

# MULTIPLE STAGES OF ORGANIZATIONAL IDEOLOGY: LOYALTY, VALUES, AND COMMITMENT

Albert S. King\*

*This study defines and measures a multiphase model of organization ideology in a large thermoplastics manufacturing firm. The utility of the progressive phases is demonstrated by their capability for discriminating with 23 variables the propensity to affective organization commitment and to distinguish regular variation on a continuum of 16 variables widely used to evaluate the quality of work organization. The analysis supports the notion of a stepwise movement from loyalty to value congruence to perceived commitment in strengthening ideological attraction to organization, and demonstrates concurrent validity of progressive phases associated with perceived quality of work organization. Although the levels and phases are progressively prepotent and valenced in predicting employee attraction to organization and commitment, different patterns and paths through the phases for individuals are indicated. At a structural level, results shed insight into ideology formation and affective organizational commitment.*

Commitment to organizational ideology has attracted much rekindled attention, and for intriguing, compelling reasons (Schein, 1991; Tracy, 1993). Ideological forces of loyalty, value congruence, and affective organizational commitment represent core components for cooperation in an organization, and for cohesiveness and consensus. Personnel pull together for the common purpose in a strong ideological organization where the unique attractiveness of its rich culture bonds members tightly and commits them individually and organizationally to identify with its rules, rewards, and values (Katz and Kahn, 1978).

---

\* Albert S. King is a Professor of Management at Northern Illinois University.

This paper reports findings of a study designed to test a hypothesized linkage between generalized values of loyalty, organizational value congruency, and affective organizational commitment. Based on the notion that an individual's behavior is determined primarily by past experiences and extending the analogy of individual development to that of organizational development, this paper discusses a series of developmental stages through which employees tend to pass in becoming "ideologically committed." But first, some overview and perspective on organizational ideology and the advantages of cooperation is provided.

### **IDEOLOGY AND COMMITMENT: BENEFITS OF COOPERATION**

The important source of an organization's ideology appears to be from within the intrinsically shared loyalties, values, and expectations of the organization itself—where members are encouraged to turn inward and take initiatives from the imperatives of the organization's own vision. Instead of gazing outward to copy what other organizations are doing, members of the strong ideology organization receive their impetus for action not from admiring comparable organizations, but from emulating their own discoveries in fulfilling particular internal needs (Mintzberg, 1989).

As a resource, ideology creates a centripetal force inward, protecting the organization from outside influence, and drawing human resources toward countless acts of cooperation with each other. In this sense—by socially indoctrinating individuals into its norms and values—ideology may best be regarded as the central ethos of an organization, indeed the life-giving force or spirit that informs the formal framework of its fundamental function (Miller, 1978).

An important application appears to be that internalization of an ideology renders any particular organization more effective (Meyer, 1989). The concept continues to be of enduring interest to managers and



organizations because of its connection to increased performance and motivation, lowered absence and turnover, and heightened stability, satisfaction, and involvement (Porter, et al., 1974, 1976; Weiner and Vardi, 1990). Personnel get "juiced-up" to pursue the focus, structure, style, controls, rewards or whatever else drives and determines the direction of the organization. The infusion of an organizational ideology can alter even the most bureaucratic structure's nature. It is the nature of the human commitment to customer responsiveness and sensitivity to employee and stakeholder needs that really counts (Peters and Waterman, 1982; Tracy, 1989).

Another important implementation arises from using ideology to resolve contradictory competing claims between people and departmental units, and to reconcile discrepant conflicts arising within individuals themselves (Reichers, 1986). At the organizational level, institutionalized ideology helps forces and functions that diametrically dominate or oppose each other to pull together, work through differences, and facilitate adaptation and change. Strong organizations solidify when threatened and when they have to because they are deeply seated in strong systems of beliefs (Kahn, et al., 1964; Meyer, 1987). Such organizations readily reconcile conflicting interests and suspend debilitating rivalries, since what matters is the organization itself, not any of its "special" parts. When people believe in the organization over and above any of its specialized parts, the organization is substantially empowered to adapt.

This dynamic is not construed to imply that the zero-sum rule is supported and the "more-less" hypothesis holds—that if an organization favors one particular function, others may fail; or if the organization is favored above all else, then individuals suffer. This may happen in a weak ideology organization where functions and outcomes are managed merely as aggregations of different parts; and people are treated as means to an end, rather than an end in itself. But when the strong force of ideology genuinely infuses an organization structure and a bone-deep belief in doing the right things for people authentically prevails, an organization takes on

an institutional life and logical dynamic of its own and conflicts are reconciled.

---

**“At the organizational level, institutionalized ideology helps forces and functions that diametrically dominate or oppose each other to pull together, work through differences, and facilitate adaptation and change.”**

---

That is what the concept of strong ideology leading to organizational commitment really conveys. Regardless of what function an individual or unit performs, each is treated as an embodiment of the total system and each is empowered to make decisions and take actions for the good of the whole. For example, it is not just the salesforce that is responsible for revenue, nor the production members for controlling costs and efficiency. A "hands on, value driven" or all hands approach compels everyone to internalize many forces in carrying out his or her own duties. Reiterating a metaphorical epigram, "It is easy to change hats when all are emblazoned with the same insignia (Mintzberg, 1989)." Thus far, organization aspects of commitment have been subordinated to analysis of individual propensities (Hrebiniak and Alluto, 1972; Brown, 1969; Dubin, Champois and Porter, 1975; Kidron, 1978), but that emphasis is being shifted. Consider three studies of an emerging agenda. Buchanan (1974) and Jamal (1974) conceptualized level of integration in organization development in terms of positive association with organizational commitment. O'Reilly and Chatman; and Allen and Meyer (1990) used an organization setting to illustrate how congruency of individual and organization values leads to mutually rewarding relationships reducing the possibility of conflict. Finally, Weiner (1982, 1994) specified a model of internalized normative

beliefs and level of value congruency leading to organizational commitment that is independent of rewards or punishment.

## **TOWARD A PROGRESSIVE PHASE MODEL OF IDEOLOGY AND COMMITMENT**

The model of ideology formation extends historical work (March and Simon, 1958; McGregor, 1967; Hall, 1970; Porter, et al., 1974, 1976; Morris and Koch, 1979). Empirical studies (Weiner, 1982; O'Reilly and Chatman, 1986; Meyer and Allen, 1987; Allen and Meyer, 1990; Mowday, Steers, and Porter, 1979) separately tested for relationships of each of the three subscales with a wide range of individual and organizational outcomes. This study makes an additional use of the essential factors. It attributes differential prepotency and attraction to the propensity to commitment, uses norms from the employee population to distinguish high vs. low propensity on each subscale, and then defines stages of organizational commitment and ideology formation in terms of possible high vs. low combinations of scores on the three factors.

Stated simply, the model seeks to show an underlying pattern between loyalty, value congruence, and affective commitment in establishing the stronger construct of organizational ideology. In terms of prepotency, loyalty precedes value congruence which precedes affective commitment. Stronger combinations of these three dimensions, in turn co-respond to successively higher states (or stages) of attraction to organization ideology.

## **PSYCHOSOCIAL STAGES OF COMMITMENT**

The current study adds to structural aspects on the psychology of commitment, setting forth the usefulness of a stage model. In a preliminary study, these phases varied systematically with commonly used measures of the quality of work organization (Bateman, 1984; Allen, 1990). Results indicate that ideology formations can be measured in large

## ***JOURNAL OF BUSINESS AND MANAGEMENT***

populations—easily and reliably. This compact analysis augments the anecdotal and judgmental focus of much of the available literature, and permits rigorous tests of it (Mowday, Porter, and Steers, 1982).

The present study included over 1,600 respondents and involved employees of a large thermoplastics manufacturing firm focusing on a cross section of lower organizational levels and narrow range of jobs (logistics, production, maintenance, and service) at dispersed locations nationwide. In several ways, the study was designed to test the stability of the pattern of correspondence of ideological forces with organizational variables. Attention was directed toward: (1) identifying characteristics of the workforce, (2) analyzing three dimensions regarded as sequential linkages to ideology formation, (3) defining successive stages of ideology, and (4) testing staged combinations of the dimensions with factors often used to evaluate the quality of work organization.

### **BACKGROUND OF STUDY**

Employee respondents for the study came from several functional areas and include four job classifications in a large (20,000 employees) Fortune 500 thermoplastics manufacturing firm with ten locations nationwide. The corporation provides eighty percent of its products and services to commercial and industrial customers under dynamic market conditions that can be competitively challenging and rewarding. The four job classes included:

- Production workers (equally skilled, semiskilled, and unskilled) constituting 65 percent of the total responding population.
- A cadre of logistics employees from one of the established position specializations (raw materials handling, supply and storage, transportation and shipment, distribution scheduling, and tools maintenance), constituting 15 percent.

- Maintenance personnel (generally at equipment repairs, tools, supplies, and materials tasks) constituting 10 percent of the population.
- Service employees in contact with suppliers, customers, contract agencies, production, maintenance, and operative personnel comprising 10 percent of the respondents.

With corporate human resources and plant management support, the organizational workforce of the fabrication and assembly group of the firm provided voluntary responses to a survey instrument covering varying aspects of employee worklife. These aspects, identified as "covariants of ideology and commitment" included a set of sixteen variables to evaluate worksite quality. While these were intended to focus on the organization as a whole, analysis from the 23-item questionnaire at the end of this article was used to demonstrate that the sample was representative of a phase model. The total population was 3,200, located at 20 sites nationwide, with plant manufacturing and assembly units having similar (not identical) production, scheduling, and cost containment roles. Although total N varied somewhat for different purposes due to item-wise adjustments made for missing data, N was never less than 1,600 for any analysis. The response rate averaged 50 percent, and comparisons of conventional demographics—age, sex, race, and so on—revealed that the responding workforce sample made up a reasonable analog of the total population. For example, women were only slightly (and nonsignificantly) under-represented in the responding sample containing 36.5% women and 63.5% men corresponding to total organizational percentages of 37.4 and 62.6, respectively. In all other demographics, the respondent to total population comparisons reflected similar closeness of fit.

**DIMENSIONS OF IDEOLOGY**

To assess employees' attachment to organization goals and values and the formation of ideology within the overall organization context, the instrument included 23 items, which tap three subscales:

1. Loyalty, high scores on which distinguish individuals who tend to be predisposed to internalize normative pressure and to be committed to institutions (family, friends, country, and work organization) as a result of primary socialization with a culture that places a premium on loyalty and duty to institutions and organization authority (Weiner, 1982). This generalized value resulting from an internalized normative pressure forces an individual to consider commitment to an employer organization as a moral obligation.
2. Value congruency, high scores on which indicate respondents who see their own and the organization's values as sufficiently related or similar that the possibility exists for a mutually rewarding employment relationship (Allen and Meyer, 1990). In this case, the individual, because of selection or socialization, finds it natural to identify with and commit to an organization.
3. Affective organizational commitment, (attitudinally related) high scores on which come from individuals who attach to the organization's goals and values, and to the organization for its own sake, apart from its purely instrumental work (Buchanan, 1974; Weiner, 1982). This is represented as an inherent willingness of individuals to identify with the organization and make personal sacrifice, perform beyond normal expectations, work selflessly and contribute to its effectiveness, to endure difficult times, and not desire to leave the organization for self interest or personal gain.

Rather than being an explanatory study that generates its own items, the survey instrument was adapted from Weiner (1982) for loyalty, Allen and Meyer (1990) for value congruence, and from Buchanan (1974) regarding

commitment. Survey respondents received simple instructions: "Write one number in the blank to the left of each statement indicating the extent you agree or disagree with each statement."

Very Much Disagree    1    2    3    4    5    6    7    Very Much Agree

Low numbers describe statements with which you disagree.

High numbers describe statements with which you agree.

Factor analysis of the 23 items (using principal components methodology with orthogonal rotation) is shown in Table 1, along with item numbers on the survey to reflect how subscale items are interspersed on the instrument. Table 2 shows item, subscale, and total alpha reliabilities. Information in these two tables suggest the usefulness of three factors—loyalty, value congruence, and affective organization commitment—with acceptable reliabilities accounting for total intercorrelation in the data. The variable correlations of items with subscale scores (right column of Table 2) suggest a major collective contribution of the three batches of items to the subscales.

Factor I (affective commitment) is loaded by four items from other subscales, but the other two factors (value congruence and loyalty) get loaded  $\geq .30$  only by items classified a priori within their respective subscale classification. The communalities,  $H^2$ , in Table 1 reflect the amount of each item's variance included in the factor analysis.

As the factor analysis suggests, the three subscales have moderate correlations, thus:

	<u>Loyalty</u>	<u>Value Congruence</u>	<u>Affective Commitment</u>
Loyalty	1.0	.29	.54
Value Congruence		1.0	.28
Affective Commitment			1.0

## *JOURNAL OF BUSINESS AND MANAGEMENT*

This pattern of correlations suggest that the three subscales make relatively independent contributions to defining the content of the psychology of attraction to ideological organization commitment.

Moreover, the model asserts a theoretical imperative that higher states of attraction to organization ideology and commitment—which some observers, e.g., Mintzberg (1989), label "missionary"—derive from and transcend the dimensions of loyalty, value congruence, and affective organizational commitment. A critical hypothesis is that the three dimensions of ideology are indeed dimensions of a greater construct. To test this hypothesis, scores for respondents on all three dimensions were totalled and correlated with overall items. Results of factor analyzing all 23 items (forced) on only one scale "missionary ideology" on overall attraction to organization ideology revealed an assuring pattern:

	<u>Loyalty</u>	<u>Value Congruence</u>	<u>Affective Commitment</u>
Missionary Ideology:			
Overall Attraction	.34	.38	.51

### **DIFFERENTIAL PREPOTENCY AND VALENCE**

The contributors to phases of attraction to organization ideology can be described as ranging in prepotency from loyalty to value congruency to organizational commitment; and increasing in valence (need strength toward commitment) from low to high involvement which correspond to an increasing organization commitment. Increases in loyalty represent the most commonly prepotent and least valenced initiators of the process. Indeed, some degree of loyalty—as in "should be willing to support their government's policies" or "should willingly support and defend friend and family members" seems useful for effective performance in many occupations. Beyond a point, however, indigenous loyalty, as a



generalized sense of moral obligation, augments the possibility of a mutually rewarding relationship (congruency) and feelings of identity and inspiration (commitment). Of substantial interest is the proposition that preentry loyalty coupled with sufficiently related or similar values become magnified by processes of organizational socialization, and so facilitate organizational identification, which in combination, lead to organization commitment.

---

**"[P]reentry loyalty coupled with sufficiently related or similar values become magnified by processes of organizational socialization, and so facilitate organizational identification, which in combination, lead to organization commitment."**

---

Perhaps the classic case involves the skilled craftsperson assigned to a challenging position in a job class appropriate to previous trades training and requiring high participation. In episodic, regularly recurring contacts with similarly trained co-workers and supervisors, certain attitudes and beliefs appear increasingly common—an awareness of values that are embracing and enduring, involvement in a wide variety of tasks, distinct identity of members, significant purposes, familiarity with work outcomes, and so on. With continued traditions and precedents, an increasing concern and satisfaction about shared goals and the ability to be a part of something highly important occurs. With repeated enactments of reinforcing meaningfulness, responsibility and knowledge of job results, socializing features build momenta for consensus and underlying value congruence. As loyalty and value congruence mount beyond a point, so can pressures result in a cathexis surpassing an individual's normal "zone

## *JOURNAL OF BUSINESS AND MANAGEMENT*

of acceptance" limit and generate the inducement surplus implied by the bone deep belief of commitment.

It is not intended to indicate there is one pathway to commitment, but rather to suggest why differences in valence occur. While ordering the phases in terms of increased valence, the proposed model does not require that all individuals go through exactly the same phases. The phases represent progressively valenced effects, with a variety of specific pathways (for individuals) leading to organizational ideology and commitment.

Percentile rankings derived from the three sets of subscale scores from the employee population of over 1,600 provided an empirically based estimate of high vs. low. The distribution of raw scores by percentiles yielded three cutting-points for high scores, or those greater than the median: 20 for loyalty, 28 for value congruence, and 24 for affective commitment. The median percentile rankings were not taken simply to establish convenient cut-off points. Identification and development of these cut-offs were adopted from the examination for construct validity taken from Vaserhelyi (1977). Using these cut-offs, an 8-phase model of progressive organization ideology was generated. High scores on organization commitment are considered most highly valenced; high scores on value congruence are more valenced than high scores on loyalty. Basically, these cut-offs provide a ready interpretation for why employees can easily become indoctrinated and often become dedicated to a degree approaching complete commitment. Low to moderate loyalty will lead only to indifferent compliance, without strong need to collaborate with others. Heightened loyalty, however, will result in increased sense of identity with goals and value congruence leading in turn to higher degrees of commitment implying surpluses beyond those associated with mere dependable role compliance. The focus on phases derives from the high vs. low distinctions on three propensities to organization commitment subscales; that is, eight combinations logically emerge from three subscales, each distinguished as two (high vs. low) categories. Table 3

defines the phases in terms of this analysis and shows the distribution of assignments in the current study employee population.

## COVARIANTS OF IDEOLOGY AND COMMITMENT PHASES

Judging from the literature on ideological organization, its covariants include a broad and enriched range of characteristics (Mintzberg, 1989). To illustrate, Schein (1991) associated formation of ideology and "strong culture" with a substantial catalog of effects which favorably compliment improvements in the quality of work life or commitment by those experiencing strong attraction to organization ideology: higher productivity and performance, increased motivation and morale, reduced absenteeism and turnover, along with various self-reported indices of cooperation, including security, initiative, unambivalence, involvement, proaction, and affection. This central characterization suggests a convenient test of the progressive valence of the phases. Consequently, the quality of work life should co-vary regularly with the phases of valence (attraction to ideology), if those phases represent conditions of increasingly ideological commitment. To assess such concurrent validity, a three-stage effort was made to: (1) identify a set of variables commonly used to evaluate worksite quality, (2) extrapolate predictions concerning the expected relationships of these variables with phases of commitment, and (3) test these likely covariants to see if the phases of commitment "map" on them in expected ways.

Covariants were comprised of seven assorted measures, of which the first six should increase as ideological attraction or commitment progresses through the several phases:

Trust in supervision (Roberts and O'Reilly, 1974).

Trust in employment practices (constructed for present study).

Job involvement (White and Ruh, 1973).

## *JOURNAL OF BUSINESS AND MANAGEMENT*

Participation in decisions regarding work (White and Ruh, 1973).

Willingness to disagree with supervisor (Patchen, 1965).

Job Diagnostic Survey (JDS), which measures satisfaction with ten facets of work (Hackman and Oldham, 1980) all of which should increase as ideological attraction to organizational commitment increases. Facets of satisfaction include:

- |                            |                        |
|----------------------------|------------------------|
| 1. Meaningfulness of work  | 6. Growth satisfaction |
| 2. Responsibility for work | 7. Job security        |
| 3. Knowledge of results    | 8. Compensation        |
| 4. General satisfaction    | 9. Co-workers          |
| 5. Work motivation         | 10. Supervision        |

Job tension, an additional scale which should decrease with advancing phases (Kahn, et al., 1965).

Table 4 shows analysis of these results with an average alpha approximating .80 with reliability coefficients for only two of the 16 variables falling below .70 (responsibility for work and work motivation). The conceptual frameworks underlying the assorted scales are general and substantiated by considerably convincing justification (Hackman and Oldham, 1980). Consider, for example, job tension, which taps several important classes of alienation or dissatisfaction—e.g., those related to role conflict and ambiguity—that impact on organization commitment phases, more or less directly.

Data from the workforce population permitted testing for the covariants of progressive phases of commitment and the results appearing in Tables 4-6 support the general usefulness of the phase model. On balance, about 17 percent of the variance in commitment phases by worksite descriptors is explained. For comparative purposes, simple correlations were run between worksite descriptors and four phase model scores—the three subscale scores and phase model total. On average, these 64 correlations

explain 12 percent of the variance and this result reinforces the usefulness of the phase approach, which at once derives from the three subscales and yet transcends them. Phases I and VIII have the lowest and highest scores on the subscales, but the six interior phases have total scores that do not vary directly with the phases. Tables 4 and 5 showing paired comparisons of variables by phases support the overall summary that phase by phase, analyses of all possible comparisons indicate that: (1) over 90 percent of the differences (404/448) are in the expected directions, (2) over 55 percent of the expected differences (248/448) attain statistical significance, and (3) only 2 differences of 448 are in an unexpected direction and statistically significant. The paired comparisons utilized the least difference test, modified for unequal subpopulations. A conclusion flows easily—phases of commitment reflect regular and robust co-variation with the panel of descriptive reports about the character and quality of worksites.

Additionally, the data suggest most or all the phases discretely map significant differences on target variables. Of course, the significant paired comparisons suggest this conclusion, but focusing on "distance" between phases highlights the point. Thus, Phases I vs. II, II vs. III, and so on, may be considered a distance of +1; Phases I and III, III and V, and so on, are +2; etc. Large proportions of expected and statistically significant differences shown in Table 6 are evenly distributed among seven possible "distances" which support the utility of the full 8-phase model.

These data demonstrate that adjacent as well as distant phases tend to map discrete segments of the ranges of target variables. This holds most clearly for the five most distant pairs of phases, where over three-fourths of the paired differences are in the expected direction and attain statistical significance. Moreover, even distances of +2 and +1 generate 41 to 20 percent records in this regard. This suggests that even very close neighbors reflect substantial discriminatory power of the phases, given that a record of one in five statistically significant pairs conventionally signals noteworthy covariation.

**“[I]t is pure folly to assume that ideology-forming attitudes are based simply on expected economic gains; much deeper values are at stake.”**

---

In sum, data in Table 6 significantly demonstrate the usefulness of all the phases. Phases I and VIII reflect the lowest and highest total scores and hence, +7 results can be interpreted as a total score effect. But phases of more proximate distance can have significantly different total scores and map on target variables in quite regular and robust ways.

Finally, the 16 target variables do not merely measure the same domain multiple ways. Varimax rotation factor analysis in Table 7 reveals three domains which are provisionally labelled. One factor accounts for over 45 percent of the common variance to which the other two factors add some 16 percent. Cross loadings in the factors exist, but the convention of reporting only loadings  $\geq .35$  highlights some differentiating tendencies. The first two factors suggest high energy and the second factor seems distinguished by its focus on supervisory versus peer level, as well as by lesser emphasis on job contributors to satisfaction. Moreover, the third factor seems characterized by low energy and peer defensiveness. This multidimensionality of the target variables reinforces the pattern of covariation discussed above, although not robustly.

## **CONCLUSION: PROGRAMMATIC RESEARCH DIRECTIONS**

These results support four future initiatives. First, the data reveal a regular and robust covariation between the commitment phases and 16 common indicators of the quality of working sites. This clearly supports

the usefulness of the phase approach, but the search for covariants should be extended to nonreactive and unobtrusive measures of individual and organizational behaviors.

Second, the incidence of commitment phases among an organizational workforce requires attention for both human resource and cultural socialization reasons, the former if only because screening and selection surveys for workers' training and aptitude potential due to values orientation (before undertaking expensive staffing programs) is *de rigueur*. Consider data from two organizations: The present focal study firm, (A), which is generally considered a moderately favorable place to work and a voluntary nurses association health services concern, (B), that is in most respects thoroughly modern, considered highly missionary, and human resources-oriented. Even the "missionary" organization faces a substantial challenge, to judge from the following distribution of employees by phases of commitment:

PHASES OF ASSIGNMENTS BY PERCENTAGES

Organization	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII
A	22.3	7.3	12.6	8.4	7.3	11.5	7.4	23.2
B	10.9	10.6	7.7	4.7	13.9	9.1	7.3	35.8

Third, more information is needed about the locus of commitment and its connection to ideology formation. The evidence, far from conclusive, suggests that most of the variance in commitment is accounted for by properties of precedent, tradition, and reinforcements of the immediate work unit and not by the overall organization or original mission itself (Ouchi, 1980; Meyer, 1989).

Fourth, there may well be several types of commitment, even if features of the immediate work group and its style of control prove dominant.

Progressively *evoked* seems to describe the dominant type of attraction to ideology measured by the phases, given not only the strong associations with worksite descriptors, but also taking into account the substantial persistence of phase assignments observed in the pilot study and over a year's interval. But, precipitous, or *natural* proclivities also no doubt exist and advanced and heightened bonding with ideology might be induced by sudden critical identity enhancing events.

---

**"Successful corporate strategies are almost invariably guided by powerful corporate visions and realistic assessments of the company's commitment and capability to attain them."**

---

This core notion might develop in several ways. Although available data imply that Phase I-VIII can be considered progressively valenced, for example, this does not imply that a phase-by-phase entrance to, or exit from, advanced commitment always occurs. Powerful internalization might induce an acute "natural" progression of phases: I→VI→VIII, for example. One also can envision a basic pathway for "evoked" commitment due to gradually accumulating and indoctrinating involvement at work: I→II→IV→VII→VIII.

Finally, it is pure folly to assume that ideology-forming attitudes are based simply on expected economic gains; much deeper values are at stake:

When the informal processes of socialization tend to function naturally; perhaps reinforced by more formal programs of indoctrination, then the ideology would seem to be strong. But when



the organization is forced to rely almost exclusively on forms of calculated identification, then its ideology would appear to be weakening, if not absent to begin with (Mintzberg, 1989).

This conclusion that deeper values than money are at stake best illustrates how combinations of affecting factors of loyalty and shared values among employee members echoes the same sentiment: The perceived instrumentality of participation, involvement, and commitment to organization ideology truly promises that workers will understand the company's mission, philosophy, and policy and will be able to deduce or derive for themselves the proper objective for any conceivable situation.

For strategy consultants, employees' belief that intervention will yield positive rather than negative outcomes for them allows planners to predict, with incredibly high accuracy, the readiness and receptivity of organizations to new initiatives in organization change. In a sense, organization commitment works like the basic postulates of an axiomatic system. They are the fundamental assumptions on which reasoning and sense making are logically derived, but in themselves are not logical. The real test of their worth is not their reasoning or logic, but the usefulness of the thinking and action that ensues. In strong cultures, everyone knows the importance of shared values and compelling commitment. It is the ideological drive for accomplishment pulling the organization together; providing continuity in what would otherwise be an autochthonous field of organization dynamics.

This line of research suggests, however, that strong cultures of commitment are not to be found in many, or even most organizations. And, while earlier studies (Ouchi, 1978) have shown they are evident in most of the superior performers, all is not rosy in the world of culture either. As one observer has exclaimed, "A corporation doesn't have a culture. A corporation is a culture. That's why they're so horribly difficult to change" (Kiechel, 1984). In established organizations, ideologies are difficult to build and sustain, and can sometimes get in the way of organization effectiveness. Whereas strong cultures promote

## ***JOURNAL OF BUSINESS AND MANAGEMENT***

change within themselves and become immutable, by forcing everyone to act within the same set of circumscribed beliefs, they themselves are not to be changed. Commitment thus becomes an obstacle to change, and the very ideology of loyalty, value congruence, and positive affect that makes an organization so adaptive within its culture undermines its efforts to move to a new context.

The phase model approach to assessing processes of commitment formation promises to provide a useful organon or model for further understanding just how ideological values serving to reconcile contradictory forces and promote change can paradoxically discourage, or even destroy it. The phase-wise analysis suggests that effective ideologies are generated gradually and incrementally by patient, deeply committed leaders capable of establishing compelling missions for their organizations, and managing the paradoxes inherent in them. The phase model also suggests a call for vision in managing organization mission. Successful corporate strategies are almost invariably guided by powerful corporate visions and realistic assessments of the company's commitment and capability to attain them. Establishing this vision imposes great demands on leadership, but meeting the demands can produce a corporate renaissance. Paradoxically, the more people understand about ideological limits of commitment, the more they seem to expand the limits of ideology. Such has certainly occurred in some organizations adopting the notion "There is absolutely no limit to quality" as their credo. Such an expansion may provide the most effective way for a company to sustain itself and prosper in the future.

### **MANAGER APPLICATIONS: INTERVENTION STRATEGIES**

Several active, organizational, and self-help strategies should be proposed to facilitate employee attraction to organization. If management wants to make ideology more attractive to employees, it must consider making work conditions more satisfying. Management and the personnel department can enhance the progressive level of attraction by: (1) self-

analysis and evaluation of commitment level; (2) greater participation, involvement, and commitment in selecting and achieving work goals; (3) originating and reinforcing positive work attitudes; (4) maintaining a "sense-making" morality of work and organizational culture; (5) providing realistic communications that create expectations that will be fulfilled; (6) designing jobs with variety, identity, significance, autonomy, and feedback which fully utilize and develop skills, knowledge, and abilities of employees; (7) structuring the social psychology of organization culture and work roles to satisfy employee personalities, interests, and preferences; (8) facilitating and effecting personnel actions that tell employees management's priority to operate through and with employees, and that the organization is committed to treating employees with trust, open-mindedness, confidence, and respect; and (9) developing leadership, motivation, and communication encouraging Pygmalion-like practices of supervision (Hackman, 1980; Roberts, 1974).

Employees sometimes respond to disloyalty and lack of shared values with both upper managers and supervisors by neurotic behavior. They decide, in effect, that as long as they are going to be alienated and estranged in their disaffected work roles, they might as well withdraw and apathetically blame others for their indifference. Unfortunately, passive withdrawal does not treat propensity toward ideology adequately. Quite the opposite; one successful mode of intervention requires that employees selectively interact and spend more quality time with key supervisors and fellow employees to become aware of problems and cope with feelings (Rand, 1980).

Another effective strategy for heightening ideology attraction among employees is developing a social support system. Social support is defined as "the degree to which a person's basic social needs are gratified through unconditional acceptance by a group and belongingness with others" (Kaplan, 1987). An employee social support system serves several specific functions. These include having co-workers available to: (1) listen actively to problems; (2) provide rewarding appreciation for skills and abilities; (3) serve as a basis for continuing socialization and education;

## *JOURNAL OF BUSINESS AND MANAGEMENT*

(4) provide emotional support as well as a knowledgeable referent; and (5) facilitate testing social organization reality (Guzzo, 1985; Gorlin, 1984).

Whether in solo, assembly, or group/project operations, it is relatively easy for employees to become socially isolated. This can lead to the individual employee feeling alone with his or her work problems. It cannot be over-emphasized that employees must learn to extend help to each other and to be more socially supportive of their fellow co-workers (Pascale, 1988).

One advantage should be suggested to organizations seeking to increase commitment momentum through a social support mechanism. If a number of employees are experiencing strong satisfaction and fulfillment at the same time, they may reinforce their positive attitudes and behaviors. The net effect would be to increase the intensity of attraction for those involved (Schuler, 1982). Research findings extol the virtues of employees sharing and reinforcing their collective recognition and achievement by exchanging unremitting "tales of triumph and prophecies of promise!" (Jackson, 1987).

Finally, it appears that the intensity of a "reengineering" campaign (and such campaigns are increasingly popular) does not sway employee predispositions or loyalty preferences one way or the other. Since employees' attitudes toward their jobs and organizations in general are quite stable and well formed, their opinions tend not to be influenced much by campaign slogans and "quick-fix" tactics (Getman, Goldberg, and Herman, 1986). Managers may simply fail to recognize the signs and symptoms of serious loyalty and value congruence problems early enough to make the appropriate form of intervention needed (Kotlowitz, 1987; Janus, 1982). The following symptoms are considered significant: (1) disaffection; (2) powerlessness; (3) meaninglessness; (4) normlessness; (5) social isolation; (6) value isolation; (7) self and/or work group estrangement; (8) disciplinary and grievance difficulties; (9) blaming others; (10) subgoal formation; (11) lack of awareness of real common problems; (12) acting contrary to data, information, and company policies

and actions; (13) displaying extreme displeasure with trifling circumstances; and (14) behaving differently outside of work organization. Organizational diagnosis and action interventions should not be confused with unfair practices of interference. Although employers cannot directly ask employees what they think and feel about organization vs. other central life interests (e.g., family or union), they can ask how satisfied they are with work and other conditions; and how much "say so" they have in confronting important problems (Kochan, 1979; Patchen, 1965).

---

**"Whether in solo, assembly, or group/project operations, it is relatively easy for employees to become socially isolated."**

---

#### SUMMARY CONCEPT

Patterns of attraction toward ideology and commitment are perhaps more common than generally accepted at the organizational level. Fortunately, the effects are very discernible and real. This approach has emphasized adapting a survey inventory for the employee work role to facilitate recognition of early signs of the attraction to affective organization commitment profile as a special subset of the formation of strong organization ideology. Utilizing this knowledge, it is hoped that individual managers in human resource programs will find it easier to develop strategies to examine and monitor this evolutionary phased and progressively patterned linkage impacting the quality of work organization.

The method presented is a tool that will permit Human Resource managers and professionals to make first order assessments of quality of work life to discover which personnel and/or jobs are most strongly bonded

## *JOURNAL OF BUSINESS AND MANAGEMENT*

to the organization and which are the most likely candidates for intervention and revitalization. It is a tool that managers will find familiar in general design, for it is squarely based on individual self-analysis and intuitive processes that ultimately are among the most critical to human resource effectiveness. It is intended that articulation and self-discovery of the subtle human ways in which employees have unconsciously become socialized into the organization culture will make a mystifying situation not magical, but manageable and improvable.

TABLE 1  
 FACTOR STRUCTURE FOR IDEOLOGY FORMATION

(N = 1,639; Items = 23)

Subscale Items	Rotated Factor*			H <sup>2</sup>
	I	II	III	
A. Organizational Commitment				
1. Effort Beyond Expected	.78			.62
2. Talk Up Organization	.81			.63
3. Accept Any Assignment	.84			.72
9. Inspires Best Performance	.63			.45
14. Chosen Organization	.58			.45
15. Care About Fate	.46			.24
21. Best Possible Organization	.64			.48
B. Value Congruence				
5. Values In Agreement		.39		.20
8. Personally Approve Way		.51		.29
10. Cares About Safety and Quality		.45		.22
13. Safe and Comfortable Work		.54		.44
18. Honesty With Employees/Public	.39	.46		.39
19. Concern For Environment		.51		.35
20. Respects Rights and Dignity		.55		.44
22. Organization is Fair		.54		.33
C. Loyalty				
4. Loyalty to Friends and Family			.45	.22
6. Willing to Sacrifice			.58	.39
7. Loyalty to Country	.34		.41	.31
11. Willing to Support Government			.58	.41
12. Sacrifice for Sake of Company	.48		.34	.37
16. Loyalty to Employer	.61		.35	.47
17. Never Criticize Policies			.33	.19
23. Make Financial Sacrifice			.31	.22
<b>Eigen Value</b>	5.9	2.4	1.7	
<b>% Common Variance</b>	25.6	10.4	7.4	
<b>% Cumulative Variance</b>	25.6	36.0	43.4	

\*Show only loading > .30

**TABLE 2**  
**RELIABILITIES OF SUBSCALES AND TOTAL SCORES**

Ideology Formation Subscale Items	Subscale Alpha Coefficient	Item Alpha Coefficient	Item/Subscale Correlation Corrected
A. Organization Commitment	.85		
1. Effort Beyond Expected		.86	.71
2. Talk Up Organization		.82	.68
3. Accept Any Assignment		.83	.61
9. Inspires Best Performance		.81	.77
14. Chosen Organization		.80	.64
15. Care About Fate		.85	.60
21. Best Possible Organization		.83	.69
B. Value Congruence	.75		
5. Values in Agreement		.74	.34
8. Personally Approve Way		.69	.47
10. Cares About Safety and Quality		.70	.35
13. Safe and Comfortable Work		.69	.49
18. Honest With Employees and Public		.69	.40
19. Concern for Environment		.71	.43
20. Respect Rights and Dignity		.69	.45
22. Organization is Fair		.70	.38
C. Loyalty	.73		
4. Loyalty to Friends and Family		.71	.34
6. Willing to Sacrifice		.69	.47
7. Loyalty to Country		.67	.45
11. Willing to Support Government		.66	.47
12. Sacrifice for Sake of Company		.70	.54
16. Loyalty to Employer		.71	.50
17. Never Criticize Policies		.68	.29
23. Make Financial Sacrifice		.68	.27
D. TOTAL			
Ideology Score	.85		



TABLE 3  
 HIGH VS. LOW ATTRACTION TO IDEOLOGY  
 TO DEFINE PHASES OF COMMITMENT

<u>Ideology Subscales</u>	<u>Phases of Commitment</u>							
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII
Prepotency								
Loyalty	Lo	Hi	Lo	Hi	Lo	Hi	Lo	Hi
Value Congruence	Lo	Lo	Hi	Hi	Lo	Lo	Hi	Hi
Commitment	Lo	Lo	Lo	Lo	Hi	Hi	Hi	Hi
	Low		Valence			High		
Assignments (N = 1,639)	365	120	206	137	120	189	122	380

Interpretation

Prepotency ranges from Loyalty to Value Congruence to Affective Organization Commitment.

Valence ascends from Phase I (Low) to Phase VIII (High) for stages provisionally defined as:

<u>Phase</u>	<u>Meaning</u>
I	Awareness
II	Concern
III	Experimentation
IV	Options
V	Partial Acceptance
VI	Momento
VII	Convergence
VIII	Affective Reinforcement

TABLE 4

COVARIATION OF PHASES OF IDEOLOGY AND  
TARGET VARIABLES VIA ONE-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

PROGRESSIVE PHASES OF COMMITMENT

	I LoLoLo	II HiLoLo	III LoHiLo	IV HHiLo	V LoLoHi	VI LoHiHi	VII LoHiHi	VIII HHiHi	F- Ratio	F- Probability
ASSORTED SCALES										
Alpha Scores	(365)	(120)	(206)	(137)	(120)	(189)	(122)	(380)		
Participation	13.0	13.5	14.9	16.2	14.9	15.2	16.3	17.8	46.793	< .001
Job Involvement	24.7	25.4	29.8	30.9	29.7	31.8	32.9	34.7	72.227	< .001
Trust in Supervision	.78	12.2	12.7	14.6	13.1	15.1	14.4	15.9	23.196	< .001
Trust in Employees	.78	14.7	16.1	17.4	17.0	17.6	17.8	19.6	32.726	< .001
Willingness to Disagree with Supervision	.79	14.9	15.3	16.4	14.6	13.7	15.6	14.6	2.996	< .01
Job Tension	.86	23.4	22.0	21.0	19.5	18.2	17.0	16.1	49.240	< .001
JOB DIAGNOSTIC SURVEY										
(JDS) SCALES										
Meaningfulness of Work	16.4	17.7	19.5	20.1	19.4	20.9	21.4	23.2	64.940	< .001
Responsibility for Results	29.0	30.3	31.9	33.6	32.1	33.4	34.6	36.4	51.462	< .001
Knowledge of Results	18.9	20.3	19.8	21.2	20.4	21.9	21.5	23.0	32.840	< .001
General Satisfaction	.81	19.2	22.2	23.1	24.2	26.0	26.5	28.4	97.183	< .001
Internal Work Motivation	67	29.9	31.1	34.4	31.9	33.2	33.7	35.7	37.987	< .001
Growth Satisfaction	85	15.3	18.6	20.0	19.3	20.7	21.5	23.1	73.738	< .001
Satisfaction with Security	.77	8.6	9.1	9.7	10.3	10.7	10.9	11.5	21.085	< .001
Satisfaction with Compensation	.87	8.2	8.4	8.7	8.7	10.2	10.1	10.5	18.987	< .001
Satisfaction with Co-Workers	.76	13.9	16.0	17.6	15.9	17.9	18.0	18.8	76.314	< .001
Satisfaction with Supervision	.80	12.2	13.5	14.7	14.1	15.9	15.7	17.1	38.385	< .001



TABLE 6  
 FOUR MEASURES OF COVARIATION OF TARGET VARIABLES, BY "DISTANCE" BETWEEN  
 PAIRS OF PHASES, PERCENT, AND ABSOLUTE NUMBER OF OBSERVATIONS (IN PARENTHESES)

	<u>Total in Percent</u>	<u>+7</u>	<u>+6</u>	<u>+5</u>	<u>+4</u>	<u>+3</u>	<u>+2</u>	<u>+1</u>
Expected Direction	90.2	94% (15/16)	97% (31/32)	96% (46/48)	98% (63/64)	95% (76/80)	90% (86/96)	78% (87/112)
Expected Direction and Statistical Significance	55.1	94% (15/16)	94% (30/32)	92% (44/48)	78% (50/64)	58% (46/80)	41% (39/96)	20% (23/112)
Unexpected Direction	9.4	6% (1/16)	3% (1/32)	2% (1/48)	3% (2/64)	5% (4/80)	9% (9/96)	21% (23/112)
Unexpected Direction and Statistical Significance	0.5	0%	0%	2% (1/48)	0%	0%	0%	1% (1/112)

TABLE 7

## FACTORS IN PANEL OF 16 TARGET VARIABLES, BY VARIMAX ROTATION

## FACTORS SUGGESTING DIFFERENCES IN WORKSITE DESCRIPTORS

	I. High Energy, Positive Job Factors, Peer-Oriented	II. High Trust, Supervisor-Oriented, Tension-Avoiding	III. Peer-Oriented, Restricted Upward Feedback	H <sup>2</sup>
<u>Assorted Scales</u>				
Participation	.49	.48		.52
Job Involvement	.71			.63
Trust in Supervision		.79		.71
Trust in Employees	.40	.67		.62
Willingness to Disagree with Supervisor			-.36	.22
Job Tension		-.55		.43
<u>JDS Scales</u>				
Meaningfulness of Work	.83			.72
Responsibility for Results	.73			.60
Knowledge of Results	.42			.33
General Satisfaction	.75	.37		.72
Internal Work Motivation	.66			.48
Growth Satisfaction		.44		.76
Satisfaction with Security	.73	.43		.27
Satisfaction with Compensation		.45		.39
Satisfaction with Co-Workers	.67		.35	.56
Satisfaction with Supervision		.82		.77
<u>Eigen Value</u>	7.5	1.5	1.1	
Percent Common Variance	46.7	9.4	6.9	
Percent Cumulative Variance	46.7	56.1	63.0	

\*Shows only loadings  $\geq .35$

# *JOURNAL OF BUSINESS AND MANAGEMENT*

## SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

Write one number in the blank to the left of each statement indicating the extent you agree or disagree with each statement.

**Very Much Disagree**                      1   2   3   4   5   6   7   **Very Much Agree**

**Low numbers describe statements with which you disagree.**

**High numbers describe statements with which you agree.**

---

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond the normally expected in order to help this organization be successful.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. I talk up this organization to my friends as a great organization to work for.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. I would accept almost any type of job assignment in order to keep working for this organization.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4. A strong loyalty to friends and family is a person's most important obligation.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 5. I find my personal values to be in agreement with those of this company.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 6. A person should be willing to sacrifice for the benefit of friends and family members.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 7. A strong loyalty to country is one's most important obligation.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 8. I personally approve of the way this organization treats customers, always being truthful.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 9. This organization really inspires the very best in me in the way of job performance.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 10. I am impressed by how this organization cares about the safety and quality of its product and services.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 11. All citizens, regardless of race, ethnic origin, religious and political affiliation, should be willing to support their government policies without second guessing.

- \_\_\_ 12. Employees should be willing to make personal sacrifice for the sake of their company if needed, giving up or rescheduling a vacation to meet work deadlines.
- \_\_\_ 13. I am satisfied with this organization to provide a safe and comfortable work environment for employees.
- \_\_\_ 14. I am extremely glad that I chose this organization to work for over others I was considering at the time I joined.
- \_\_\_ 15. I really care about the fate of this organization.
- \_\_\_ 16. A strong loyalty to one's employer is one of an employee's most important obligations.
- \_\_\_ 17. Employees should never publicly criticize the policies of their employer.
- \_\_\_ 18. I admire this organization's honesty in dealing with its employees and the public.
- \_\_\_ 19. I am impressed by this organization's concern for the environment.
- \_\_\_ 20. This organization respects and protects the rights and dignity of all employees.
- \_\_\_ 21. For me, this is the best of all possible organizations for which to work.
- \_\_\_ 22. This organization is fair and there is little more that I can ask for.
- \_\_\_ 23. Employees should be willing to make financial sacrifice, such as giving up pay increases for a given period of time for the sake of their company's survival.

REFERENCES

- Allen, N.J. & Meyer, J.P. (1990). "The Measurement and Antecedents of Affective, Continuance, and Normative Commitment." *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63(4), 1-18.
- Bateman, T.S. & Strasser, S. (1984). "A Longitudinal Analysis of the Antecedents of Organizational Commitment." *Academy of Management Journal*, 27(1), 95-112.
- Brown, M.E. (1979). "Identification and Some Conditions of Organizational Involvement." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 54(2), 14-22.
- Buchanan, B. (1974). "Building Organizational Commitment: The Socialization of Managers in Work Organizations." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 52(1), 19-24.
- Dubin, R., Champour, & Porter, L. (1975). "Central Life Interests and Organizational Commitment of Blue Collar and Clerical Workers." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 52(4), 20-26.
- Getman, J.G., Goldberg, S. & Herman, S.B. (1986). *Union Representation Elections: Law and Reality*, New York, NY: Russelsage Foundation.
- Gorlin, H. (1984). *Innovations in Managing Human Resources*, New York, NY: Conference Board.
- Guzzo, R.A. (1985). "The Effects of Psychologically Based Intervention Programs on Worker Productivity." *Personnel Psychology*, 64(2), 275-293.
- Hackman, J.R. & Oldham, G.R. (1980). *Work Redesign*, Reading, MA: Addison Wesley.



- Hall, D.T., B. Schneider, & Nypren, H.T. (1970). "Personal Factors in Organizational Identification." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 51(12), 15-23.
- Hrebniak, G. & Alutto, J.A. (1972). "Personal and Role-Related Factors in the Development of Organizational Commitment." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 53(2), 17-24.
- Jackson, E. (1987). "Stress Management and Personal Satisfaction." *Clinics of North America*, 21(5), 559-576.
- Janus, C.J. (1982, November 22). "A Push to Unify the New Unions." *Business Week*, 93-94.
- Jamal, M. (1974). "Task Specialization and Organizational Commitment: An Empirical Examination Among Blue Collar Workers." *Academy of Management Proceedings*, 34th Annual Meeting, Seattle, Washington.
- Kahn, R., Wolfe, R., Quinn, J., Snoeck, G. & Rosenthal, R. (1964). *Organizational Stress: Studies in Role Conflict and Ambiguity*. New York, NY: Wiley.
- Kahn, R., D. Wolfe, R. Quinn, J. Snoeck, & Rosenthal, R. (1965). *Organizational Stress*. New York, NY: Wiley.
- Kaplan, B. H. (1987). "Social Support and Health." *Medical Care*, 15(4), 47-58.
- Katz, D. & Kahn, R. (1978) *Social Psychology of Organization*. 2nd Ed., New York, NY: John Wiley and Sons.
- Kidron, A. (1978). "Work Values and Organizational Commitment." *Academy of Management Journal*, 21(2), 41-45.

## ***JOURNAL OF BUSINESS AND MANAGEMENT***

- Kochan, T. A., (1979, March). "How American Workers View Labor Unions." *Monthly Labor Review*, 103(4), 23-31.
- Kotlowitz, A. (1987, August 28). "Labor's Turn." *The Wall Street Journal*, 14.
- March, J.G. & Simon, H.A. (1958). *Organizations*. New York, NY: Wiley.
- McGregor, D. (1967). *The Professional Manager*. New York, NY: McGraw Hill.
- Meyer, J., et al., (1989). "Organizational Commitment and Job Performance: It's the Nature of the Commitment That Counts." *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74(1), 152-156.
- Meyer, J.P. & Allen, N.J. (1987). "Organizational Commitment: Toward a Three-Component Model." *Research Bulletin 660*, Vancouver, Canada: The University of Western Ontario, Department of Psychology.
- Miller, J.G. (1978). *Living Systems*. New York, NY: McGraw Hill.
- Mintzberg, H. (1989). *Mintzberg on Management: Inside Our Strange World of Organizations*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Mintzberg, H. (1983). *Power in and Around Organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Morris, J.H. & Koch, J.L. (1979). "Impact of Role Perceptions on Organizational Commitment, Job Involvement and Psychosomatic Illness Among Three Vocational Groupings." *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 14(2), 88-101.

- Mowday, R.T., Steers, R.M., & Porter, L. (1979). "The Measurement of Organizational Commitment." *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 14(8), 224-247.
- Mowday, R., Porter, L., & Steers, R. (1982). *The Psychology of Commitment, Absenteeism and Turnover*. New York, NY: Academy Press.
- O'Reilly, C. & Chatman, J. (1986). "Organizational Commitment and Psychological Attachment: The Effects of Compliance, Identification, and Internalization on Prosocial Behavior." *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(3), 492-499.
- Ouchi, W.G. & Jaeger, A.M. (1978). "Type Z Organizations: Stability in the Midst of Mobility." *Academy of Management Review*, 3(1), 305-314.
- Ouchi, W. (1980). "Markets, Bureaucracies, and Clan." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 25(2), 129-141.
- Pascale, R. (1988, May 28). "Fitting Employees into the Corporate Culture." *Fortune*, 28-40.
- Patchen, M. (1965). "Some Questionnaire Measures of Employee Motivation and Morale." Monograph No. 41, Ann Arbor, MI: Survey Research Center.
- Porter, L., Steers, R., Mowday, R.T. & Boulin, P.V. (1974). "Organizational Commitment, Job Satisfaction, and Turnover Among Psychiatric Technicians." *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 5(3), 603-609.
- Porter, L., Crampton, W. & Smith, F. (1976). "Organizational Commitment and Managerial Turnover: Longitudinal Study." *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 15(4), 87-98.

## ***JOURNAL OF BUSINESS AND MANAGEMENT***

- Rand, J. F., (1980, June). "Preventive Maintenance Techniques for Staying Union Free." *Personnel Journal*, 37(1), 498.
- Reichers, A. (1986). "Conflicts and Organizational Commitment." *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(3), 508-514.
- Roberts, K.H. & O'Reilly, C. (1974). "Failures in Upward Communication in Organizations: Three Possible Culprits." *Academy of Management Journal*, 17(4), 104-115.
- Schein, E. H. (1991). *Organizational Culture and Leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Tracy, L. (1984). "A Dynamic Living-Systems Model of Work Motivation." *Systems Research*, 1(2), 191-203.
- Tracy, L. (1989). *The Living Organization: Systems of Behavior*. New York, NY: Praeger.
- Vaserhelyi, M.A. (1977). "Man-Machine Planning Systems: Style Examination of Interactive Decision Making." *Journal of Accounting Research*, 42(12), 310-316.
- Weiner, Y. (1982). "Commitment in Organizations: A Normative View." *Academy of Management Review*, 7(3), 418-428.
- Weiner, Y. & Gechman, A.G. (1977). "Commitment: A Behavioral Approach to Job Involvement." *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 10(4), 47-52.
- Weiner, Y. & Vardi, Y. (1980). "Relationships Between Job, Organization, and Career Commitments and Work Outcomes--An Integrative Approach." *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 26(1), 81-96.

White, J. K. & Ruh, R. (1973). "Effects of Personal Values on the Relationships Between Participation and Job Attitudes." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 18(2), 506-514.