All authors execute a publication permission agreement taking sole responsibility for the information in the manuscript. The DreamCatchers Group, LLC is not responsible for the content of any individual manuscripts. Any omissions or errors are the sole responsibility of the individual authors.

The Academy of Organizational Culture, Communication and Conflict Proceedings is owned and published by the DreamCatchers Group, LLC, PO Box 1078, Arden, NC 28704, U.S.A., (828) 507-9770. Those interested in the Proceedings, or communicating with the Proceedings, should contact the Executive Director of the Allied Academies at info@alliedacademies.org.

Copyright 2010 by the DreamCatchers Group, LLC, Arden, NC
# Table of Contents

**FACT OR FICTION? A STUDY OF MANAGERIAL PERCEPTIONS APPLIED TO AN ANALYSIS OF ORGANIZATIONAL SECURITY RISK** ........................................... 1  
Richard G. Taylor, Texas Southern University  
Jeff Brice, Jr., Texas Southern University

**PREDICTOR VARIABLES OF CONSTRUCTIVE AND DESTRUCTIVE CONFLICT BEHAVIOR** ............................................................................................................ 2  
Kristen M. H. Bohlander, Eckerd College

**STEREOTYPE THREAT IN MANUAL LABOR SETTINGS FOR HISPANIC AND CAUCASIAN PARTICIPANTS** ................................................................................................ 7  
Jennifer L. Flanagan, Texas A&M University – Commerce  
Raymond Green, Texas A&M University – Commerce

**WHAT OR WHO REGULATES EUROPEAN ELECTRONIC MEDIA?** ........................................... 8  
Kathy L. Hill, Sam Houston State University  
Aaron Manahan, Sam Houston State University

**THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE THREE COMPONENTS MODEL OF COMMITMENT, WORKPLACE STRESS AND CAREER PATH APPLICATION TO EMPLOYEES IN MEDIUM SIZE ORGANIZATION IN LEBANON** ............................................................................................ 13  
Linda Nasr, Lebanese American University

**IDENTIFICATION OF OUTCOME BASED BUSINESS COMMUNICATION SKILLS** ................................................................. 28  
Robert Newberry, Winona State University  
David Conrad, Augsburg College

**THE EFFECT OF LAW ENFORCEMENT’S SOCIALIZATION PROCESS ON THE WHISTLE-BLOWING BEHAVIOR OF POLICE OFFICERS** ........................................... 33  
L. Jeff Seaton, Murray State University
FACT OR FICTION? A STUDY OF MANAGERIAL PERCEPTIONS APPLIED TO AN ANALYSIS OF ORGANIZATIONAL SECURITY RISK

Richard G. Taylor, Texas Southern University
Jeff Brice, Jr., Texas Southern University

ABSTRACT

The underlying theme of this paper is to determine whether managerial perceptions of important organizational processes and competitive situations are based in fact or fiction. While it is known that manager’s base decisions, largely, on their perceptions, our examination utilizes a unique observational investigative technique to ascertain the information necessary to answer this research inquiry.

Additionally, this paper will examine the variation between managerial perceptions of organizational security risks and the actual state of these risks while also exposing the unintended security vulnerabilities that occur due to routine employee behavior. In doing so, we employ the Perception of Risk Theory (Slovic et al, 1976) to argue that manager’s perceptions of organizational risk are based mostly on (1) technology solutions to protect organizational assets and (2) their beliefs that employees habitually follow established organization security policies.

Utilizing a case study conducted in an existing financial institution, the research reveals that many of management’s perceptual assumptions about organizational security are inaccurate. It is suggested that by increasing manager’s awareness of the likelihood of perceptual inaccuracies, managers might make better informed decisions that may serve to, ultimately, increase organizational performance. Additional findings, limitations, and implications for research and practice are discussed.
PREDICTOR VARIABLES OF CONSTRUCTIVE AND DESTRUCTIVE CONFLICT BEHAVIOR

Kristen M. H. Bohlander, Eckerd College

ABSTRACT

Employees who handle conflict constructively can bring about positive change, but destructive behavior can damage outcomes. The research problem in this study was that it was unknown if workplace conflict behaviors could be predicted by age, gender, and hierarchical level. The purpose was to provide ways for organizational decision makers and researchers to predict and explain workplace conflict behavior. The hypotheses concerned the extent to which constructive and destructive conflict behaviors, as measured by the Conflict Dynamics Profile (CDP), were predicted by the three independent variables. The sample (n=5034) was drawn from an existing database of 9405 participants who were rated on their conflict behavior by peers, bosses, and direct reports. The non-experimental quantitative research design included stepwise and standard regression analyses. Gender was the strongest significant predictor of constructive and destructive conflict behaviors, age was a predictor of constructive behavior, and hierarchical level was a predictor of destructive behavior. Possible social impacts on organizations and employees include improved decision-making and conflict management, enhanced constructive conflict thorough interventions, and reduced destructive behavior. Results validate the worth of potential future research studies that distinguish differences between conflict styles and conflict behaviors. Future development of a model that incorporates conflict behavior into conflict assessment may enhance overall workplace conflict assessment.

INTRODUCTION

Constructive conflict behaviors can bring about positive outcomes, such as cooperation and productivity (Deutsch, 2000; Gehani & Gehani, 2007; Nelson & Quick, 2009). However, when conflict behavior turns destructive, incivility, immorality, and bullying can result (Ayoko, 2007; Glomb, 2002; Hodson, Roscigno, & Lopez, 2006). Destructive conflict also has an adverse financial effect on an organization’s bottom line (Etzioni, 1988; Frankel, 2006) and reduces employee commitment (Thomas, Bliese, & Jex, 2005), productivity (Andre, 2008), job satisfaction (Wilhelm, Herd, & Steiner, 1993), trust (Greenberg & Colquitt, 2005; Simons & Peterson, 2000; Weichun, May, & Avolio, 2004), and citizenship behaviors (Korsgaard, Brodt, & Whitener, 2002). Consequences of destructive behavior have threatened the ability of organizations to thrive and survive.

The current study helps to clarify which variables predict constructive and destructive workplace conflict behavior. Predictive relationships of hierarchical level, gender, and age were statistically examined. Results provide information that will allow decision makers to predict employee conflict behaviors based on individual and organizational variables.
CONFLICT BEHAVIORS AND CONFLICT STYLES

It is important to note that conflict behaviors, rather than the more conventionally researched conflict styles, are being examined in this study. While conflict styles are only an individual’s intentions of how he or she handles conflict (Robbins & Judge, 2009; Van de Vliert & Euwema, 1994), conflict behaviors are overt actions and statements made by individuals involved in conflict (Deutsch, 1973; Robbins & Judge, 2009). Although conflict styles inventories have been well used and researched (i.e., Blake & Mouton, 1964; Rahim, 1983; Thomas & Kilmann, 1974), there has been a lack of explicit attention paid to how people actually behave during conflict in the workplace (Davis, Kraus, & Capobianco, 2009).

RESEARCH PROBLEM

The research problem was that it was unknown if constructive and destructive conflict behaviors in the workplace are predicted by age, gender, and hierarchical level, as measured by the Conflict Dynamics Profile (CDP) (Davis, Capobianco, & Kraus, 2004). The purpose was to provide ways in which to predict and explain conflict behavior variation. Constructive and destructive conflict behaviors were measured separately on two separate continuums (rather than two extremes of a single continuum).

HYPOTHESES

Hypotheses involving constructive conflict behavior are:

H1 Gender will be a significant predictor of constructive conflict behavior
H2 Age will be a significant predictor of constructive conflict behavior
H3 Hierarchical level will be a significant predictor of constructive conflict behavior

Hypotheses involving destructive conflict behavior are:

H4 Gender will be a significant predictor of destructive conflict behavior
H5 Age will be a significant predictor of destructive conflict behavior
H6 Hierarchical level will be a significant predictor of destructive conflict behavior

METHOD

Participants and Procedures

The target population (N=9,405) consisted of working adults in the United States who completed the CDP between the years 2000 and 2007. Most of the participants were enrolled in the Leadership Development Institute (LDI) at Eckerd College; completion of the CDP was a requirement of one of the sessions. A sample (n=5,034) was drawn from existing data based on those who received constructive and destructive conflict behavior scores from at least one rater in each of the rater categories (peer, boss, and direct report).
Measure

The CDP, an instrument designed by Davis, Capobianco, and Kraus (2004) that assesses employee behavioral responses to conflict, includes 63 behavior items that measure 15 specific behavioral responses to provocation of conflict. The CDP was used to gather 360 feedback from peers, direct reports, and bosses, allowing participants to gain knowledge of how others perceived their behavior during conflict. This instrument has been deemed statistically reliable and valid for measuring the specific constructive and destructive conflict behaviors being studied here (Davis, et al).

Research Design and Method

In this non-experimental research design, multiple regression models determined predictive relationships between independent and dependent variables and provided a rank order of independent variables based on prediction strength. Standard multiple regression models followed, ensuring concurring results.

ANALYSIS

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of Estimate</th>
<th>R Square Change</th>
<th>F Change</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Sig .F Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.105&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>4.243</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>55.90</td>
<td>1, 5032</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.122&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>4.235</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>20.30</td>
<td>1, 5032</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Hierarchical level was not a significant predictor in this model

<sup>a</sup>Predictors: (Constant), gender

<sup>b</sup>Predictors: (Constant), gender, age

<sup>c</sup>F(1, 5032) = 38.21, < 0.0005

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Predictor Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std Error</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.4077</td>
<td>.180</td>
<td>.180</td>
<td>226.01</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.919</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>7.477</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.3934</td>
<td>.366</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>107.61</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.932</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>7.64</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of Estimate</th>
<th>R Square Change</th>
<th>F Change</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Sig .F Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.102&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>4.420</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>53.38</td>
<td>1, 5032</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.123&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>4.106</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>23.18</td>
<td>1, 5032</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Age was not a significant predictor in this model

<sup>a</sup>Predictors: (Constant), gender

<sup>b</sup>Predictors: (Constant), gender, hierarchical level

<sup>c</sup>F(1, 5032) = 38.40, < 0.0005
Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Predictor Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std Error</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>24.62</td>
<td>.188</td>
<td>-.936</td>
<td>131.02</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.936</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>-.102</td>
<td>-7.306</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>25.64</td>
<td>.282</td>
<td>-.949</td>
<td>90.80</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.949</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>-.104</td>
<td>-7.42</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.269</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>-.067</td>
<td>-4.81</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RESULTS

Constructive Conflict Behavior: Hypotheses 1, 2, and 3

After the gender variable was entered, the stepwise regression model explained 1.1% ($R^2 = .011, p < .0005$, model 1) of the variance in constructive scores. Gender and age combined explained 1.5% ($R^2 = .015, p < .0005$, model 2) of constructive scores. Gender and age were statistically significant ($p < .0005$), with gender showing a higher beta value (Beta = .105) than age (Beta = .063). Hierarchical level was statistically eliminated from the model; it was not a significant predictor of constructive scores (see Tables 1 and 2). Regarding follow up testing, standard multiple regression results were similar to those from the stepwise regression, indicating further validity of the stepwise analysis.

Destructive Conflict Behavior: Hypotheses 4, 5, and 6

After the gender variable was entered, the model explained 1.0% ($R^2 = .010, p < .0005$, model 1) of the variance in destructive scores. Gender and hierarchical level combined explained 1.5% ($R^2 = .015, p < .0005$, model 2) of destructive scores. Gender and hierarchical level were statistically significant ($p < .0005$), with gender showing a higher beta value (Beta = -.102) than hierarchical level (Beta = -.067). Age did not significantly strengthen the model, thus it was statistically eliminated (see Tables 3 and 4). As a follow up, standard multiple regression was conducted. Again, results were similar to those from the stepwise, indicating further validity for the stepwise analysis.

DISCUSSION

Regression analyses supported Hypotheses 1, 2, 4, and 6, but did not support Hypotheses 3 or 5. Analysis results indicated five key findings: (a) age and gender were small but significant predictors of constructive workplace conflict behavior; (b) hierarchical level was not a predictor of constructive scores, (c) gender and hierarchical level were small but significant predictors of destructive workplace conflict behavior, (d) age was not a significant predictor of destructive workplace conflict behavior, and (e) gender was the strongest predictor of both constructive and destructive workplace conflict behavior.
LIMITATIONS

Limitations of this study, as originally outlined by Davis, Kraus, and Capobianco (2009), include possible bias and human error based on multiple rater feedback due to the fact that raters did not base their assessments on current participant behaviors, thus having to rely on memory. Social desirability bias (i.e., fear of being exposed) may have occurred among direct reports rating bosses.

FUTURE RESEARCH

Future research might benefit from studying conflict behaviors as an extension of conflict styles. For instance, a model that integrates conflict styles (intentions) with measurement of conflict behaviors (actions) with the CDP may lead to a more holistic conflict assessment tool. Previous research on conflict often involved measurement of only conflict styles with the TKI (Thomas & Kilmann, 1974; Thomas, 1976) or ROCI II (Rahim, 1983).

Further research is also needed to determine why age is such a weak predictor of destructive conflict behavior and why gender is the strongest predictor of both types of conflict behavior. Likewise, follow up studies are needed to determine why hierarchical level is such a weak predictor of constructive conflict behavior. Perhaps the inclusion of other variables such as organizational structure, size, and industry might build upon results from the current study.

Finally, existing research (e.g., Chusmir & Mills, 1989, Korabik, et al., 1993; Molm, 1986), as well as literature on structural theory of power (Ridgeway, 1991) would have supported that hierarchical level within the workplace would override age or gender in predicting behavior. An explanation for the disparity may have been that individuals in upper hierarchical levels have more self-efficacy when rating their own conflict styles (intentions) on the TKI or ROCI II. Consequently, their actual behaviors, especially when rated on the CDP by impartial observers, may not have reflected their self-rated conflict styles. Future research in these areas may provide much needed information on how one’s conflict-handling intentions might differ from his or her actual conflict behaviors.
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STEREOTYPE THREAT IN MANUAL LABOR SETTINGS FOR HISPANIC AND CAUCASIAN PARTICIPANTS

Jennifer L. Flanagan, Texas A&M University – Commerce
Raymond Green, Texas A&M University – Commerce

ABSTRACT

Stereotype threat, primarily studied in academia with test performance, aptitude, ability, and intelligence, impacts performance and causes both behavioral and cognitive decrements. Research in the workplace has usually looked at upper-level or more academically-based job tasks. This paper concentrates on how stereotype threat impacts those in manual labor workplace settings, specifically with Caucasians and Hispanics, and sought to test subjects on a behavioral task in a workplace setting to see if the results mirror those in academia. Stereotype threat in academic settings has been shown to cause both behavioral and cognitive decrements, and it was theorized that stereotype threat would cause performance decrements for the Hispanics, more so than Caucasians. Participants were undergraduate students, 60 Caucasian and 36 Hispanics. All performed two manual labor tasks, sorting and assembling nuts and bolts, and a math test, half while under stereotype threat and half without stereotype threat manipulation. Results yielded significant differences between ST and NST condition for Hispanics on the non-academic/manual labor tasks, but not on the academic task administered during the study.
WHAT OR WHO REGULATES EUROPEAN ELECTRONIC MEDIA?

Kathy L. Hill, Sam Houston State University
Aaron Manahan, Sam Houston State University

ABSTRACT

America has the FCC to keep the electronic media in line, but what or who keeps European media in line? We will discuss the individual media related efforts of thirteen European nations to better understand the differences between America's and Europe's approach to setting up and policing media. Do other countries have the same problems or are they different? Because Europe is a collection of cultures and languages in close proximity, do they share problems?

The countries selected for this study are: Switzerland, Germany, France, Italy, United Kingdom, The Netherlands, Belgium, Sweden, Finland, Norway, Denmark, Spain, and Greece. We will look at: (1) A quick history of the country, (2) Information on each country’s government and media, (3) Cultural boundaries that may have to be crossed to be successful.

INTRODUCTION

America has the FCC but what or who keeps European media in line? We'll examine the media related efforts of thirteen European nations to better understand the differences between America's and Europe's approach to setting up and policing media. The countries selected for this study are: Switzerland, Germany, France, Italy, United Kingdom, The Netherlands, Belgium, Sweden, Finland, Norway, Denmark, Spain, and Greece.

The information included on each country will be: (1) A quick history of the country, (2) Information on each country’s government and media, and (3) Cultural boundaries that may have to be crossed for successful communication.

SWITZERLAND

Switzerland is a federal state made up of 28 cantons. The President with two legislative houses rules both the country and the government. The Swiss have four official languages; French, Italian, German, and Romansch, but most business people speak English (Morrison, 1994).

Since 1926 Switzerland has enjoyed television. The Swiss Broadcasting Company (SBC), a non-profit organization, is the parent company to the local stations and companies. The Ministry of Transport and Energy regulates like America's FCC. The SBC’s standards are strict, and the programming is news, religion, culture, and information (Noam, 1991).

Because Switzerland borders many countries, the Swiss media has become second tier. Why would you watch Swiss television when you could watch a German station? This and the three languages spoken caused problems. Cable TV swept the country because they could get stations from other countries. The SBC’s monopoly ended in 1983 with the legalization of private
stations. Swiss Television, with many restrictions, competitions, and overall "boring" style seems like a difficult place to make a living.

**GERMANY**

Germany has made great progress since WWII. German is the official language, but a large portion of the inner city population also speaks English (Morrison, 1994).

German broadcasting has always been state run. The Reichspost, the regulating agency, governed all communication and was very restrictive and required licensing of all broadcast receivers (Noam, 1994).

During the 1930's, the citizens were "forced" to listen Hitler on the radio. After the war the German's broadcasting system became independent from the state like the BBC (Casmir, 1995).

Television began in 1935. Television advertising began in 1956 and was considered controversial. In Germany you will find nudity and sex on the airwaves (Noam, 1991). Setting up a station in Germany would be a lot like America, except it is more liberal.

**FRANCE**

In 1814 France developed into one of the strongest and most unified countries in the world. The Prime Minister, who is appointed by the President for a seven-year term, is the Head of Government, and the President is the Chief of State. The official language is French, but many speak English (Morrison, 1994).

French broadcasting was both a public and private system. Then, the government controlled it. Around the mid 1970's, French media became open, independent, and created diversity. Three government-owned networks dominated French broadcasting. Eventually more non-state stations and channels were included and private channels were made legal and flourished (Noan, 1991). France is a diverse and private group with more cultured programming and more legitimacy in Europe (Venturelli, 1998). Since France seems open to new ideas, setting up a station in France would be good.

**ITALY**

Italy is a multiparty parliamentary republic with a Senate and a Chamber of Deputies serving as legislative bodies. The President is the Chief of State, and the Prime Minister heads up the government. The official language is Italian but most business owners speak English (Morrison, 1994).

Italy is open to broadcast television. Although it has very few cable or satellite television channels, hundreds of commercial channels graced the airwaves since the 1970's (Noam, 1991). Silvio Berlusconi controls the major networks. Although the government is fighting him for control, they have failed. They haven’t given up (Noam, 1991). Italy would not be a good place to start up a station because of Berlusconi’s monopoly.
UNITED KINGDOM

The United Kingdom consists of England, Wales, Scotland, and Northern Ireland. The government is in England and is a constitutional monarchy. Parliament is divided into the House of Commons, which the Prime Minister leads, and the House of Lords (Morrison, 1994).

The British Broadcast Corporation (BBC) is government owned, operated, has been for more than thirty years, and has full government majority control. Private channels and networks exist, which is why the system works. Although they are popular, there are critics to this system (Noam, 1991).

Because of London’s size and population, the UK moved ahead in the media game, tested ideas, passed it on, and kept improving. Since the UK had enough influence, other countries listened and learned (Noam, 1991). The UK is a great place to start a station because they seem very conductive to new station development.

THE NETHERLANDS

The Netherlands are governed by a constitutional monarchy. Parliament consists of First and Second Chambers. The Chief of State is the Monarch, and the Prime Minister runs the government. The official language is Dutch, but a few speak Turkish and Arabic. The majority speak at least two languages, and English is usually understood (Morrison, 1994).

Because the Dutch are well versed in languages, they have an international trade mentality. They readily accept foreign television broadcasts. Dutch television has never been good because of the outside competition (Noam, 1991). The public stations usually run the common, correct religious, and mundane programming expected (Noam, 1991). To succeed in getting broadcasting to the Netherlands, broadcast in from another country.

BELGIUM

The Belgium government is a constitutional monarchy with two legislative houses. The King is the Chief of State, and the Prime Minister is the Head of Government. Three languages are recognized: French, German, and Flemish (Morrison, 1994).

Because they speak multiple languages in Belgium, a centralized media is not possible. This and their geographical location cause problems. Since Belgium's viewers watched outside media, they united with other stations across Europe. With these new alliances, they enjoy the broadcasts they want. Belgium broadcasters need invest in a more successful public system (Noam, 1991). Starting a station in Belgian would not be a good idea now.

SWEDEN

Sweden is a parliamentary state under a constitutional monarchy. The executive branch consists of a Prime Minister and his advisors, parliament, and a Supreme Court. The official language is Swedish, but most school children learn English (Morrison, 1994).

In the early 1990's Sweden public broadcasts’ rules were extremely strict. Cable became the primary distribution. Television went from public to a mixed system. The cable and satellite companies came into fill their needs. The government tried to compete (Noam, 1991). The public felt the private channels met their needs better (Bryant & Zillman, 1994, p. 11). When the media
liberalized, many companies began to run cable throughout the country. Sweden is becoming a more stable media society, but it would not be good place to start a station.

FINLAND

The Finnish government is a constitutional republic with the President as the Head of State, and he shares power with the Prime Minister whom he appointed. The official languages are: Finnish and Swedish, but English is the primary language learned in school. Older Finnish usually speak German (Morrison, 1994).

Finland has diversified media and enjoys a mix of public and private communication. Commercial television works with public television. This allows local media to flourish, get stronger, and be successful. They are also open to cable television. Because of all of this convergence, Finland is becoming an unlikely media power (Noam, 1991). Finland seems to be a great place to set up a successful station because everyone works together.

NORWAY

Norway is a multi-party constitutional monarchy. The three branches of government are: the King, the cabinet, and the Prime Minister who heads up the government. Norway's official language is Norwegian, and English is also widely spoken (Morrison, 1994).

The Norwegian government did not like electronic media because of the decentralizing of the public system. Pirate stations started broadcasting to Norway's public system. Cable television brought in neighboring countries’ channels allowing the Norwegians to enjoy more channels and networks. Norway imposes very restrictive rules on outside countries (Noam, 1991). Norway needs to relax its rules and increase the quality of its own public broadcasts. This makes Norway a very unattractive place to set up a successful station.

DENMARK

Denmark's government is a constitutional monarchy which consists of the Prime Minister, who has the power and heads the government, and the cabinet members. Denmark’s official language is Danish although children are taught English starting at age ten (Morrison, 1994).

Denmark had only one public television channel so the government broadcasts began to include outside programming through cable. Commercial television brought in national advertising, meaning more money coming in, more stations, more shows, more diversity and more interest. Since commercial channels make more money, the government integrated with them. Eventually domestic and international broadcasts will be integrated into one package for more choices and local broadcasts which is similar to satellite TV in the states holding the local channels. Denmark is progressing through this converging media age. For now, the best idea is to pipe in your channel from an outside source.

SPAIN

In Spain the King is the Chief of State and the Cortes (parliament) is the legislative power. The Prime Minister, who is responsible for the Cortes, as well as his deputy and
ministers, is the Head of Government. The official language is Spanish, but in the northwest, there are many dialects which cause confusion (Morrison, 1994).

Spain has overcome many nasty media environments; the old fascist government had a strong public system but was used primarily for propaganda. They did permit some private broadcasting as long as it was involved with the church, labor organizations, or municipalities. The new democratic government allowed mixed media to come in from the outside and inside. Eventually international media came in and added to the country’s media diversity and increased privately owned media networks (Noam, 1991). Spain is making serious headway and may be resting on a very lucrative untapped media market. Lots of Europe has broadcasts in German, English, and Swedish but not in Spanish. Spain is well on its way to being a great place to start a station.

GREECE

Greece is a presidential parliamentary republic. The President is elected by parliament, but the Prime Minister, who is the head of government, holds the real power. The official language is Greek (Morrison, 1994).

Greece’s idea of broadcasting was old and had few public channels, very little cable, and did not assist media convergence. The technological change resulted in five rival broadcast systems. Cable is now in Greece, but the only way to receive outside signals is through satellite reception which isn’t good. They need to reach out to other nations although this may be difficult because of their geographical location (Noam, 1991). Greece needs to catch up on the broadcast spectrum or be left completely behind.

CONCLUSION

Media quality seems to be a major problem in the 13 nations we examined. The larger nations have it and profit from it, but some of smaller nations cannot compete. Some do, like Belgium, but much of their success is primary location and their liberalized media laws. More nations should allow the support of commercial and privately owned stations. This will cause more competition for the public stations, but a little competition is good.

Every country has to find its way around their limitations to be successful. Since Europe is a nation without borders, they need to have a centralized media or broadcasting law to liberalize their media system to get the programming they need and want.
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THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE THREE COMPONENTS MODEL OF COMMITMENT, WORKPLACE STRESS AND CAREER PATH APPLICATION TO EMPLOYEES IN MEDIUM SIZE ORGANIZATION IN LEBANON

Linda Nasr, Lebanese American University

ABSTRACT

This study reports the results of 100 survey questionnaires with full-time and part-time employees working in medium size organizations in Lebanon. The researcher focused on the relationship between the three components model of commitment, workplace stress and career path. This research’s aim was to determine what type of commitment is more vulnerable to stress and what type leads to a longer career path. The participants described their commitment type, the amount of workplace stress and the characteristics of their career path using a scale. The results of the correlation and regression showed that Affective Commitment is negatively related to Stress and has no correlation with Career Path. Continuance Commitment is positively related to Stress and has no correlation with Career Path. While, Normative Commitment has a negative relationship with Career Path and a positive relationship with Stress.
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INTRODUCTION

Work; previously defined as a series of duties to be fulfilled, is now regarded as an intense source of stress and a trigger for high physical and emotional pressure. (Cohen, 2002)

The American Medical Association claims that ninety five million Americans take anti-stress medications. Businesses also suffer from increased stress in the workplace by loosing around two hundred billion dollars per year to stress caused productivity decline. (Ornelas & Kleiner, 2003).

Between these two extremes, the question remains as to where does employee commitment resides? And within these circumstances, is it still possible to sustain a selected career path?

Some people might question whether the whole issue of commitment is still relevant in this ever changing environment. Definitely, there is enough evidence to prove that the relationships between the employees and the organizations are changing. However, this fact doesn’t challenge the importance of understanding how commitment is developed, and how it influences the type of the bond between the employees and the organizations. By understanding these complex relations, organizations are in a better position to predict the consequences of change and to be better prepared to manage them effectively. (Meyer & Allen, 1997)

One of the major consequences of change is stress. Workplace stress is a well-known fact that is expressed differently with different employees in different work settings. (Michael et al.
2009). Findings about the levels of work related stress and organizational commitment have been diverse and doubtful.

**ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT**

Sheldon (1971, p.143) using the psychological approach defines organizational commitment as "... an attitude or an orientation toward the organization which links or attaches the identity of the person to the organization”. Kanter (1968) and Buchanan (1974), both advocates of the psychological approach as well, believe that the emotional attachment of an employee to his organization has a positive relationship with organizational commitment.

The interest to study organizational commitment increased in the last decade because it is believed that it has a strong association with job performance (Angle & Perry, 1981), innovativeness (Katz & Kahn, 1978), absenteeism and turnover (Larson & Fukami, 1984), organizational productivity and effectiveness (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990). It is important to differentiate between the different scopes of employee commitment, for it helps in shedding light on work related depended variables such as, motivation to perform a good job, determination to stay within the organization, turnover rate, and absenteeism. (Lee et al. 2000). Thus, organizational commitment has been viewed as a result (antecedent) and at the same time as a cause (outcome) of many organization related issues.

Despite the various approaches and conceptualization of commitment, John Meyer and Natalie Allen remain the pioneers in this field. They started their research in the early 1980’s. Meyer and Allen believed that commitment is a “psychological state” that: “Characterizes the employee’s relationship with the organization and has implications for the decision to continue membership in the organization.” In order to be able to differentiate between the various psychological states, Meyer and Allen developed “The three components model of commitment: affective, continuance, and normative”.

**Affective Commitment**

Affective commitment can be described as the emotional attachment an employee has for the organization he is working for. It is the degree to which an employee is identified and involved with the organization. It is related to employee’s feeling of belonging, connection, and devotion (Mueller et al., 1992). Affectively committed employees tend to remain within the organizations. (Meyer et al., 1990). This type of commitment builds up from positive experiences in the organization, out of which the employees perceive themselves as being supported and treated fairly by the organization. In addition, affective commitment could build up from events which are psychologically rewarding. Such as making employees feel at ease, whether in satisfying their needs or in helping attaining their personal goals. Employees with high affective commitment levels remain with the organization because they want to. (Meyer & Allen, 1997).

**Continuance Commitment**

Continuance commitment is the degree to which an employee is aware of the costs related to quitting the organization. An employee with a high continuance commitment has a need to remain with the organization. The perceived cost results from two main causes: First, the loss of the side bets (Becker & Carper, 1956), such as payments, vacations, time, etc. Therefore,
continuance commitment increase when the employee is well paid, compensated, rewarded, etc. The fear of losing these side bets is what keeps the employee in the organization. Second, the lack of job alternatives: employees remain within the organization because they realize that if they leave, they might not be able to find another job. (Meyer & Allen, 1997)

Normative Commitment

Normative commitment is the degree to which an employee has a feeling of obligation to continue working in the organization. Normative commitment comes from internal pressures caused by norms coming from the socialization processes in society such as the feeling of loyalty and belonging. Normative commitment can be increased when organizations invest in employees’ training and tuition funding. Employees scoring high on normative commitment feel as if they must remain with the organization. (Meyer & Allen, 1991).

Meyer and Allen believe that “the three components of commitment” have different consequences on job related outcomes. An employee with elevated affective commitment would be much more motivated to work than an employee with low affective commitment. This is also supported by Wasti (2005) who believes that affective commitment is strongly related to positive work results, in particular when shared with low levels of continuance commitment. Thus, employees with high affective commitment will have low absenteeism. On the other hand, employees scoring high on continuance commitment might feel demotivated and frustrated because they are staying within their jobs simply because the cost of leaving is too high for them to handle. Thus, it is irrational to expect from such employees high work performance or accurate attendance. Employees with high normative commitment tend to act ethically and do what is asked to be done. They score high on job performance, attendance and organizational citizenship. However, they might not be innovative, or risk takers; they prefer to go with the flow, due to the feeling of obligation they have towards the organization.

Commitment has been also studied in relation with negative experiences that happen at work. Hirschman (1970) and Farrell (1983) found three responses to job dissatisfaction: “Voice, Loyalty and Neglect”. Affective commitment is positively associated to voice (ideas to improve), to loyalty (accept the situation as it is), and negatively related to neglect (ignore the dissatisfying situation).

OCCUPATIONAL STRESS

Stress has always been a companion of humans. Since pre-historical times, stress has accompanied our ancestors in their search for food, shelter or in their social life. The existence of stress as a force that causes discomfort in the mental stability of human beings, survived through centuries and still exists nowadays. For the last 40 years, research around stress has produced a multitude of conferences, books, articles… however, despite the popularity of “stress” as a research topic, experts still cannot agree on one common definition of this simple and at the same time controversial issue. (Rees & Redfern, 2000). As Nelson and Quick mentioned (1994, p. 202): “Stress is one of the most creatively ambiguous words in the English Language, with as many interpretations as there are people who use the word.”

The positive stress or what is known as good stress, is the one that inspires and encourages. This type of stress is called Eustress. While, Distress is the bad stress, the one that gets the person irritated, decrease the spirit and eventually shortens the life cycle. (Rees & Redfern, 2000). Other categorizations of stress are: Acute stress, it is a short term, immediate
stress that happens on a one time basis and Chronic stress which is a long term, continuous stress caused by an uninterrupted situation such as job environment. (Ornelas & Kleiner, 2003)

According to Mullins (1999) Stress can be perceived by someone as a burden while by another person as a source of excitement and energy. Nelson and Quick (1994, p.202) observe stress only from a positive perspective. They conclude that: “Stress is a great asset in managing legitimate emergencies and achieving peak performance.” On the contrary, health and safety executives, portrays stress from a negative angle. Stress is considered to be a natural reaction to an excess of pressure, and the symptoms that accompany stress, are more than enough to show that it has a negative effect on people. Heilriegel et al. (1992, p. 280) believe that stress has both positive and negative effects. He defined stress as: “A consequence of or a general response to an action or situation that places special physical or psychological demands, or both, on a person”. According to Victor Rojas & Brian Kleiner (2000. p. 103), stress is “desirable to generate enthusiasm, creativity, and productivity.” However, they believe that if the level of stress is higher than needed in a particular situation, stress can become counterproductive. These two researchers also state that it is the responsibility of the organization to develop the ability of its own employees to control the intensity of stress.

Causes of Workplace Stress

Perrewe et al., (2000) believe that the work environment enhanced by new technological advancements, organizational reformation, and the multitude of redesign options, etc. contributes to the increasing stress level in the work environment. Workplace stress can be in direct relationship with the organizational structure. Work related stressors such as risk of layoffs (Leana and Feldman; 1990), work relocations (Martin, 1996), work overload ( DeFrank and Ivancevich, 1998; Sparks & Cooper, 1999), augmented family work clash ( Andesron et al., 2002) increased inter-company politicking (Cropanzano et al., 1997), and certain behaviors of the leader (Carlopio et al., 1997) are all stressors rotating around the organizational structure. Other organizationally induced stressors could be job ambiguity and role conflict. Leigh et al, (1988) believed that role conflict occurs as a result of employees facing a conflict between what their role in the organization requires from them, and their personal values and needs. While role ambiguity occurs when the job related activities and responsibilities are not clearly stated for the employee (Westman, 1992; Leigh et al., 1988). Bacharach et al. (2002) took it a step further by claiming that the inconsistencies between the expectations of the employee on one side and the expectations of the organization on the other side are the main source of stress in any organizational environment. Conner & Douglas (2004) concluded that the ability to consider and combine both parties’ expectations and characteristics is the key to reducing work related stress. Also the physical environment such as noise level, crowd in the workplace, lack of private space are all reasons that have been linked with stress (Burke, 1988)

Occupational outcomes of Workplace Stress

The effects of stress in the workplace can have a deeply negative impact on the employee. This impact can be divided into three categories: Employee psychological level such as “increased anxiety, and depersonalization” (Barnett & Brennan, 1995). Employee physiological level such as cardiovascular and gastrointestinal problems, increase breathing, heighten level of adrenaline, excess of coagulants in the blood ( Rojas & Kleiner, 2000) and employee behavioral level or what is known as occupational outcomes of stress such as
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“increased absenteeism and turnover” (Lee & Ashforth, 1996) “Lower Job Performance” (Longenecker et al., 1999; Nelson and Burke, 2000), lowered efficiency, lessened ability to perform, reduced initiative and interest in work, augmented stiffness of thought, a lack of worry for the organization and colleagues and a loss of accountability (Greenberg and Baron, 1995). Through various researches, stress has been associated with occupational outcomes such as employee intention to withdraw, job satisfaction and job commitment (Naumann, 1993; Tett and Meyer, 1993). High levels of stress have a negative relationship with job satisfaction (Terry et al., 1993), moreover job stressors are projectors of dissatisfaction at work (Cummins, 1990).

CAREER PATH

Nowadays, individuals no longer follow a particular career path over several years. In the twenty first century, organizations are faced with extreme challenges caused by the rising complexity resulting from severe competition (Nelson & Quick, 2006). People’s skills are becoming obsolete, and they struggle to “de-learn and re-learn” in order to remain valuable for the organizations they belong to. Hirsch (1987) believes that: “the corporate ladder is becoming unstable – the rungs are weakening and beginning to break” This whole process, in addition to other career challenges such as “career deadlocks and career plateaus” significantly raise the level of work related stress (Dolan & Garcia, 2002).

Miner and Robinson (1994) introduced the term “Boundaryless Career” which is a career that spreads out unrestrained by any kind of attachment or feeling of commitment to a particular organization. This type of careerists tend to develop “meta-skills” instead of particular competencies, in order to work in various settings (Hall, 1986) and their ultimate goal becomes the development of their own careers, not the organization they are temporary working for (Hansen, 1993). Mirvis (1993) disagrees with the fact that “Boundaryless career” is encouraged by organizations. In fact, little is being done to encourage this type of career. Strategies such as optional scheduling, support of employees’ education, varieties of pension plans, etc are rarely used. Organizational restructuring and the flattening of the organizational charts (Ornstein & Isabella, 1993) in addition to the increased number of employees with longer participation periods in the work force (Greenhaus & Callanan, 1994) lead to the shortening of innovation periods resulting in shorter product life cycles. “Career Plateauning” or career maturity occurs earlier during a selected career path. (Mirvis & Hall, 1994). As a result, many employees opted for a new career path; some created their own organizations, others shifted to smaller enterprises, while others preferred to pursue a higher level of education. (Modic, 1987). However, others are simply attached to their career paths and are unwilling or unable to change it. (Osherson, 1980).

The indicators of career entrenchment might be as diverse as social pressures, fear of age related concerns, acknowledgment of personal skills limitations, and skepticism about future income. Fisher (1988) empirically proved that people who tend to change their career path have lower lifetime incomes than those who stick to the originally selected career path. The dilemma remains that if the entrenched careerist is satisfied with his/her job, he/she poses no problems to the organization, whereas, those who are not satisfied, might become an organizational liability.

Career research has always tried to shed light on the affective component of the employees. Subjects such as job satisfaction, work motivation, job commitment have been deeply studied. Accordingly, it is important to differentiate between commitment and entrenchment. If commitment is a sort of attachment to a chosen occupation, entrenchment is not a sole psychological state of mind. It is a sort of attachment based on a continuance approach,
where employees stick to a job because of the extrinsic rewards they perceive receiving from a job, or because of the perceived loss caused by leaving the job. (Carson, K. & Carson, P. 1994).

Career entrenchment is a multidimensional model composed of three components:

1. Career Investment: the investment that might be lost if a new career path is selected. (Meyer & Allen, 1984).
2. Emotional Cost: perceived emotional cost of changing the career path. (Hirsch, 1987).
3. Few career alternatives: few options for changing career path (Teger, 1980).

ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT, WORKPLACE STRESS AND CAREER PATH

Due to the major impact organizational commitment has on work turnover and work performance in general, researchers deeply studied the effect of workplace stress on organizational commitment. (Benkhoff, 1997; Brown & Peterson, 1993). Many studies proved that organizational change is very stressful for employees. (Elrod & Tippett, 2002; Grant, 1996). While Lau and Woodman (1995) believed that a highly committed employee is more accepting of change than a none committed employee (if the change is believed to be favorable). Highly committed employees, are ready to put more efforts into the change process, and are likely to have a favorable attitude towards this change. (Iverson, 1996).

On the other hand, Montgomery et al. (1996) perceived intense job stress as dysfunctional. It plays a major role in decreasing employee commitment and productivity in general. Mattson & Dubinsky (1979) research also showed that work related stress, negatively influence employee’s commitment to the organization and the plan to quit the organization (Singh et al, 1994). On the opposite side, work group cohesion decreases the effect of workplace stress on employees’ commitment level, while the educational level of the employees safeguards the link between workplace stress and commitment (Michaels & Dixon, 1994).

According to Michael et al, (2009), job stress negatively influences affective commitment. During stressful times, people tend to put their sense of belonging and their entire emotions aside, and focus on the tasks and goals they need to perform. On the contrary, when stress decreases, the level of affective commitment tends to increase. Michal et al (2009) also found that role ambiguity and role conflict, which are direct causes of stress, had a positive relationship with continuance commitment. This result contradicted with the researcher’s hypotheses, but they explain this as being the result of the fear of losing the side bits, or the lack of other job alternatives as described by Meyer & Allen (1997).The third type of commitment, the normative commitment, was not found to be related to workplace stress (Michal’s et al, 2009). This finding is not supported by Rousseau (1995) who claims that normative commitment grows based on a psychological agreement between the organization and the employee, creating a feeling of confidence and trust between both groups in relation to their common obligations. On the other hand, continuance commitment tends to decrease when the employees realize that there is no career path within the organization. If the organization doesn’t guarantee a successful climb on the organizational ladder, the employee tends to leave the organization (Michael et al, 2009).

As previously mentioned, role conflict and role ambiguity, are considered to be two job stressors. It is believed that people who experience high levels of role conflict and role ambiguity tend to be less committed to their organizations (Addae et al, 2008).Matson and Dubinsky (1979) found that role ambiguity and role conflict are negatively related to organizational commitment which in turn increases the intention of the employees to abandon the job. This fact was also supported by Brown and Peterson (1993); they found a strong inverse relationship between
commitment and intention to leave. Accordingly, high levels of role conflict and role ambiguity will lead to a decrease in affective commitment. As a matter of fact, various studies concluded that a negative relationship exists between affective commitment and role conflict and role ambiguity. (Meyer et al., 2002; Yousef, 2002; King and Sethi, 1997; Irvin and Coleman, 2003; Glazer and Beerth, 2005.).

Yousef (2002) concluded that there is enough evidence to claim that role stressors are positively related to this particular type of commitment (Glazer and Beerth, 2005; King and Sethi, 1997; Meyer et al., 2002; Micheals et al 2009).

Addae et al (2008), found that people who value job security are more likely to have high continuance commitment towards their organizations; these results came to support the finding of Meyer et al (1998). While people who score high on affective commitment tend to leave the company they work for if they feel that the psychological contract between them and the organization has been breached (Addae et al. 2006).

The career entrenchment multidimensional model is in accordance with the continuance commitment component since the same dimensions of perceived cost are used. Investment loss, emotional cost and the lack of alternatives are the items that create the relationship between continuance commitment and the decision to remain or leave the selected career path. Career entrenchment is also associated with stress. Boredom and monotony caused by the over learning of a particular task or job create distress (Fisher, 1993). Employees faced with career entrenchment tend to isolate themselves from their colleagues at work, the result of such a behavior create stress in the form of depression and pessimism (Beehr & Newman, 1978).

Some employees feel committed (affective or continuance commitment) to their organizations because the job itself has the potential to develop them professionally (Meyer et al., 1990). Employees withdrawal intentions from an occupation is the “employees’ subjective assessment that they will be leaving their current occupation in the near future” (Carmeli & Gefen, 2004, p.70) which is a direct indicator of a shortening career path.

With respect to the relationship between the three component model of work commitment and withdrawing intention from an occupation (change of career path), Morrow (1993) considered that continuance commitment develop within employees due to their strong commitment to their career. The recent results of Lee et al (2000) are in accordance with Morrow; a negative correlation was traced between these two constructs. Thus, the researcher hypotheses are:

- H1 There is a negative relationship between Affective Commitment and Stress
- H2 There is a slightly positive relationship between Continuance Commitment and Stress
- H3 There is NO relationship between Normative Commitment and Stress
- H4 There is a negative relationship between Normative commitment and Career Path.
- H5 There is a negative relationship between Affective commitment and Career Path.
- H6 There is a positive relationship between Continuance commitment and Career Path.

**METHODOLOGY**

The researcher started with an exploratory research by gathering secondary data which helped in forming the literature review of this project. Accordingly, the literature review helped in defining the problem at hand as well as in formulating the various hypotheses. Afterwards, the researcher used the explanatory research design. Consequently, the researcher selected the basic research method that is going to be used in this project, and opted for a survey. A self
administered questionnaire was used. The source of the questionnaire is both valid and reliable. The printed questionnaire was distributed in person to Lebanese employees working in medium size enterprises.

Medium size organizations located in Lebanon were the main source of participants in this survey. The survey was conducted between January and March 2010. A non-sampling error technique was selected to ensure that only respondents working on full time or part time basis in middle size organizations in Lebanon fill out the questionnaire. In total, 100 questionnaires were distributed and filled out. The process happened in absolute anonymity, and this was assured to all participants in the survey.

Based on the findings, we can conclude that the tool selected proved its efficiency by fulfilling the objective of this research. The questionnaire consisted of twenty four questions, divided as follows:

- Three general demographic questions.
- Three sets of questions each made up of four questions. Each set rotated around a specific type of commitment based on “the three components model of commitment of Allen and Meyer (1997): Affective, Continuance and Normative Commitment”. The questions were measured on a five point Likert scale that ranged from strongly agree = 1 to strongly disagree = 5.
- A set of five questions to measure the career path selected from the Career Entrenchment Measure developed by Carson & Carson (1994). The questions were measured on a five point Likert scale that ranged from strongly agree = 1 to strongly disagree = 5.
- A set of five questions to measure the stress were selected from “The Perceived Stress Scale” (PSS) (Cohen’s 1983). This scale was developed by Cohen to measure the degree of how stressful, subjectively perceived life situations are. A frequency category scale was used. 1 referring to Never, 2 to Almost Never, 3 to Sometimes, 4 to Fairly Often, 5 to Very Often.

“The Statistical Package for Social Sciences” (SPSS) was used for statistical analysis. SPSS is a user friendly package that performs statistical calculations and hypothesis testing for various types of data.

DATA ANALYSIS

Demographic analysis

75% of the responded are full time employees working in medium size organization in Lebanon. 55% are female employees. Similarly, the majority of the respondents have one to three years of work experience. The range of years of experience, proved to be very wide, ranging from half a year up to twenty one years of experience.

Table 1 represents the results of the Correlation between a. Stress and the three types of Commitment:

- Stress is negatively and significantly correlated with C1: Affective Commitment at a significance level of 0.001.
- Stress is positively slightly correlated with C2: Continuance Commitment. It is a positive slight correlation at a significance level of 0.075.
- Stress is slightly correlated with C3: Normative Commitment at a significance level of 0.051.
b. Career Path and the three types of Commitment:
- There is no correlation between Career Path and C1: Affective Commitment. There is no correlation between Career Path and C2: Continuance Commitment.
- There is a negative and significant correlation between Career Path and C3: Normative Commitment at a significance level of 0.016.

Statistical Analysis: Correlations and Regression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>c1</th>
<th>c2</th>
<th>c3</th>
<th>Career path</th>
<th>stress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career path</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>.152</td>
<td>-.241*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td></td>
<td>.961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>-.328**</td>
<td>.179</td>
<td>.196</td>
<td>-.005</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td></td>
<td>.961</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Regression between Stress and C1: Affective Commitment:** Regression Equation I:
Affective Commitment = 4.459 – 0.386 stress
The concluded regression equation I shows a negative relation between affective commitment and stress. Stress is said to predict Affective Commitment negatively by a coefficient of -0.386. The constant coefficient equal to 4.459 and the affective commitment is said to decrease by 0.386 when stress increase by 1 unit. *H1 is supported*

**Regression between Stress and C2: Continuance Commitment**
Regression Equation II:
Continuance Commitment = 2.718 + 0.204 stress
The concluded regression equation II shows a slight positive relation between Continuance Commitment and Stress. Stress is said to predict Continuance Commitment positively by a coefficient of 0.204. The constant coefficient equal to 2.718 and the Continuance commitment is said to increase by 0.204 when stress increase by 1 unit. *H2 is supported*

**Regression between Stress and C3: Normative Commitment**
Regression Equation III:
Normative Commitment = 2.637 + 0.167 stress
The concluded regression equation III shows a positive relation between Normative Commitment and Stress. Stress is said to predict Normative Commitment positively by a coefficient of 0.167. The constant coefficient equal to 2.637 and the Normative commitment is said to increase by 0.167 when stress increase by 1 unit. *H3 is not supported*

**Regression between Career Path and C3: Normative Commitment**
Regression Equation IV:
Normative Commitment = 3.507 – 0.284 Career Path
The concluded regression equation IV shows a negative relation between Normative Commitment and Career Path. Career path is said to predict Normative Commitment negatively.
by a coefficient of 0.284. The constant coefficient equal to 3.507 and the Normative commitment is said to decrease by 0.284 when career path increase by 1 unit. \( H_4 \) is supported.

**Regression between Career Path and C1: Affective Commitment.**
No correlation exists between Career Path and C1: affective Commitment. Therefore \( H_5 \) is rejected.

**Regression between Career Path and C2: Continuance Commitment.**
No correlation exists between Career Path and C2: Continuance Commitment. Therefore \( H_6 \) is rejected.

**DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION**

The objective of this research was to study the relationship between the three component model of commitment of Allen and Meyer (1997) and Stress as well as to shed some light on the effect of this relationship on career path. These results would be of benefit to human resources’ managers during the selection process of new job applicants as well as supervisors and managers when trying to control the effect of work related stress on the commitment level of employees, to reduce turnover rates and lengthen the career path.

Our results support the first Hypothesis (H1): There is a negative relationship between Affective Commitment and Stress. These results come in accordance to Michael et al, (2009) studies. Micheal et al., (2009) proved that job stress negatively influences the affective commitment. Accordingly, during stressful periods, people put their emotions aside and focus on the tasks they need to perform. Conversely, when the stress level decreases, affective commitment tends to increase. Our results support as well Brown & Peterson (1993) findings that there is a strong inverse relationship between commitment and intention to leave. Consequently, high levels of role conflict and role ambiguity (work stressors) make the employees perceive the company as unsupportive, thus their affective commitment decreases. Our findings are in agreement as well with Yousef, (2002); King & Sethi, (1997); Glazer & Beerth, (2005); Irvin and Coleman, (2003); and Meyer et al., (2002); a negative relationship exists between affective commitment and role conflict and role ambiguity.

Similarly, the results of this research support our second hypothesis (H2): There is a slightly positive relationship between Continuance Commitment and Stress. This result agrees with Michale et al.( 2009) who also found that role ambiguity and role conflict (direct causes of stress) had a positive relationship with continuance commitment. Our results also concur with Glazer and Beerh, (2005); King & Sethi, (1997); Meyer et al., (2002) and Micheals et al. (2009), that there is enough evidence to claim that role stressors are positively related to Continuance Commitment. Our results support as well the findings of Addae et al. (2006) that showed that people who value job security, which in itself reduces work related stress level, have high continuance commitment towards their organizations.

On the contrary, the results don’t support the third hypothesis (H3): There is NO relationship between Normative Commitment and Stress. Our results showed a slight positive relation between Normative Commitment and Stress. This contradicts Michael’s et al. (2009), who found that normative commitment is not correlated with workplace stress. However our findings support Rousseau (1995) who claims that normative commitment grows based on a psychological agreement between the organization and the employee; this generates confidence...
and trust between the two parties as to their mutual obligations. Our results oppose as well the findings of Yousef (2002) who concluded that there exists a negative relationship between role ambiguity (a stressor) and normative commitment.

Hypothesis four (H4): There is a negative relationship between normative commitment and Career Path was supported. It is believed that committed employees tend to remain with their organizations since their career path will be enhanced. Moreover, end results showed no significant relationship between affective commitment and career path. Accordingly, hypothesis five (H5): There is a negative relationship between Affective commitment and Career Path was rejected. Our findings contradict Carmeli & Gefen (2004) as well as Meyer and Allen (1997); who believed that a negative relationship exists between affective commitment and career path.

Concerning Hypothesis six (H6): There is a positive relationship between Continuance commitment and Career Path. Although supported through research such as by Michael et al., (2009) who claim that continuance commitment tends to decrease when the employees realize that there is no career path within the organization. This wasn’t supported by our findings. On the contrary, our findings showed no correlation between Continuance commitment and Career Path. The results contradict with Morrow (1993) and Lee et al. (2000); both believed that continuance commitment is negatively related to career commitment (longer career path). We explain this mismatch as a result of the various attitudes, values, and behaviors that govern Lebanese employees when compared to the employees in other cultures and countries.

CONCLUSION AND LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The results of this research confirmed some of the previously done research while contradicted other, and brought new insights into this field, by creating a link between commitment and stress on one side and career path on the other.

This research verified a negative relationship between affective commitment and stress, and a slight positive relationship between continuance commitment and stress. On the other hand, this study showed a positive relationship between normative commitment and stress. According to the researcher, there is no previous research proving these findings and not totally supported by the literature review.

The finding that a negative relationship exists between normative commitment and career path can be explained since people scoring high on loyalty are less inclined to change career path, they prefer to remain committed to their norms and values, which is most of the time dictated by society.

The present research paper has a series of limitations such as: Limitation of the research design, the researcher used a cross sectional design by selecting the questionnaire as the main tool for data collection, which doesn’t involve further causal explanations. Future studies could be done by using longitudinal or experimental methodologies to cross validate the findings of the relation between workplace stress, commitment and career path. The findings of this research are based on a relatively small sample of respondents coming from middle size business organizations in Lebanon. Further research could be done on employees in non business organizations (government, non professional employees…) to test whether these findings would match ours. In addition, since the findings cannot be generalized due to the small sample size, future research can undertake a bigger sample as well.
The researcher studied the commitment to the workplace in general. Literature review showed that people tend to develop commitment to various work-related domains (work groups, teams, unions...). Thus, the respondents might not be very accurate in their answers since they might have considered a special domain such as the department he/she belongs to, not the whole organization. Accordingly, this research can serve as a guide for future studies related to work commitment. Future research could be done to study the commitment of the employees to the various entities in the organization, not only to the whole organization. Using the Allen and Meyer three component model of commitment, acted as a barrier when measuring the relationship between organizational commitment in general and career path. Accordingly, the researcher was only able to study each type of commitment independently from the career path. Only Normative commitment showed a significant negative result. For future studies, it would be beneficial to use a general evaluation scale to measure general commitment and its relationship with career path since this domain is not very well studied.
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IDENTIFICATION OF OUTCOME BASED BUSINESS COMMUNICATION SKILLS

Robert Newberry, Winona State University
David Conrad, Augsburg College

ABSTRACT

Despite academia’s considerable efforts there remains a gap in communication skills delivered by new graduates versus those desired by business practitioners. We suggest that this may be the result of practitioners seeking outcome based skills and academia teaching basic (non-business specific) fundamentals of communications. The authors utilized a thorough review of the literature to identify 24 outcome based communication skills most needed in business organizations.

COMMUNICATION SKILLS GAP

There is general agreement on the importance of business communication skills in the business curriculum. Yet, conversations with human resource recruiters and substantial research show many inadequately prepared entry level employees (Cappel, 2002; The National Commission on Writing, 2004; Bolt-Lee & Foster, 2003). Numerous studies suggest a gap between the skills business schools teach and the skills that are considered important in business. The National Commission on Writing (2004), Seshadri and Theye (2000), and Tanyel, Mitchell and McAlum (1999) found differences between employers and faculty regarding expected communication skills and abilities among recent graduates. In general there appears to be a gap between what practitioners want and what academia is providing.

Research suggests that the gap can best be described as academics stressing theory and models versus practitioners’ emphasis on practical outcome producing skills. Pfeffer and Fong (2002) conclude that the practical use of skills should be the focus, not theoretical understanding or abstract knowledge. Pittenger, Miller and Mott (2004) propose teaching communications with an emphasis on real-world standards and seeking operational skills outcomes. Kerby and Romine (2009) promote embedding communications assessment in course content, suggesting pursuing outcomes that are useful skills as determined by employers. Du-Babcock (2006) states that teaching business communication theory without “associated application materials” may produce students that are incapable of applying communication skills in a work environment. In each study there is a strong emphasis on the application of skills to business related outcomes versus abstract technique development.

To pursue a curriculum focused on outcome based skills requires research and experimentation on appropriate skills sets. A substantial literature review found several diverse suggestions and applications, but no comprehensive skills set. To this end the authors have identified a set of constructs and specific skills based on previous business communication skills research.
ESTABLISHING BROAD BUSINESS COMMUNICATION CONSTRUCTS

Business communication research and curriculum has focused on the basic constructs of reading, writing, oral presentations and listening. However, it appears these skills alone are not sufficient in themselves to satisfy the business practitioner’s needs. Examination of over 300 articles and books, and numerous discussions with practitioners have lead us to believe that the skills most sought by businesses should be defined by communication behavior outcomes, such as the ability to negotiate a solution between two conflicting parties.

A review of business communication literature written by management experts, leadership theorists, business education professionals, communication skills researchers, and business development writers was examined. During this extensive review it became obvious that foundation constructs were needed to guide the identification of the myriad of individual skills. Ober (2001), Angell (2004) and Roebuck (2001) suggest a fairly comprehensive foundation for categorizing business communication skills into three basic categories: "organizational communication skills," "leadership communication skills," and "interpersonal communication skills". Below are the definitions for each construct.

Business Communications Construct Definitions

1. Organizational Communication Skills - are the communication and information processes that allow the organization to interact with the larger, external environment and the units that they are composed permitting coordination among people and organized behavior

2. Leadership Communication Skills - are the skills used to communicate the vision and values of the organization employing communication methods including rich channels of communication, stories, informality, metaphors, openness, and strategic dialogue to create trusting and supportive relationships with, and among, colleagues and staff

3. Interpersonal Communication Skills - are a level of communication where two or more people exchange thoughts in face-to-face verbal and non verbal contexts by sharing information, providing feedback, or simply maintaining a social relationship

IDENTIFYING BUSINESS COMMUNICATION SKILLS SETS

Each construct was researched independently to assure that the communication skills cited were only the skills that make up that particular construct. In total over 200 publications contributed to the 24 communication skills identified below. The communication skills found were examined, categorized, and tabulated for frequency of citation. Only those skills that were cited most frequently were included in the final inventory. The definitions are derived from common language, context and usage of the skill as presented by the literature. Below are the lists of skills sets and a definition for each communication skill.

Organizational Communication Skills

1. Initiating open discussion - the ability to create the act of discussion and dialogue exploring opposition by individuals who advocate their positions and convince others to adopt those positions through logic, argument, or debate
2. Resolving conflict - the ability to employ a range of processes aimed at alleviating or eliminating sources of conflict through processes including negotiation, mediation, and diplomacy

3. Creating information networks - the ability to design and institute formal or informal systems for managing the flow of information and providing person-to-person relationships through which information flows

4. Teaching important skills - the ability to provide skill remediation to employees in areas such as job performance, technical competency, interpersonal communication, and problem solving

5. Using information technology - the ability to employ equipment (usually computers) that enables managers and staff to access ongoing and relevant company information including reports, planning data, and employee and customer feedback

6. Providing performance feedback - the ability to assess employee performance and provide performance feedback as a review of the performance of employees, which helps to set targets for future performance targets

7. Negotiating - the ability to produce an agreement upon courses of action, to bargain for individual or collective advantage, or to craft outcomes to satisfy various interests.

8. Writing business correspondence - the ability to produce written communication used in business including letters, memos, bulletins, and reports

9. Making convincing presentations - the ability to provide informal or formal talks delivered to decision making groups to convey information or make a point

**Leadership Communication Skills**

1. Arousing enthusiasm - the ability to inspire a whole-hearted devotion to an ideal cause, study or pursuit, or merely being visibly excited about what one's doing

2. Being a change catalyst - the ability to initiate change through provision of information to employees that will convince them of why a change is necessary and will compel them to embrace it

3. Creating group synergy - the ability to compel organizational members to interact and produce a joint effect that is greater than the sum of the members acting alone

4. Building team bonds - the ability to establish team cohesiveness, which is the extent to which members stick together and remain united in the pursuit of a common goal

5. Expressing encouragement - the ability to provide support and confidence raising or increasing one’s self-esteem and confidence to make choices and decisions

6. Providing motivation - the ability to move a person or group toward desired goals by increasing their willingness to exert effort and energy to achieve the goals

7. Being persuasive - the ability to guide people toward the adoption of an idea, attitude, or action by rational, and logical means relying on appeals rather than coercion

8. Building optimism - the ability to create a disposition or tendency to look on the more favorable side of events or conditions and to expect the most favorable outcome despite obstacles and setbacks
Interpersonal Communication Skills

1. Active listening - the ability to employ an intrapersonal and interactive process to actively focus on, interpret, and respond verbally and nonverbally to messages

2. Building rapport - the ability to create a harmonious relationship, bond, or kinship based on mutual respect, friendship, camaraderie, or emotional ties making someone feel comfortable and accepted

3. Demonstrating emotion self control - the ability to display balanced moods through retaining, mastering, and dominating one's reactions provoked by pleasant or unpleasant emotion

4. Building trust - the ability to construct the reciprocal faith in others’ intentions and behavior through a shared belief that you can depend on each other to achieve a common purpose

5. Relating to people of diverse backgrounds - the ability to recognize and respect differences in people and communicate appropriately in verbal and nonverbal exchanges

6. Demonstrating respect - the ability to show esteem for or a sense of the worth or excellence of a person, a personal quality or ability, or something considered as a manifestation of a personal quality or ability

7. Building relationships - the ability to establish a relatively long-term association between two or more people based on liking, trust, and respect creating regular business interactions, interdependence, or some other type of social commitment

BUSINESS COMMUNICATION CURRICULUM AND FUTURE STUDY

In curriculum development there has been some movement toward emphasizing applications that focus on outcome specific skills. In some cases the results have been measurably significant (Murranka & Lynch, 1999; Pittenger, Miller & Mott 2004; Kerby & Romine 2009) while others, based on their research or experience, strongly suggest moving in this direction (Du-Bacob, 2006; Pfeffer & Fong, 2002; Reinsch & Shelby, 1997). The skills sets proposed in this review could be useful in focusing course materials on outcome based communication skills demanded by business.

From a research perspective this skills sets inventory offers fertile ground for further study in a number of arenas that may very well advance knowledge in the field. For example:

1. Survey alumni to determine dimension from the stakeholder perspective that can be used to design communication skill curriculum. Discovery of competency gaps can be used to develop existing undergraduate, graduate, and post-college business communication skill education.

2. Research business practitioners to discover which outcome based communication skills are the most critical skills business organizations or specific organizational members must acquire and possess.

3. Research business leaders and college business teachers regarding how outcome based communication skills can be developed in undergraduate business curriculum and other required college course offerings, or by educational means outside of the college environment such as through continuing education, training consultants, or on-line educational methods.
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THE EFFECT OF LAW ENFORCEMENT’S SOCIALIZATION PROCESS ON THE WHISTLE-BLOWING BEHAVIOR OF POLICE OFFICERS

L. Jeff Seaton, Murray State University

ABSTRACT

As we read our newspapers or listen to our televised evening news we become astonished by stories of employees who have knowledge of illegal, immoral or illegitimate activities in their organizations but choose to keep silent about these activities. The accounting practices at the Enron Corporation, the failure to disclose potential safety hazards at any one of many tobacco and drug companies, government employees covering up of potential illegal activities by elected officials, the obvious misrepresentations and cover up experienced during B.P.’s Gulf oil spill and the failure to report or recall Toyota defective automobiles are just a few of the stories that seem to be reported daily by our news media.

Researchers are starting to realize the importance of whistle-blowing as a form of governance in organizational operations. While researchers are providing new information concerning the organizational whistle-blowing process and how to properly manage that process, there seems to be a void in the research which focuses on how contextual factors affect the whistle blowing process in different work environments.

In the current study, a contextual factor is hypothesized to be present in law enforcement organizations that would, as ethical researchers have suggested, affect an individual’s perspective of what constitutes an act of illegal and/or unethical behavior. This factor is the police value system created by the strong socialization process that law enforcement officers go through in their quest to become police officers.