ 11 – 15 ____ 16 – 20 ____ 21 + ____

2. Consider the following scenario: you are approached by friend who asks, “Where do you work?” What do you say?

3. How many years and/or months have you been employed by *this organization*?

____ years and/or ____ months

4. How many years and/or months have you been employed in *this job*?

____ years and/or ____ months

5. What is your current job position in your organization? (Examples: Entry, Manager, Director, Legislative, Press, Owner, etc):

6. Previous to your current position, what are the last two positions you have held:

7. Did you work on the most recent campaign of the elected official for whom you now work?

Yes ____ No ____ N/A (I work for an appointed official) ____

8. I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization

Strongly agree ____ Agree ____ Neither agree nor disagree ____ Disagree ____ Strongly disagree ____

9. I enjoy discussing my organization with people outside of it.

Strongly agree ____ Agree ____ Neither agree nor disagree ____ Disagree ____ Strongly disagree ____

10. I really feel as if this organization’s problems are my own.

Strongly agree ____ Agree ____ Neither agree nor disagree ____ Disagree ____ Strongly disagree ____

11. I think I could easily become as attached to another organization as I am to this one.*

Strongly agree _____ Agree _____ Neither agree nor disagree _____ Disagree _____ Strongly disagree _____

12. I do not feel like “part of the family at my organization”.*

Strongly agree _____ Agree _____ Neither agree nor disagree _____ Disagree _____ Strongly disagree _____

13. I do not feel “emotionally attached” to this organization. *

Strongly agree _____ Agree _____ Neither agree nor disagree _____ Disagree _____ Strongly disagree _____

14. This organization has a great deal of personal meaning to me.

Strongly agree _____ Agree _____ Neither agree nor disagree _____ Disagree _____ Strongly disagree _____

15. I do not feel a strong sense of “belonging” to my organization.*

Strongly agree _____ Agree _____ Neither agree nor disagree _____ Disagree _____ Strongly disagree _____

16. I am not afraid of what might happen if I quit my job without having another one lined up.*

Strongly agree _____ Agree _____ Neither agree nor disagree _____ Disagree _____ Strongly disagree _____

17. It would be very hard for me to leave my organization right now, even if I wanted to.

Strongly agree _____ Agree _____ Neither agree nor disagree _____ Disagree _____ Strongly disagree _____

18. Too much of my life would be disrupted if I were to change my organization now.

Strongly agree _____ Agree _____ Neither agree nor disagree _____ Disagree _____ Strongly disagree _____

19. It wouldn't be costly for me to change my organization now.*

Strongly agree _____ Agree _____ Neither agree nor disagree _____ Disagree _____ Strongly disagree _____

20. Right now, staying with my organization is a matter of necessity as much as desire.

Strongly agree _____ Agree _____ Neither agree nor disagree _____ Disagree _____ Strongly disagree _____

21. I feel I have too few options to consider leaving this organization.

Strongly agree _____ Agree _____ Neither agree nor disagree _____ Disagree _____ Strongly disagree _____

22. One of the few negative consequences of leaving this organization would be the scarcity of available alternatives.

Strongly agree _____ Agree _____ Neither agree nor disagree _____ Disagree _____ Strongly disagree _____

23. One of the major reasons I continue to work for this organization is that leaving would require considerable personal sacrifice – another organization may not match the overall benefit I have here.

Strongly agree _____ Agree _____ Neither agree nor disagree _____ Disagree _____ Strongly disagree _____

24. I think people these days move from company to company too often.

Strongly agree _____ Agree _____ Neither agree nor disagree _____ Disagree _____ Strongly disagree _____

25. I do not believe that a person must always be loyal to his or her organization.*

Strongly agree _____ Agree _____ Neither agree nor disagree _____ Disagree _____ Strongly disagree _____

26. Jumping from organization to organization does not seem at all unethical to me.*

Strongly agree _____ Agree _____ Neither agree nor disagree _____ Disagree _____ Strongly disagree _____

27. One of the major reasons I continue to work for this organization is that I believe that loyalty is important and therefore feel a sense of moral obligation to remain.

Strongly agree _____ Agree _____ Neither agree nor disagree _____ Disagree _____ Strongly disagree _____

28. If I got another offer for a better job elsewhere I would not feel it was right to leave my organization,

Strongly agree _____ Agree _____ Neither agree nor disagree _____ Disagree _____ Strongly disagree _____

29. I was taught to believe in the value of remaining loyal to one organization.

Strongly agree _____ Agree _____ Neither agree nor disagree _____ Disagree _____ Strongly disagree _____

30. Things were better in the days when people stayed with one organization for most of their careers.

Strongly agree _____ Agree _____ Neither agree nor disagree _____ Disagree _____ Strongly disagree _____

31. I do not think that wanting to be a “company man” or “company woman” is sensible anymore. *

Strongly agree _____ Agree _____ Neither agree nor disagree _____ Disagree _____ Strongly disagree _____

32. I would probably continue working for my organization even if I didn't need the money.

Strongly agree _____ Agree _____ Neither agree nor disagree _____ Disagree _____ Strongly disagree _____

33. In general, the people employed by my organization are working towards the same goals.

Strongly agree _____ Agree _____ Neither agree nor disagree _____ Disagree _____ Strongly disagree _____

34. I am proud to be a member of my organization.

Strongly agree _____ Agree _____ Neither agree nor disagree _____ Disagree _____ Strongly disagree _____

35. My organization's image in the community represents me well.

Strongly agree _____ Agree _____ Neither agree nor disagree _____ Disagree _____ Strongly disagree _____

36. I often describe myself by saying, "I work for _____" or "I am from _____".

Strongly agree _____ Agree _____ Neither agree nor disagree _____ Disagree _____ Strongly disagree _____

37. I try to make on-the-job decisions by considering the consequences of my actions for my organization.

Strongly agree _____ Agree _____ Neither agree nor disagree _____ Disagree _____ Strongly disagree _____

38. We at _____ are different from others in the field.

Strongly agree _____ Agree _____ Neither agree nor disagree _____ Disagree _____ Strongly disagree _____

39. I am glad I choose to work for this organization rather than another company.

Strongly agree _____ Agree _____ Neither agree nor disagree _____ Disagree _____ Strongly disagree _____

40. I talk up my organization to my friends as a great company to work for.

Strongly agree _____ Agree _____ Neither agree nor disagree _____ Disagree _____ Strongly disagree _____

41. In general, I view the organization's problems as my own.

Strongly agree _____ Agree _____ Neither agree nor disagree _____ Disagree _____ Strongly disagree _____

42. I willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected to help my organization be successful

Strongly agree _____ Agree _____ Neither agree nor disagree _____ Disagree _____ Strongly disagree _____

43. I become irritated when I hear others outside of my organization criticize the company.

Strongly agree _____ Agree _____ Neither agree nor disagree _____ Disagree _____ Strongly disagree _____

44. I have warm feelings towards my organization as a place to work

Strongly agree _____ Agree _____ Neither agree nor disagree _____ Disagree _____ Strongly disagree _____

45. I would be willing to spend the rest of my career with my organization.

Strongly agree _____ Agree _____ Neither agree nor disagree _____ Disagree _____ Strongly disagree _____

46. I feel that my organization cares about me.

Strongly agree _____ Agree _____ Neither agree nor disagree _____ Disagree _____ Strongly disagree _____

47. The record of my organization is an example of what dedicated people can achieve.

Strongly agree _____ Agree _____ Neither agree nor disagree _____ Disagree _____ Strongly disagree _____

48. I have a lot in common with others employed by my organization.

Strongly agree _____ Agree _____ Neither agree nor disagree _____ Disagree _____ Strongly disagree _____

49. I find it difficult to agree with my organization's policies on important matters relating to me. *

Strongly agree _____ Agree _____ Neither agree nor disagree _____ Disagree _____ Strongly disagree _____

50. My association with my organization is only a small part of who I am. *

Strongly agree _____ Agree _____ Neither agree nor disagree _____ Disagree _____ Strongly disagree _____

51. I tell others about projects that my organization is working on.

Strongly agree _____ Agree _____ Neither agree nor disagree _____ Disagree _____ Strongly disagree _____

52. I find that my values and the values of my organization are similar.

Strongly agree _____ Agree _____ Neither agree nor disagree _____ Disagree _____ Strongly disagree _____

53. I feel very little loyalty to my organization. *

Strongly agree _____ Agree _____ Neither agree nor disagree _____ Disagree _____ Strongly disagree _____

54. I would describe my organization as a large “family” in which most members feel a sense of belongings.

Strongly agree _____ Agree _____ Neither agree nor disagree _____ Disagree _____ Strongly disagree _____

55. I find it easy to identify myself with my organization.

Strongly agree _____ Agree _____ Neither agree nor disagree _____ Disagree _____ Strongly disagree _____

56. I really care about the fate of my organization.

Strongly agree _____ Agree _____ Neither agree nor disagree _____ Disagree _____ Strongly disagree _____

57. I would describe the intensity of my beliefs in my organization’s policies as:

Very high _____ High _____ Neither high nor low _____ Low _____ Very low _____

58. I would describe the intensity of my beliefs in my leader(s) as:

Very high _____ High _____ Neither high nor low _____ Low _____ Very low _____

59. I would describe the intensity of my beliefs in my political party as:

Very high _____ High _____ Neither high nor low _____ Low _____ Very low _____

60. I would describe the intensity of my beliefs in my career as:

Very high _____ High _____ Neither high nor low _____ Low _____ Very low _____

61. Please mark one of the following:

(1) Male _____ (2) Female _____

62. Age: _____

63. Please identify your highest level of education:

(1) _____ High School (2) _____ Associate’s Degree (3) _____ Bachelor’s Degree

(4) _____ Master’s Degree (5) _____ PhD Degree (6) _____ Vocational

(7) _____ Other (name): _____

64. Which of the following best represents your political party affiliation? Check **ONLY ONE** of the following:

(1) _____ Democrat (2) _____ Republican (3) _____ Independent

(4) _____ Other (*name*): _____

65. Thinking of the party affiliation that you have just identified, what is the **strength of your affiliation?**

strong: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: weak

66. Which of the following best represents your ethnic background (*circle one*):

- (1) Asian or Pacific Islander (2) Non-Hispanic White (Caucasian) (3) African-American
(4) Spanish or Hispanic origin (5) Multi-racial or mixed race (6) Native American
(7) Other (*name*): _____

67. When thinking about politics and government, do you consider yourself to be:

- _____ very conservative
_____ somewhat conservative
_____ moderate
_____ somewhat liberal
_____ very liberal

68. Please identify the legislative division you work within (Sen. Joe Brown – Federal; Attorney General for X State – State, Mayor of City Y – Local, etc):

- (1) _____ Federal (2) _____ State (3) _____ Local
(4) _____ Other (please specify): _____

69. Do you work in a public agency or for an elected member?

- (1) _____ Public agency (2) _____ Elected member

70. People attach to a variety of things in their organizations. What is it for you? (Examples include but are not limited to: job responsibility, level within the organization, the public figure leading the organization, major issue, location the organization represents, salary, coworkers, etc.)

* Indicate reverse coding

Appendix B

Tables

Table 1: Overall Correlations

	Affective	Continuance	Normative	Identification
Affective		-0.124	0.539**	.839**
Continuance			0.031	-0.136
Normative				.503**

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 2: Demographic Mean Scores and Standard Deviations

	<u>Level of Office</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
Affective	Federal	21	3.65	0.53
	State	21	3.46	0.79
Continuance	Federal	21	3.10	0.66
	State	21	3.33	0.77
Normative	Federal	21	3.10	0.64
	State	21	3.01	0.56
Identification	Federal	21	3.98	0.42
	State	21	3.72	0.55
Intensity	Federal	21	4.25	0.61
	State	21	3.84	0.54
	<u>Participant Gender</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
Affective	Male	23	3.67	0.59
	Female	22	3.41	0.74
Continuance	Male	23	3.09	0.75
	Female	22	3.28	0.68
Normative	Male	23	3.27	0.61
	Female	22	2.88	0.5
Identification	Male	23	3.88	0.46
	Female	22	3.78	0.54
Intensity	Male	23	3.90	0.54
	Female	22	4.11	0.69

	<u>Participant Party</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
Affective	Democrat	11	3.39	0.91
	Republican	31	3.67	0.49
	Independent	3	2.83	1.01
Continuance	Democrat	11	3.32	0.62
	Republican	31	3.14	0.74
	Independent	3	3.17	0.95
Normative	Democrat	11	2.94	0.64
	Republican	31	3.13	0.59
	Independent	3	3.04	0.26
Identification	Democrat	11	3.70	0.54
	Republican	31	3.96	0.34
	Independent	3	3.01	0.9
Intensity	Democrat	11	3.91	0.56
	Republican	31	4.11	0.57
	Independent	3	3.22	0.84

Note: Mean scores and standard deviations are reported only due to sample size limitations.