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The mediating effect of Role conflict and Role ambiguity of faculty’s’ job satisfaction and commitment.

Assil Homayed

ABSTRACT

**Purpose:** The primary purpose of this study was to explore the mediating effect of role conflict and role ambiguity on faculty’s job satisfaction and commitment since minimal research has been done from this aspect on faculty members. It also aimed at finding if a direct relationship exists between faculty’s job satisfaction and commitment and investigate the relationship among the variables when role conflict and role ambiguity were introduced as mediators. Faculty members of a top institution of higher education in Lebanon were chosen as a sample of the study.

**Design/methodology/approach:** Quantitative analysis was conducted in this study where surveys were distributed and collected. The sample of the study included the full time and part time faculty members of a prominent university in Lebanon. The data obtained from 133 participants were analyzed using the Rstudio software and the hypothetical model was tested using structural equation modeling through Onyx.
Findings: The findings of the researcher resulted in a new version of organizational commitment scale where normative commitment scale was dropped, and continuance commitment scale was divided into two subscales. It was demonstrated that the updated commitment is more applicable to faculty members. The results supported H1a (There is a direct relationship between JS and AC); and H1b (There is a direct relationship between JS and Alt CC); whereas H1c was not supported (There is a direct relationship between JS and CC Econ). H2 was supported (Role ambiguity mediates the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment), as RA partially mediated the relationship between JS and AC, fully mediated the relationship between JS and CC Econ, and also served as a mediator between JS and Alt CC. H3 was supported in the case of AC and Alt CC as RC partially mediated the relationship between JS and complete mediated the relationship between JS and Alt CC. However, RC had no mediative power in the relationship with CC Econ.

Originality/value: This study highlights the importance of acknowledging and minimizing role conflict and role ambiguity in a workplace to result in a higher level of satisfaction and commitment among employees. It also gives an insight on understanding the relationship between job satisfaction and commitment among faculty members, in the case where role conflict and role ambiguity serve as a mediators. This paper adds value to the literature gap as a limited research exists on this topic and a new version of the organizational commitment scale was also developed, which is more relevant to faculty members.

Key words: Role Conflict, Role Ambiguity, Job Satisfaction, Commitment, Affective commitment, Continuance Commitment, Normative Commitment.
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CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

1.1. General Background

Role conflict and Role ambiguity are two factors which affect employees’ performance and well-being on daily basis. Organizations tend to give a blind eye or not know what struggles their employees are dealing with. Unfortunately, in Lebanon, there exists a high level of role conflict and role ambiguity amongst employees as HR managers are still operating in a traditional way where they still view their employees as expenses rather than assets. Thus, training and coaching is not always a priority for employees. Also, communication is still based on hierarchy and differs based on positions. Hence, such situations and environments all lead to high role conflict and role ambiguity in a workplace, leading to higher intention to leave, and negative impact on employees’ job satisfaction and commitment.

Role conflict refers to an employee’s confusion on who to take orders from, or what demands to respond to; having multiple demands from different individuals leads to role conflict. Role Ambiguity is the level of uncertainty within the job. For instance, not knowing what your actual job role is, what tasks should you perform etc., are all known as role ambiguity. (Rizzo et al., 1970).
Such conflicts and uncertainty within the job of an individual affects many aspects of their behavior and well-being. For instance, several studies have shown that employees facing role conflict and role ambiguity not only have an intention to leave or quit, but also face stress, depression, burnout, demotivation, dissatisfaction, and a sense of disengagement. (Schmidt et al., 2014).

Thus, one of the main challenges faced by HR managers nowadays, is dealing with individuals’ conflicts and satisfying them. This paper will study the mediating effect of role conflict and role ambiguity on faculty’s job satisfaction and commitment.

1.2. Need for the study

The need for this study is based on the notion that limited research has been done on this topic, with the chosen variables and factors, especially in Lebanon. Thus, this study is essential fill the gap on this topic and to give organizations a better insight and vision on the consequences of having role conflict and role ambiguity in their organizations, and how to minimize it.

1.3. Purpose of the study

The purpose of this study is to serve as a guidance for HR managers as the study is based on exploring the mediating effects of role conflict and role ambiguity on employees’ job satisfaction and commitment. It is essential to understand the crucial impact of having such uncertainty in the workplace and identifying strategies to reduce them.
1.4. Statement of the research problem

This research aims to study the mediating effect of role conflict and role ambiguity on employees’ job satisfaction, and commitment. It attempts to answer the question: What is the mediating effect of role conflict and role ambiguity on employees’ job satisfaction and commitment?

1.5. Operational definition of terms

Role conflict: can be referred to as “The inability to satisfy incompatible demands is what generates role conflict” (Boles & Babin, 1996).

Role ambiguity: “Role ambiguity is a demanding work condition that prevents employees from understanding clearly how they can conduct their jobs” (Rizzo et al., 1970)

Job satisfaction: Job satisfaction is defined as “the feelings a person has about her or his job”.

Organizational commitment: Organizational commitment is defined as “the relative strength of an individual’s identification with and involvement in an organization” (Anderson & Williams, 1991).

The following chapter of this thesis entails a comprehensive explanation of the theoretical framework regarding the main variables: role conflict, role ambiguity, job satisfaction and organizational commitment, with the hypotheses formulated by the researcher at the end. The third chapter displays the process and method used to collect the data required, while the fourth chapter presents the results of the data analysis. The succeeding chapter reveals the hypothesis testing results followed by the last chapter
which discusses the outcomes of the study, limitations, managerial implications, future research and ends with a conclusion.
CHAPTER TWO

Literature Review

2.1. Role

Role is defined as “a set of expected activities associated with the occupancy of a given position” (Katz & Kahn, 1978). Pareek (1994) defines role as the set of tasks done by an individual in response to the expectations of the job position itself and the expectations of the other individuals. It is also described as the way an individual behaves in response to the pattern of behaviors expected (Ilgen & Hollenbeck, 1991; Naylor et. Al, 1980). Role expectations can sometimes be perceived as role behaviors; Ilgen & Hollenbeck (1991) illustrated that role expectations are the given job tasks of an individual, whereas role behavior is how an individual behaves while performing the required tasks. The term “role” may be referred to several behaviors, not limiting it to certain job tasks, thus, differentiating them with the terms “role conflict” and “role ambiguity” (Katz & Kahn, 1978).

2.2. Role theory

The study of Role theory was first researched by Kahn, wolfe, Quinn, Snoek, & Rosenthal (1964), and introduced to the organizational behavior literature. The theory states that the environment or culture of any organization influences the expected role behavior of an individual. Any job position requires certain behaviors and job duties, thus, individuals feel obligated to behave in a specific way based on the norms of the
organization and the role requirements sent by the role sender. According to this theory, misunderstandings and conflicts arise when the role sender sends messages that are unclear, indirect or not listed in the individual’s role; hence, the focal person will behave in an unexpected manner due to the ambiguous messages received.

Monnot (2008) defined role theory as a process of communication and interaction between individuals in a workplace. It is stated that an individual adopts the role and responsibilities based on the given situation. For instance, an individual holds a specific role when acting as a manager, but by the same token, his role differs when acting as a subordinate in the same organization but in a different department. Role expectations can be set by the individual, the role itself, or other people in the organization or society (Kahn et al., 1964). Consequently, if an individual did not know what are his exact job tasks and responsibilities, the limits for decision making, or even the way his performance is measured; the individual will most probably fail in meeting the expectations of his superior (Rizzo et al.; 1970). Therefore, organizations should set and communicate clear role expectations and behaviors to prevent organizational tensions and provide constant stability to role behaviors and role expectations (Katz & Kahn, 1978).

### 2.3. Job stress

Job stress is defined as “Any characteristic of the workplace that poses threat to the individual” (Larson, 2004). Job stress differs from the general stress as it is caused from within the organization, whereas general stress can be caused from external factors such as personal matters, financial or health issues, marriage issues and more. (Larson,
The internal factors that lead to job stress are referred to as “Role stressors”; role stressors include factors such as role conflict, role ambiguity, role overload and more. This study will only cover role conflict and role ambiguity.

According to Jamal (1990), an individual experiences job stress due to lack of communication, training and even lack of skills or abilities. Consequently, job stress is known to result in demotivation, intention to quit, decrease in performance, dissatisfaction, high absenteeism, and lower commitment. (Williams et al., 2000; Murphy, 1995; Judeh., 2011; McHugh., 1993; Mikkelsen et al., 2000; Kahn et al., 1964; Kemery et al., 1985). Job stress could either result in positive or negative actions by an employee. Every employee experiences different type of job stress depending on his supervisor or company. Accordingly, stress can have a negative impact on the organization if it were for a long period of time with strong effect on individuals. However, despite the undesirable consequences of job stress on the organization, it does have some benefits associated with it. With reference to Weiss et al, (1982)’s study, it is proven that an individual could actually perform better if he is experiencing a low level of stress. Moreover, stress could be beneficial for the organization if the employees had strong willpower, patience, and most importantly, if the job stress was slight and for a short period of time (Weiss et al, 1982; Schermerhorn, 2002).

2.4. Role stressors

Any individual who feels that his work performance is ineffective and inadequate will experience role stress. The basic role stress theory states that negative consequences such as higher turnover rates, dissatisfaction and low levels of commitment are all
resulted by role stressors (Kemery et al., 1985; Kahn et al., 1964). Role stressors are classified into three concepts, which are interrelated but different at the same time. They are categorized as role conflict, role ambiguity, and role overload. (Montgomery et al., 1996; Singh, 1998). Despite the fact that role conflict and role overload are different concepts but still correlated, they are usually used interchangeably in research studies by researchers. (Coverman, 1989; Kahn et al., 1964).

Role overload is divided into two notions or categories; which are qualitative and quantitative role overload. Qualitative role overload is when an individual is given a task or job that is beyond that individual’s skills and capabilities. Whereas Quantitative overload is when an employee is given so many tasks to complete in a short period of time (Fineman and Payne, 1981; Larson, 2004; Kahn et al., 1964; Bacharach et al., 1991; Coverman, 1989).

2.5. Role Conflict

2.5.1. Definition of Role Conflict

Rizzo et al., (1970) developed the role conflict questionnaire and defined role conflict as the occurrence of a situation where the principle chain of command or principle unity is complex in an organization and the individual is imposed to inconsistent job requirements and expectations.

Larson (2004) defines role conflict as the process of having more than one job demand where an individual faces difficulty in complying one job demand with another. In other
words, fulfilling conflicting job demands at once is nearly impossible, hence facing role conflict.

According to Jones (2007), an employee who has more than one supervisor with different requests will experience role conflict as he will be caught in a crossfire between two supervisors with multiple demands, and the need to satisfy them both. Similarly, when an individual is uncertain in which direction to work and which role partner to satisfy will definitely face role conflict (Onyemah, 2008).

Another perception of role conflict is when an employee is compelled to interact with other individuals who he doesn’t along in an organization in order to fulfill contradicting job requirements from his supervisor (Ivanceivich, 1990, p.227).

Role conflict is stated to occur in a workplace when individuals are asked to work on incompatible job demands and face difficulties in which demand to prioritize first and how to perform them (Tidd & Friedman, 2002).

Lastly, Baron (1986) describes role conflict as a situation where an individual interacts with more than one individual or group, who have different expectations regarding that individual’s behavior in performing his job.
2.5.2. Causes of Role conflict

There is no standard cause of role conflict as the reasons differ between organizations, departments, supervisors, and even the employee himself. However, according to studies by Katz & Kahn, (1978) and Jackson & Schuler (1985), the most common causes of role conflict are poor communication, lack of information, or even excess information which can result in inconsistent knowledge. Also, incompatible expectations and demands of the job role or position is one of the main causes of role conflict (Allen & Mellor, 2002; Burke, 2002). Correspondingly, having more than one role, multiple groups with different values and expectations can arise role conflict in the workplace (Robbins & Coutler, 2003, p. 401). With this in mind, Ryan (1980) stated in his study that the type and size of the organization plays a role in the level of role conflict present within employees.

Tarrant and Sabo (2010) stated three examples of situations where role conflict is created in a workplace. First, they described role conflict as occurring when an employee’s new role demands decision making skills, and participating in a management team while maintaining his individual profile. Second, from an executive’s point of view, conflict ascends when an individual has to develop new abilities in order to work with advanced technology or regulations related to the government. Third, when an executive is required to adopt additional skills in order to apply changes in the company, but unprofessional or minimal training is provided; role conflict will definitely occur in such a situation.
2.5.3. Consequences of Role conflict

The presence of role conflict in organizations has known to have negative consequences associated with it. A study by Rizzo et al., (1970) proved that when an employee has multiple authorities, he will definitely experience role conflict; and such experience will lead to ineffectiveness and inefficiency of the organization as a whole.

Moreover, several researches revealed that role conflict affects employees’ state of mind which in turn leads to lower job satisfaction (Dubinsky and Mattson, 1979), higher turnover intentions for the employee feels uncertain as to how to perform his/her job (Guimaraes and Igbaria, 1997; Lyonski and Johnson, 1983), burnout (Singh et al., 1994), poor performance (Schuler et al., 1977; Jackson & Schuler, 1985; Oneymah, 2008), stress (Kahn et al., 1964; La Porte, 1965; Fenlason & Beehr, 1994; Evans, 1962; Kalliath & Morris, 2002; Kaplan, 1959), depression, less commitment (Kahn et al., 1964), and lower productivity (Williams and Cooper, 1998; Elfering et al., 2005).

In addition, having multiple authorities and having to choose between them affects the employees’ orientation towards his/her job or organization negatively. (Etzioni, 1959; Kaplan, 1959; La Porte, 1965; Reissman, 1949; Evans, 1962).

Lastly, high levels of role conflict make the decision-making process difficult as it influences individuals’ coping behavior. (Seeman, 1953; Rizzo et al., 1970).
2.5.4. Benefits of Role conflict

Despite the negative consequences of role conflict on organizations; a study by Luthanss, 1989, pp.212-3, showed a positive aspect that can lead to organizational development. According to the study, the only positive consequence of role conflict is the case where employees are able to overcome organizational inertia.

2.6. Role Ambiguity

2.6.1. Definition of Role Ambiguity

Role ambiguity is defined as the situation where the employee is uncertain on how he is expected to behave, and what are his exact job key requirements. (Baron, 1986; Slattery et al., 2008).

Another definition of role ambiguity labels the state of an employee who does not have clear expectations of his/her role, nor clear feedback on his job performance (Aziz, 2004). Role ambiguity is also referred to as the situation where an individual lacks information on how he should behave in his work effectively (Jackson & Schuler, 1985).

Onyemah (2008) views role ambiguity as the situation where an individual feels helpless as a result of not having adequate knowledge on how to perform his/her tasks or job. It is also viewed as the state of confusion on how multiple individuals hold different expectations regarding his role behavior.
According to Katz and Kahn (1978), role ambiguity is defined as the “Uncertainty about what the occupant of a particular office is supposed to do” (p.206). Similarly, it was expressed by Rizzo et al. (1970), who also developed a Role ambiguity questionnaire, as when the employee lacks clear direction on what are his job obligations and expectations.

From Guimsraes’ (1997) point of view, role ambiguity is described as the state of confusion experienced by an employee who feels perplexed on what is expected from him to do the job and what he actually thinks he should do to carry on the task required.

Considering Montgomery’s (2012) perception, role ambiguity is perceived as the level of knowledge and understanding an individual has regarding his job’s requirements in order to perform his work responsibilities.

Ahmad et al., (2009) conceptualize role ambiguity as the availability and obtainability of information regarding employees’ jobs roles and job requirements. In this sense, they highlighted the importance of providing clear information on how to perform the job, and what is expected from that particular role. In addition, they also elucidated that individuals should also be aware of the activities required to fulfill their job position and responsibilities.
2.6.2. Causes of Role ambiguity

Studies show that several factors contribute to causing role ambiguity in a workplace (normally, role ambiguity differs between organizations and individuals). One of the main causes of role ambiguity is known to be short on information and lack of communication (Ahmad & Taylor, 2009; Ortqvist & Wincent, 2006).

An alternative interpretation of the cause of role ambiguity in organizations is the lack of well-defined role positions to newcomers. Slattery et al. (2008) stated that newcomers tend to experience role ambiguity more due to miscommunication and misunderstanding their job demands, the rules and norms of the workplace, and procedures associated with them.

Studies mention that role ambiguity is created when individuals receive negative feedback regarding their performance, as misunderstanding or rethinking what is expected from them leads to uncertainty. Thus, individuals might feel that their understanding of their job requirements are not as what they actually believed them to be. (Weick, 1995; Louis, 1980).

In relation to the above, role ambiguity could also be affected by the size and complexity of the organization itself. In this case, Kahn et al. (1964) demonstrates that when an organization is growing, modifications such as using advanced technology, change in social structure and personnel, as well as changes in the workplace environment will take place. Therefore, employees will face role ambiguity as new demands and
requirements will be needed by those individuals required to implement and sustain the changes. Furthermore, the flow of information will also be restricted throughout the organization as a means of change which will increase the level of uncertainty and confusion amongst the employees.

2.6.3. Consequences of Role ambiguity

As any other role stressor, the presence of role ambiguity in an organization has several negative effects. First, it increases the probability of dissatisfaction amongst individuals, as well as anxiety; and it will definitely result in ineffective and lower performance (Jackson & Schuler, 1985; Abramis, 1994; Kahn et al, 1964; Örtqvist & Wincent, 2006; Cohen, 1959; Gilboa et al., 2008; Tubre & Collins, 2000). It also affects the employees’ intention to stay, thus increasing the organization’s turnover rate (Udo et al., 1997; Hinger & cooper, 1986; Jackson & Schuler, 1985). Likewise, role ambiguity is also shown to result in higher job tension, job stress (Jackson & Schuler, 1985; Slatterya et al., 2008), and higher perception of politics in the organization (Leslie & Gelfand, 2012).

Cohen (1959) demonstrated in his study that role ambiguity not only affects employees’ anxiety level, but also results in a decrease in their productivity level. Moreover, according to a study by Hill et al., (2015), an increase in role ambiguity affects the individual’s way of coping with his/her role expectations, and increases the level of
relationship conflict, as well as increases the probability that an individual engages in ego-defensive behaviors.

2.6.4. Benefits of role ambiguity

Ortqvist and Wincent (2006) revealed in their study that role ambiguity does serve as an advantage in organizations as it tends to facilitate employees’ adaptation to changes, making them less resistant to changing circumstances and more likely to enhance administrative flexibility.

2.7. How to reduce role conflict and role ambiguity in organizations.

Role conflict and role ambiguity are somehow interrelated and have similar or shared consequences on organizations. Thus, strategies can be implemented to minimize their negative effects on both individuals and organizations. First, managers can apply changes by providing a supportive atmosphere, improving the design of tasks and providing clear roles. Second, in terms of individuals’ career paths and directions, planning and counseling can be offered as a means of reducing the level of ambiguity and conflict; which will in turn prevent employees from making their own career decisions and strategies (Luthans, 1989, pp.212-3). Thirdly, working on monitoring and handling the improvement of role conflict and role ambiguity will most likely minimize them in the workplace (Hill et al., 2015).
Hamilton (2003) suggested in his research that every job position should have clear job requirements, and well-defined tasks to reduce ambiguity and confusion experienced by individuals. Also, when individuals are aware of their authority relationships, this will contribute to minimizing confusion, and increasing the level of interaction between individuals in the organization (Judeh, 2011).

2.8. Role conflict and role ambiguity in academic sectors.

Previous research studies have always been interested in the management of academic sectors and how do they adapt to organizational, political or any other change. Minimum research has been done on the academic faculty and their perspective of adapting to the changes applied in their organization. For example, academic faculty used to be more independent with less control from their directors in the workplace. But now, due to changes in technology, number of enrollment, diversity, and a more structured working culture, the academic faculty feel less autonomous and restricted (Kolsaker, 2008; McNay, 1995).

In terms of the faculty’s roles, their job in higher education requires multiple roles; for instance, their role includes teaching, preparing the study material, interacting with students and meeting their needs. Such tasks are required to serve the students’ needs. On the contrary, their role also includes research, administrative tasks, attending conferences, and holding activities to serve the community (Blaxter, Hughes, & Tight). Thus, due to the conflicting demands from students, coworkers, and directors creates the potential of experiencing role conflict. It also tends to create role ambiguity when the
faculty member fails to meet one of the incompatible demands (Nir & Zilberstein – Levy, 2006). Not only that, but also changes in the organizational climate and management structure are other causes of role conflict and role ambiguity in academic institutions (Ortqvist & Wincent, 2006).

From the academic sectors and universities’ point of view, both the academic staff and faculty experience role conflict and role ambiguity. The academic staff perceive role conflict and role ambiguity in a similar perception to that of employees working in a non-academic sector as their work is mainly administrative. However, the academic faculty view them from a different perspective. For instance, an academic dean faces role conflict in the sense of satisfying and fulfilling both the provost’s and faculty’s demands. Here, the dean is caught in a crossfire of focusing on the internal duties of the university to meet the provost’s demands and concentrating on the day to day needs of the faculty members. Thus, the dean experiences role conflict by trying to serve conflicting demands (Wolverton et al., 1999).

In terms of the causes or the level of role ambiguity experienced by academic deans and academic chairs, research findings are contradictory. For example, Schuler (1975) discussed that the more tenure and seniority an employee had, the more likely he or she is going to experience role ambiguity. On the other hand, a study by Howard et al. (1978) found that employees tend to face less ambiguity when they are tenured. Thus, it can be illustrated that there is no standard cause of role ambiguity between academic deans and faculty.
2.9. Job Satisfaction

2.9.1. Definition of Job satisfaction

Ivancevish et al., (1997, p.91) describes job satisfaction as the way employees perceive their job and how compatible they are with the organization, which creates the attitude they have about their work. It is also the way an employee feels and reacts towards his/her job. (Fields, 2002).

Job satisfaction is also outlined as the type of emotion an employee has towards his/her job, in other words, it is expressed as the positive or negative feelings an employee has concerning his/her job aspects (Odom et al., 1990; Bhuian and Menguc, 2002; Hunt et al., 1985).

Spector (1985, p. 693), who created a job satisfaction questionnaire, defines job satisfaction as “employee attitudes, including pay, promotion, supervision, fringe benefits, contingent rewards, operating procedures, coworkers, nature of work, and communication”.

From Locke’s (1976) perspective, job satisfaction is the way an employee feels after his/her self-appraisal. It is more about the positive emotions and pleasure experiences after appraising his/her job.
Furthermore, Brief (1998, p.86) expresses job satisfaction as “an internal state that is expressed by affectively and/or cognitively evaluating an experienced job with some degree of favor or disfavor”.

Job satisfaction can also be viewed as a result of the similarity between an individual’s needs and the workplace environment (Lofquist and Dawis, 1969, p.53).

Considering executives’ satisfaction, it can be implied that an executive will most likely be satisfied and performing well if the working conditions created were favorable and good. (Montgomery, 2012).

2.9.2. Facets of job satisfaction

The term job satisfaction as well it’s questionnaire measures several aspects of job satisfaction. The facets include several dimensions and are not limited to one facet only. According to research, job satisfaction includes work related components such as control of work, the content of the job itself, the tasks to be performed by the employee, the direct supervision between the supervisor and the employee, the type of promotions given, financial rewards, working conditions among coworkers, compensation, as well as the satisfaction with the top management (Churchill et al., 1974; Futrell, 1979; Ronan 1970).
Rose (2001) classifies job satisfaction dimensions into two types: intrinsic and extrinsic satisfaction. The intrinsic dimensions is about the qualitative facet of the employees’ job. Here, it is related to the individual’s features which include the supervisor’s relationship with the employee, the individual’s work performance, as well as the employees’ abilities and level of creativity. It also consists of the type of job given to the employee, personal growth, individual’s achievements, pride, meaningfulness, and authority (Weiss et al., 1967; Hodson & Sullivan, 2002). The extrinsic dimension is related to the external factors which depend on the individual’s surrounding and work environment. This source of job satisfaction consists of financial rewards such as individual’s salary, rewards, benefits, praise, promotions, feedback, working conditions, and the policies of the company (Rose, 2001; Weiss et al., 1967; Hodson and Sullivan 2002).

There are also other theories defining job satisfaction. One of the theories is referred to as the discrepancy theory (Locke, 1969) which describes the difference between an individual’s expected payment and the actual payment received by the employee. If the individual received a higher payment, it will be a source of satisfaction whereas if the payment was lower than expected, the individual tends to become dissatisfied (Lawyer, 1973).

Another theory includes the equity theory. An employee compares his/her input/outcome with his/her coworkers. The employee will perceive that equity is present in the workplace if his/her input and outcome was equal to his/her coworkers’ input and outcome. Conversely, the employee will perceive inequity if his/her level of inputs and
outcomes were unequal to his/her coworkers’ level of input and outcomes. The presence of equity is linked to job satisfaction whereas the existence of inequity leads to employees’ dissatisfaction (Mowday, 1992). Souza-Poza and Souza Poza (2000) also proposed a similar approach stating that individuals’ happiness and satisfaction stems from providing them the basic universal requirements needed by a human. This approach states that the individual’s satisfaction is based on the balance between his work-role inputs “pains” and his/her work-role outputs “pleasures”. If the individual’s work-role outputs such as financial rewards, praise or benefits increases based on his/her effort and working hours, the level of the individual’s satisfaction will most likely increase.

Additionally, the motivation-hygiene theory is based on the perception that job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction are not based on one factor or aspect, but have several factors linked to them.

Herzberg, Mausner, and Synderman (1959) categorized the dimensions of job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction into five factors where the causes of job satisfaction are referred to as “motivators” and the term “hygiene” to the causes of job dissatisfaction. The determinants of job satisfaction were categorized into recognition, achievement, the work of the individual itself, advancement in the individual’s job and responsibility. Salary, the individual’s working conditions, supervision, administration and policy were classified as determinants of dissatisfaction.
2.9.3. Benefits of job satisfaction

Job satisfaction is known for its importance and contribution in organizations. Acknowledging and increasing employees’ satisfaction positively influences and enhances their productivity level, organizational commitment (Syptak et al., 1999; Bhuian and Abdul-Muhmin, 1997; Russ and McNeilly, 1995; Yavas and Bodur, 1999; Fletcher and Williams, 1996; Clugston, 2000), life satisfaction (Judge et al., 1994; Iris and Barrett, 1977), job involvement, and creativity (Syptak et al., 1999; Agho et al., 1992; Spector, 1997).

Research shows that satisfied employees tend to perform better than individuals who are dissatisfied with their job (Chambers, 1999; Babin and Boles, 1996; Meyer et al., 1989; Birnbaum and Somers, 1993; Igbaria, 1991). A study by Lincoln and Kalleberg (1990) stated that individuals with a high level of satisfaction tend to be loyal to the organization, which also benefits the organization by giving it a higher identification rate.

2.9.4. Consequences of job satisfaction

Organizations that have employees with low level of satisfaction tend to experience consequences such as high absenteeism and turnover (Porter & Steers, 1973; Beehr &Newman, 1978; Muchinsky, 1977; Locke, 1984), decreased work quality and
productivity (Tack & Patitu, 1992) as well as an increase in employee depression and job burnout (Porter & Steers, 1973; Beehr & Newman, 1978).

A positive outcome of having a high number of satisfied employees is that job satisfaction is proven to be an antecedent to organizational commitment. Thus, having satisfied employees will lead to committed employees (Testa, 2001; Batrol, 1979).

2.9.5. Job satisfaction theories in academic sectors

Herzberg’s (1959) two-factory theory states that satisfaction and dissatisfaction are on separate ranges. He contended in this theory that there is a difference between satisfaction and dissatisfaction. His conclusion was related to the hierarchy of needs theory by Maslow (1981). Herzberg (1959) claims that the intrinsic motivational factors of one’s job, are a source of either satisfaction or no satisfaction; whereas the extrinsic elements of the job, which are known as “hygiene” or “context” factors are related to job dissatisfaction. Thus, if the hygiene factors such as salary and working conditions were absent, it will result in dissatisfaction; and if they were present, it will result in no dissatisfaction.

Herzberg’s theory was adopted by Hill (1986) and applied to measure the faculty’s job satisfaction. He indicated that it’s very successful to assess job satisfaction in academic sectors. He also argued that the intrinsic elements of a faculty’s job such as teaching, research, and the nature of their work are the cause of their satisfaction whereas the
extrinsic elements caused by external factors are the cause of the faculty’s dissatisfaction.

A study by Pearson and Seiler (1983) to measure faculty’s job satisfaction using Herzberg’s dual factor theory resulted in higher level of satisfaction than dissatisfaction among faculty members.

Finkelstein (1984) discovered in his study that faculty members are not attracted to the extrinsic elements of their job, they conform more to the intrinsic factors such as their professional growth to become more satisfied. There are other factors that affect faculty’s intention to leave. Manger and Eikeland (1990) found that the less satisfied the faculty member is with his/her intrinsic job factors, the more likely that individual will leave. He concluded that the extrinsic factors which are related to payment or other economic and external factors did not impact faculty’s intention to leave or stay. They also stated that the organization’s culture and climate play a bigger role in influencing faculty’s job satisfaction and job commitment than the economic resources. Also, Clark (1999) mentioned that in order for a faculty member to be satisfied, he/she should have the skills and motivation to teach.

2.10. Organizational commitment

The term “commitment” is originally expressed as a unidimensional concept linked to either the costs associated with an individual leaving the organization (Becker, 1960), or to an individual’s emotional attachment to his/her organization.
Mowday, Porter, and Steers (1982) define organizational commitment as “the relative strength of an individual’s identification with and involvement in an organization”. It is also viewed as the psychological state that shapes the individual’s relationship with the organization (Meyer & Allen, 1997).

Organizational commitment is described as the increased congruency and integration of the organization and the individual goals (Hall et al., 1970). Another perception of organizational commitment is the individual’s behavior towards his/her organization which leads to a association between the individual’s identity and the organization (Sheldon, 1971).

Salanick (1977) defines organizational commitment as “a state of being in which an individual becomes bound by actions to beliefs that sustains activities and involvement”.

The present study is based on Meyer and Allen’s (1991) three-component model of commitment as their perception of organizational commitment has been developing as the top model and mostly used among researchers (Clugston, 2000). Meyer and Allen’s (1991) three-component model is classified into three components: affective commitment, continuance commitment, and normative organizational commitment.

2.10.1. Affective commitment
Affective commitment is defined as “employee’s emotional attachment to, identification with, an involvement in the organization” It is the level of alignment between the
organization’s goals and values with those of the individual which impacts the employee’s wish to stay in the organization. Individuals relationship with colleagues and the organization as whole, also contributes to affective commitment. They also described strong affective commitment as a situation where the individual wishes to remain and belong to the organization because he/she wants to stay. (Meyer & Allen, 1991).

Affective commitment is explained as the sentimental connection and feeling an individual has towards the organization. The bond is created in the sense of the employee’s involvement with the organization, employees’ identification, and the level of satisfaction an employee has for being a part of the organization (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Mowday et al., 1982; Meyer & Allen, 1997; O’Reilly & Chatman, 1986).

2.10.2. Continuance commitment.

Continuance commitment, which is sometimes referred to as “calculative commitment” (Mattheiu & Zajac, 1990; Hacket et al., 1994) is perceived as the employee’s need to stay in the organization due to the costs linked with leaving it (Meyer & Allen, 1991; McGee & Ford, 1987). The costs associated with their intention to leave may include the loss or sacrifice of the benefits linked to their tenure such as seniority, pension funds, and many other benefits. Also, another reason individuals tend to stay is due to low job alternatives or because the individual himself values job security and comfort (Meyer & Allen, 1991; Meyer et al., 1998). A study also showed that individuals with high level of continuance commitment result in poor organizational citizenship behavior as well as poor
performance (Meyer et al., 1989). Therefore, Individuals with strong continuance commitment tend to stay with the organization because they have to stay (Meyer & Allen, 1991).

2.10.3. Normative commitment.

Normative commitment is the notion of a moral obligation and sense of loyalty, duty, or responsibility felt by the individual to stay in the organization. This type of commitment differs from continuous and affective commitment as it is not related to the individual’s relation or alignment with the organization’s goals or mission. Thus, normative commitment results from the individual him/herself, it can be derived from their personal ethics, work ethics, or culture, which makes them feel they “ought” to remain in the organization (Meyer & Allen, 1997; 1991). Normative commitment is the least used by researchers and lastly presented. There is no standard definition of normative commitment as its meaning changed since it was introduced (Allen, 2003). Originally, it was defined as the incorporation of norms and the level of loyalty towards the organization (Weiner, 1982). Recently, it became about the sense of loyalty and moral obligation to remain in the organization (Meyer et al., 1993; Allen & Meyer, 1996).

2.10.4. Causes of organizational commitment.

Organizational commitment has many antecedents which are classified into three categories based on Steers (1977), and Mowday et al., (1982). The first category is about
the individual’s personal variables which includes factors such as gender, age, education, tenure, achievements, and responsibilities. The second category is characteristics of the individual’s job and role which comprises factors related to the job such as challenges, level of the job position, role ambiguity, role conflict, mobility and number of working hours. The third category is the structural factors which incorporate the level of involvement an employee has with his/her coworkers and formalization. All these factors are antecedents or causes of organizational commitment.

Ferrell et al. (2002) stated in their study that the organization’s reputation, level of fairness, and the level of care and trust given to employees are all factors that enhance and create organizational commitment.

Affective commitment is caused by several factors such as the person’s character and features, the nature of the job, the structure of the organization, and the work experience that generates the person’s requirements (Meyer & Allen, 1991; 1997; Allen & Meyer, 1990; Mowday et al., 1982; Meyer et al., 2002).

According to Weiner (1982), normative commitment is caused by organizational socialization and acculturation. It is also caused by the norms of an individual such as the perception of committing to the organization as a means of paying back the organizational investments in him/her (Meyer & Allen, 1997).
2.10.5. Consequences of organizational commitment.

There are positive consequences of having committed employees in an organization. A study by Yousef (2000) stated that committed employees tend to perform higher, resulting in a higher productivity level for the organization. Committed employees have the sense of belonging, the feeling of security, are more satisfied and motivated, and have the perception of higher compensation and rewards (Meyer et al., 2004; Mowday et al., 1982; Meyer & Allen, 1997; Kristof-Brown et al., 2005; Weiner & Vardi, 1980).

From the organization’s perspective, having committed employees results in lower or limited turnover rate, higher rate of employee tenure, increased job satisfaction, higher performance level, retention, reduced absenteeism, lower tardiness, and lower costs (Morris & Sherman, 1981; Angle & Perry, 1981; Salanick, 1977; Buchanan, 1974; Sheldon, 1971; Steers, 1977). Another advantage is that committed employees tend to make personal sacrifices for the sake of the organization or their job (Jaworski & Kohli, 1993).

According to Matheiu and Zajac (1990), organizations that have committed employees tend to have a sustained competitive advantage due to their employees’ enhanced participation in innovative and creative work.
2.10.6. Commitment in academic sectors

Commitment among faculty members has always been a topic of interest for researchers. Neumann and Finaly-Neumann (1990, p. 77) mentioned that “Universities need dedicated faculty members who not only join their university, but continue to remain actively involved in innovative research activities; prepare new materials and approaches for teaching; build, assess, and reform academic programs; maintain high levels of academic standards; participate in academic decision making; and work closely and actively with their students”. Thus, organizations implement strategies to enhance the commitment of their faculty members to retain them. Studies have proven that factors such as leadership and student behaviors, the support provided by the administration, and policies play a role in increasing or decreasing the level of faculty’s commitment in academic sectors (Louis, 1998; Singh & Billingsley, 1998; Tsui & Cheng, 1999). Also, Hreniniak and Alutto (1972) added in their study that role tension and role ambiguity had a negative effect on faculty’s commitment; whereas gender and years of experience were positively correlated with commitment.

2.11. Relationship between variables

2.11.1. Role Conflict and Affective commitment

Role conflict and affective commitment are proven to have negative relationships. In other words, employees who experience high level of role conflict tend to have less affective commitment towards their organization (Malik & Waheed, 2010; King &

2.11.2. Job satisfaction and Affective commitment

Job satisfaction and affective commitment have a positive relationship which serves as a benefit for organizations. The more satisfied the individual is, the more emotionally committed he/she will be to the organization (Yousef, 2002b; Meyer et al., 2002; Malik & Waheed, 2010).

2.11.3 Job satisfaction and Organizational commitment

Job satisfaction and organizational commitment have a positive relationship; the higher the job satisfaction, the higher level of organizational commitment; studies have proven that job satisfaction is a function of organizational commitment (Anari, 2012; Wang, 2007; Karadal et al., 2008). Also, studies by Yavas and Bodur (1999) and Yousef (2001) have shown a strong relationship between the two variables. However, Hellman and McMillan (1994) and Harrison and Hubbard (1998) studies resulted in a moderate correlation between job satisfaction and organizational commitment. In terms of the significance, Sager (1994), Williams and Hazer (1986), as well as Jamal and Badawi (1995) studies showed a significant effect between the two variables and also proved that job satisfaction is an antecedent of organizational commitment. Lastly, a study by
DeCotiis and Summers (1987) indicated that job satisfaction is predicative of organizational commitment.

2.11.4. Role Ambiguity, Role conflict and Job satisfaction.

Role stressors such as role conflict and role ambiguity affect job satisfaction in a negative way as it decreases the level of job satisfaction experienced by the employees. Many studies have proven that the higher the role conflict and role ambiguity, the lower the job satisfaction due to their negative relationship (Karadal et al., 2008; Oalominoc & Frezatti, 2016; Kemery, 2006; Fisher & Gitelson, 1983; Kahn et al., 1964; Schulz, 2013; Bedeian & Armenakis, 1981; Oliver & Brief, 1977; 1978; Abdalla, 1991; Babakus et al., 1996; Gregson & Wendell, 1994; Sin, 1997; Jamal, 1997; Yousef, 2002; Jackson & Schuler, 1985; Behrman & Perreault, 1984; Schuler et al., 1977). Also, a study by Faucett et al. (2012) that focused on the intrinsic aspects of job satisfaction proved that such aspects have a negative relationship with role conflict and role ambiguity.

2.11.5. Role Conflict and Job satisfaction.

Similar to other role stressors, role conflict has a negative relationship with job satisfaction as employees who experience role conflict tend to be less satisfied due to the misunderstanding of tasks and relationships in the workplace (Fisher & Gitelson, 1983; Babin & Boles, 1998; Coverman, 1989; Eckman, 2004).
2.11.6. Role conflict, Role ambiguity and Organizational commitment.

Organizations with high level of role ambiguity and role conflict get harmed as employees tend to less committed to the organization. Thus, it can be illustrated that role conflict and role ambiguity have a negative relationship with organizational commitment (Oliver & Brief, 1977, 1978; Fisher & Gitelson, 1983; Zahra, 1985; Babakus et al., 1996). A study by Hartenian et al. (1994) showed a negative relationship between role conflict and organizational commitment.

2.11.7. Role ambiguity and Affective commitment.

Individuals who experience role ambiguity tend to be less emotionally attached to the organization. Thus, a negative relationship exists between role ambiguity and affective commitment (Agarwal & Ramaswami, 1993; King & Sethi, 1997; Yousef, 2002).

2.11.8. Affective commitment, Continuance commitment, Normative commitment and Job satisfaction.

In terms of the different types of commitment, researchers showed a positive relationship between affective commitment and job satisfaction as employees who are highly satisfied will be more emotionally attached to the organization (Jenkins & Thomlinson, 1992; Yousef, 2002; Hackett et al., 1994). Normative commitment also has
a positive relationship with job satisfaction as employees feel obliged to commit to the organization if they are satisfied with their job (Yousef, 2002; Hackett et al., 1994). However, continuance commitment has a negative relationship with job satisfaction as individuals who are satisfied might choose not to stay with the organization if they have a better alternative employment options (Jenkins & Thomlinson, 1992; Yousef, 2002; Hackett et al., 1994; Konovsky & Cropanzano, 1991; Withey, 1988).

2.11.9. The mediating effect of role conflict and role ambiguity on faculty’s job satisfaction and commitment.

Until today, there exist few research studies on the effect of role conflict and role ambiguity on job satisfaction and commitment in academic sectors. This research will investigate the relationships between the variables, if any, and address the correlations between them. The findings of this study aims to fill the literature gap by adding value to them.

The researcher hypothesizes the following:

**H1:** There is a direct relationship between job satisfaction and commitment.

**H2:** Role ambiguity mediates the relationship between job satisfaction and commitment.

**H3:** Role conflict mediates the relationship between job satisfaction and commitment.
Figure 1. Schematic model of Role ambiguity mediating the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment.
Figure 2. Schematic model of Role Conflict mediating the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment.
CHAPTER THREE

Methodology

This chapter is designed to introduce the methods used for this research and the empirical techniques applied. The data collection method will be explained as well as the population of the study, instrumentations used, data analysis, and the conceptual framework.

3.1. Construct Operationalization

The nature of this study is quantitative research, where a self-administered questionnaire was employed to measure the relationship between the selected variables for this research. The questionnaire includes four structured scales with demonstrated reliability and validity in previous studies; and four questions to collect demographic data.

The construction and distribution of surveys were chosen as the method of this study as they are known to be the fastest way of collecting data as well as being an inexpensive method. The surveys were developed in both hardcopy and softcopy formats; where the softcopies were constructed using Google forms for data collection and testing.

This study was conducted on the faculty members of a top institution of higher education in Lebanon. The reason for choosing faculty members as the study sample was due to the fact that very limited research exists on studying the effect of role ambiguity and role conflict on faculty members.
The survey was voluntary, where participants had the option to proceed or to quit. The questions were all optional as well. The survey consisted of 45 close-ended questions for the Faculty members; it was divided into six sections: Consent form, demographics, role conflict, role ambiguity, job satisfaction and organizational commitment. The first section was the consent to participate in the survey where participants were given the option to proceed or quit. The following demographics section was required for the participants to fill, where it consisted of general demographic questions regarding their age, educational level, years of experience, and gender. The third and fourth sections investigated the effect of the role stressors: role conflict and role ambiguity on employees’ job outcomes. The fifth section was based on measuring the level of employees’ satisfaction within their job. The sixth section was divided into three parts, which aimed to measure the different levels of the faculties’ commitment. Three types of commitment were measured, which were affective commitment, normative commitment, and continuance commitment. The last page/screen displayed a thank you note for the participants of the study.

Before distributing the surveys, a pilot study was applied to five faculty members and five random participants to ensure that the content was clear, well-constructed and understood. It resulted in being clear and easy to read by the participants.

Section one: Consent

Given the nature of this research, ethical considerations such as ensuring informed consent, optional participation and respecting the participant’s privacy by ensuring their anonymity were taken and placed. Thus, this section included an introduction of the
purpose of the research, and statements to inform the participants that their input was completely confidential and voluntary. Lastly, after reading the statements, they were given the option to participate or quit the survey.

Section two: Demographics

This section required the participants to fill four questions in order to obtain data regarding their age, educational level (whether they were held masters or a PhD degree), years of experience, and gender.

Sections three and four: Role ambiguity and role conflict.

This third section consisted of six questions to measure role ambiguity; it was introduced with “The questions in this section aim to measure the level of role ambiguity in your job position. Please remember that your responses are completely confidential.” The fourth part consisted of eight questions to measure the level of role conflict experienced by the faculty. It was also introduced with “The questions in this section aim to measure the level of role conflict in your job position. Please remember that your responses are completely confidential.”.

The questionnaire is measured at a 5-point scale where participants will respond to situational questions which comes in a form of a scale from 1 to 5 in which “1” means strongly disagree and “5” means strongly agree.
Section five: Job satisfaction

This section was also introduced with “The questions in this section aim to measure your level of job satisfaction. Please remember that your responses are completely confidential.”

The shortlisted questions of (Domino et al., 2015) were used where only 5 questions were selected to measure the level of the participants’ job satisfaction.

Section six: Commitment

Similar to the previous sections, the last section was also introduced with “The questions in the following sections aim to measure your level of commitments towards your job. Please remember that your responses are completely confidential.”

This section was divided into three parts, to assess and analyze the three different levels of an employee’s commitment. The three types of commitment selected for this study were Meyer & Allen’s classification of Affective commitment, normative commitment and continuance commitment.

The first part of this section consisted of eight questions to measure the level of “Affective commitment” of the employee. Correspondingly, the second part also entailed eight questions to study the level of “continuance commitment” of the faculty members. Lastly, eight questions were listed to test the level of normative commitment of the participants.
Section seven: Thank you note.

The final section of the survey contained a thank you note of “Thank you for participating in this survey!” for the participants of the study.

3.2. Scale Development

Role conflict and role ambiguity scale development

The 30-item questionnaire of role conflict and role ambiguity was developed and validated by Rizzo et al. in 1970. 15 items were developed to measure role conflict and 15 to measure role ambiguity on a seven-point scale ranging from 1 (very false) to 7 (very true). After conducting the validity and reliability analysis, items were excluded and ended up with the final scale which consisted of six questions to measure role ambiguity and eight questions to measure role conflict.

In this study, the 14 items were used to measure role conflict and role ambiguity which are rated on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

Examples of items used to measure role conflict are “I have to do things that should be done differently” and “I have to work on unnecessary things”. On the other hand, examples of items used to measure role ambiguity are “I feel certain about how much authority I have” and “I know exactly what is expected of me”. Several studies such as the research conducted by Chen et al. (2017), Schwab et al. (1982), Palomino, M.N., & Frezatti, F. (2016), Judeh, M (2011), Irving, P.G. (2003), and Wu et al. (2006) demonstrated the reliability, validity and consistency of this scale.
Job satisfaction scale development

In this study, the shortlisted version of Spector (1985)’s job satisfaction scale was used, which was shortened by (Madelina Ann Domino, Stephen C. Wingreen and James E. Blanton. 2015). The original scale was developed by Spector (1985) which consisted of 36 items to measure all facets of job satisfaction such as pay, rewards and job satisfaction itself on a six-point scale. In this study, only 4 items were selected which measure only one facet of job satisfaction which is job satisfaction itself, on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The Job satisfaction survey has been widely used and known for its reliability and validity. Researchers such as Anari, N.N (2011), Sukriket, P (2014), and Azeez et al., (2016) demonstrated the reliability and validity of this scale.

Commitment scale development

A 24-item scale developed by Meyer and Allen (1991) was used to measure the organizational commitment. The scale is classified into three categories: a) affective commitment, b) normative commitment, and c) continuance commitment. Each category consists of 8 questions and are measured on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to (strongly agree). Only 7 items were selected from the Normative commitment scale in this study which resulted in a total of a 23-item scale of organizational commitment. Examples of items included “I would be happy to spend the rest of my career with the organization” and “I do not feel my obligation to remain with the organization”. Meyer and Allen (1996) demonstrated the reliability of their scale as well as other researchers such as Clugston, M (2000), Judeh, M (2011), Bergman, M.E.,
3.3. Objectives and Hypotheses

The objectives of this study were to:

1. Analyze the mediating effect of role conflict and role ambiguity on faculty members’ level of job satisfaction and commitment.
2. Test the hypotheses derived from the theoretical framework of this paper.

Hypotheses:

The researcher hypothesizes the following:

**H1:** There is a direct relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment.

**H2:** Role ambiguity mediates the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment.

**H3:** Role conflict mediates the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment.

3.4. Data Collection

The data for this thesis was collected by inviting employees of a prominent university in Lebanon to participate in the study by answering the questionnaire. The intention of this study is to develop a structural equation causal model to better reflect the effect of role conflict and role ambiguity on employees working in private universities in Lebanon. Data was collected during the first three weeks of October of Fall semester.
2019, where hardcopies were distributed to the faculty and collected later using a file to ensure anonymity, and the link of the survey was also emailed three times by the university to the faculty members to invite them to participate in the survey. The email was sent three times for three weeks to serve as a reminder. Only 150 members participated in the study and completed the surveys. Based on employment numbers provided by the institution, this 39.9% of the target population.
CHAPTER FOUR

Analysis

4.1. Survey Administration

The sample of this study includes faculty members of a University in Lebanon. The questionnaire administration took place during the first three weeks of October 2019. The surveys were distributed to 820 faculty members (full time and part time) where only 150 faculty members responded and participated in the survey. However, 133 responses were used in this study as the researcher had to remove 17 responses due to incomplete answers by participants. Thus, 133 responses were used for analysis using the RStudio software (RStudio Team, 2015).

4.2. Demographics

Table 1: Summary of the participants’ demographics (n=133).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variables</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 shows the summary of faculty’s demographics where 6% were aged between 20-29, which was an interesting finding to have 8 young faculty members in the University; the majority of the participants were aged between 30-39, 21.8% aged between 40-49, 24.8% between 50-59 and 18.8% belonged to the 60+ age group. It can be seen that the highest percentages are aged between 30-59 and the lowest percentages are the youngest and the eldest faculty members. It is fascinating to note that more than half of the respondents are young and have a long career path ahead of them which plays a role in influencing their overall commitment.

Of the respondents, 71.4% have more than 10 years of work experience as a faculty member which is also interesting to relate with the findings of the level of role conflict.
and role ambiguity in their jobs. Of the remaining, 19.5% had between 6-10 years of experience and 9% had 1-5 years of experience. The results are logical as the university has a reasonable number of young faculty members working in it.

Table 1 shows that 60.9% of the respondents were female, and 39.1% were male, which shows that this sample included more female respondents than male. However, according to the university’s institutional research department; the percentage of male faculty members of Fall 2019 is 55.6%, which is more than the female faculty members.
4.3. Cronbach alpha

*Table 2: Cronbach alpha*

Cronbach alpha was calculated to measure the reliability and validity of each scale with n=133.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Scale Items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev</th>
<th>Cronbach alpha coefficient</th>
<th>Lowest</th>
<th>Highest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role Ambiguity</td>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Conflict</td>
<td>1-8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Commitment</td>
<td>1-8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuance Commitment</td>
<td>1-8</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative Commitment</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment as a whole</td>
<td>23 Items</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The researcher used R studio software to compute the Cronbach Alpha and analyze the findings.

The first item of the Job satisfaction scale was reverse coded as were the fourth, fifth, sixth, and eighth item of the Affective commitment scale. The first and fourth item of Continuance commitment scale were also reverse coded as well as the first and second items of normative commitment scale. The table above shows the results of the six scales measured. All variables showed high Cronbach Alpha with results above 0.7 except for normative commitment with a result of 0.6. The last two columns of Table 2 indicate the lowest and highest values of the item to scale correlations as a measure of internal consistency.

The researcher removed the first item of the Job satisfaction scale which stated “I sometimes feel my job is meaningless.” as it was inconsistent with the other items of the scale as the academic context is inherently meaningful for most respondents. The researcher felt justified in removing this item as the respondents may not have realized the reversal of the statement’s meaning. Thus, the Job Satisfaction scale included the 3 Items: JS2, JS3 and JS4.
4.4. Principle Component Analysis

*Figure 3: Principal component analysis (Full dataset)*

PCA was used to perform exploratory factor analysis on all the variables excluding the demographic items. This figure shows how the variables differentiate along the first two components of the PCA. From this figure we see that, the Normative commitment items are clustered randomly with a low magnitude in oppose to the other variables. The variables Role Ambiguity and Affective Commitment are clustered together and show a strong relationship whereas the variable Role Conflict is clustered independently. The Continuance Commitment items were clustered with the highest magnitude but with a weak
relationship. The fourth item of Continuance Commitment is randomly clustered with a low magnitude as shown in the figure above. The fifth, sixth and seventh items of the Continuance commitment scale were clustered together with a high magnitude and the first, second, third, and eighth items also illustrated a strong relationship. The researcher decided to drop the variable Normative commitment as the researcher felt that dropping the Normative commitment scale was justified within the academic setting as the statements Company “man” and “woman” used within the normative commitment scale do not have much meaning within academia. The researcher also found that the Commitment scale as a whole should be overlooked when observing faculty; as in this study, there aren’t many options available for the faculty members when it comes to committing to the organization. In other words, the university is a singular organization in Lebanon, with only one or two competitors from the same standing.
The researcher performed a PCA on the variables Affective and Continuance commitment alone after dropping the Normative Commitment variable. The researcher decided to remove the fourth item of the Continuance Commitment scale (Item CC4) on basis of double negative being tricky for participants to apprehend and respond. The researcher divided the Continuance Commitment scale into two scales where the first, second, third and eighth items were classified as the Economic Continuance Commitment as they clustered together as shown above. It is logical as those items were economic driven and refer to
the economic costs contemplated by an individual before leaving the organization.

The fifth, sixth and seventh items of the Continuance Commitment scale were categorized as Alternative Continuance commitment as they were also clustered together as they are related to alternatives and the scale items referred to the individual choosing not to leave the organization due to the limited options available.
4.5. Corrplot

The researcher used Corrplot to check the relationship between all the constructed items.

![Corrplot to test the relationship between items](image)

Figure 5: Corrplot to test the relationship between items

Based on the correlations displayed above, the researcher dropped the fourth item from the role ambiguity scale, first item from the continuance commitment scale, which was classified as the Economic continuance commitment, fourth item from the affective commitment scale and item the first item from the Role conflict scale as the researcher indicated that the first item of Role conflict scale is not relative to faculty context. The researcher chose to drop these items based purely on a mathematical decision.
Table 3: Updated Cronbach Alpha

The researcher recalculated the Cronbach Alphas after dropping the items.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Scale Items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev</th>
<th>Cronbach alpha coefficient</th>
<th>Lowest</th>
<th>Highest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role Ambiguity</td>
<td>1,2,3,5,6</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Conflict</td>
<td>2-8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Commitment</td>
<td>1,2,3,5,6,7,8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuance Commitment (Alternatives)</td>
<td>5,6,7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuance Commitment (Economy)</td>
<td>2,3,8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows the Cronbach Alphas for the updated scales after dropping the items.

Role Ambiguity’s Cronbach Alpha increased from 0.84 to 0.86, Job satisfaction from
0.83 to 0.92, Affective commitment from 0.85 to 0.87 and Continuance commitment got
categorized into two scales where Alternative continuance commitment resulted in a
Cronbach Alpha of 0.78 and Economic continuance commitment in 0.71. Role conflict’s
Cronbach alpha remained 0.86.
4.6. CFA

CFA was performed to test the quality of the presumed model using the Rosseel Y (2012). “lavaan: An R Package for Structural Equation Modeling” to test the CFA model.

![Figure 6: CFA](image)

The model showed the results below.

*Table 4: CFA results*

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>0.954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLI</td>
<td>0.948</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The TLI is very high as shown above which represents a very good fit. The RMSEA scores are a bit high due to the limited number of 133 observations. Thus, the model is indicated to be very good based on TLI and the fact that the study was only applied on a sample of 133.
CHAPTER FIVE

Hypothesis Testing and Results

1- Testing H1

Figure 5. Displays the Model of the direct relationship between job satisfaction and the three types of commitment using ONYX.
Table 5: Path and Z-values of Figure 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Path Value</th>
<th>Z-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1a (JS → AC)</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>5.123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1b (JS → CC Alt)</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>-1.293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1c (JS → CC Eco)</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.486</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Displays the construct correlation and Z values of the variables when there is a direct relationship between Job satisfaction and Organizational commitment (n=133). The result is considered significant when Z Value is at 1.645 level and above. In this case, H1a is supported (Z value 5.123), whereas H1b is supported at the p = 0.10 level (Z = -1. 293) and H1c is not supported (Z = -0.486). Thus, there is a direct positive relationship between Job satisfaction and Affective commitment; a direct negative relationship between job satisfaction and Alternative Continuance Commitment and no relationship between Job satisfaction and Economic Continuance Commitment.
2- Testing H2

Figure 7: Structural equation model of the mediating effect of role ambiguity between job satisfaction and commitment using ONYX.

Table 6: Displays the construct correlation and Z values of the variables in the model (n=133).

The relationship between variables is significant when Z Value is at 1.645 level and above,
with a path value of <0.05.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paths</th>
<th>Path Value</th>
<th>Z Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(JS → RA)</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>3.697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(RA → AC)</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>2.973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(JS → AC)</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>3.924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(RA → CC Alt)</td>
<td>-0.75</td>
<td>-3.538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(JS → CC Alt)</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(RA → CC Eco)</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
<td>-1.731</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The relationship between Job Satisfaction and Affective commitment resulted in a lower positive relationship (0.33 versus 0.52, Z value = 3.921 versus Z value = 5.123) when Role ambiguity was introduced as a mediator by the researcher. This result is significant and indicates that Role Ambiguity partially mediates this relationship as its inclusion in the model lessened the relationship between Job Satisfaction and Affective Commitment.

The direct relationship between Job Satisfaction and Alternative Continuance commitment was not significant when the Researcher introduced Role ambiguity as a mediator as the Z values was below 1.645. Thus, Role Ambiguity serves as a complete mediator in the relationship between Job Satisfaction and CC Alt and fully mediates the
relationship between Job satisfaction and Economic continuance commitment. However, we do note that the path from Job Satisfaction to CC Alt via Role Ambiguity are significant (p < 0.05). Thus, Role ambiguity mediates the relationship between Job satisfaction and continuance commitment.

The researcher tested the mediated model by analyzing the RMSEA, TLI and CFI scores, where it resulted in a good fit model as the TLI score was above 0.8 (0.818), CFI = 0.842, and a RMSEA score of 0.099 respectively.
3- Testing H3

Figure 8. Structural equation model of the mediating effect of role conflict between job satisfaction and commitment using ONYX.
Table 7: Displays the construct correlation and Z values of the variables in the model.

(n=133) The relationship between variables is significant when Z Value is at 1.645 level and above, with a path value of <0.05.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Path Value</th>
<th>Z Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(JS → RC)</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>-2.967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(JS → AC)</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>4.171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(JS → CC Alt)</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(RC → AC)</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
<td>-3.131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(RC → CC Alt)</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>1.306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(RC → CC Eco)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.026</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The relationship between Job Satisfaction and Affective commitment decreased when Role conflict was introduced as a mediator (0.35 versus 0.52) with a (Z-value of 4.228 versus Z-value 5.123). Thus, the result is significant and shows that role conflict partially mediates the relationship between Job Satisfaction and Affective Commitment.

In the case of Alternative Continuance Commitment, we do see that the mediated relationship from Job Satisfaction to Alternative Continuance Commitment via Role Conflict is significant at the p = 0.11 level. Consequently, Role conflict also mediates the relationship between Job satisfaction and Alternative continuance commitment.

Finally, In terms of Economic continuance commitment, it can be seen that the coefficient of the relationship is 0.0 and the Z-score is nearly 0. Thus, role conflict has
no mediative power in the relationship between job satisfaction and economic
continuance commitment.

Moreover, the researcher tested the model fit which yielded a RMSEA= 0.99, TLI=
0.796 and CFI= 0.819 respectively. These results indicate that the model with role
ambiguity as a mediator has a generally better fit than the model with role conflict as a
mediator.
CHAPTER SIX

Discussion, Recommendations and Conclusion

6.1. Discussion

The main objective of this thesis was to determine the relationship between Job satisfaction and Organizational commitment, where Role conflict and Role ambiguity were introduced as mediators. In other words, it aimed to find how role conflict and role ambiguity affected faculty’s level of commitment and satisfaction.

6.1.1 Direct relationship between Job satisfaction and Organizational commitment.

Testing H1: There is a direct relationship between Job satisfaction and Organizational commitment.

The result of this study supported H1a and H1b, concluding that there is a direct positive relationship between Job satisfaction and affective commitment, and a direct negative relationship between job satisfaction and Alternative continuance commitment. However, H1c was not supported as there is no relationship between Job satisfaction and Economic continuance commitment.

A study by Yousef (2002) showed a positive relationship between Job satisfaction and Affective commitment as satisfied employees tend to be more attached to their job and workplace. This study supported the findings of the existing studies because both job satisfaction and affective commitment are variables related to emotions, which complement each other. Thus, ending with a positive relationship.
In terms of the different types of continuance commitment, previous studies showed a negative relationship between Job satisfaction and Continuance commitment as employees tend to stay in the organization due to fewer alternatives available, even though they are satisfied (Yousef, 2002; Withey, 1998; Jenkins & Thomilson, 1992). This study classified continuance commitment into two scales, alternative continuance commitment and Economic continuance commitment, thus, the findings partially support previous studies as only Alternative continuance commitment showed a negative relationship with Job satisfaction.

6.1.2. Mediated relationship, where job satisfaction and organizational commitment are mediated by role ambiguity.

Testing H2: *Role ambiguity mediates the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment.*

The findings of this study supported H2 as role ambiguity mediates the relationship between Job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Previous studies showed a negative relationship between role ambiguity and affective commitment as employees who experience role ambiguity become less attached to the organization and dissatisfied (King & Sethi, 1997; Yousef, 2002). Organizational commitment as a whole is known to have a negative relationship with role ambiguity, as employees are less likely to commit to an organization if they are experiencing role ambiguity (Zahra, 1985; Babakus et al., 1996).
6.1.3. Mediated relationship, where job satisfaction and organizational commitment are mediated by role conflict.

Testing H3: Role conflict mediates the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment.

H3 was also supported in this study as the results showed that Role conflict mediates the relationship between Job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Previous studies have shown a negative relationship between Role conflict and Affective commitment as employees who experience role conflict tend to be less emotionally attached to the organization (King & Sethi, 1997; Malik & Waheed). It is also proven that a negative relationship exists between role conflict and organizational commitment (Hartenian et al., 1994) as well as role conflict and job satisfaction (Fisher & Gitelson, 1983; Babin & Boles, 1998).

The results are logical as Job satisfaction is a function of commitment, thus the higher the level of satisfaction, the higher the level of affective commitment. Continuance commitment also increases with job satisfaction but not in the case where a better option is available for the employee. In terms of role conflict, individuals who feel confused on how to achieve their tasks or who to respond to, will definitely become less satisfied and committed.
6.2. Managerial Implications

The researcher recommends managers and Deans of academic departments to allow employee, and in the case of this study, professors, to participate in management decisions. Such a step would not only decrease the level of role conflict experienced, but will also enhance the level of faculty satisfaction and increase their level of commitment as faculty members will feel more involved in the organization.

Training should also be provided for deans, chairpersons, head of departments, and directors to have a better notion on role conflict and role ambiguity and learn ways to minimize them. It is very critical as not all academic sectors are aware of the fact that even faculty members do experience role conflict or role ambiguity. Thus, training will play a role in minimizing them.

The mission, vision, goals, and objectives of the organization should be clear to minimize role ambiguity. The researcher also recommends to align faculty career goals with that of the organization. This will lessen the level of role conflict experienced and increase their overall commitment.

A supportive and open culture is also encouraged with the aim to increase the socialization between faculty members. Programs and seminars could be provided to increase their level of teamwork and interaction. Accordingly, with open
communication, it is believed that faculty members will become actively involved in the organization and their satisfaction level towards their job will be enhanced.

6.3. Limitations of the study

Like all other studies, this study included some limitations. First, the study was conducted at a particular period of time as it is a thesis project with a deadline, which limited the scope of findings. Second, the sample size was small as the study was applied to one university only; hence, the study cannot be generalized. Third, the study measured only one job satisfaction facet and excluded other facets.

6.4. Future research

As for the recommendations for future studies, the researcher suggests the following: first, researchers should consider studying the impact of demographic variables of the effect of role conflict and ambiguity on faculty job satisfaction and commitment. Second, further research could look into gender analysis or the mediating effect of generational gap on faculty members’ job satisfaction and commitment. Third, research could include other facets of job satisfaction with other variables such as engagement, culture, organizational citizenship behavior and motivation, in relation to other role stressors like role stress, role tension and more. Lastly, the researcher recommends future studies to include more than one university or other organizations for the generalizability of the findings.
6.5. Conclusion

The main objective of this study was to investigate the mediating effect of role conflict and role ambiguity on faculty’s job satisfaction and commitment which resulted in important insights. First, it showed that there is a positive relationship between job satisfaction and affective commitment among faculty members, a negative relationship between alternative continuance commitment and job satisfaction and no relationship between job satisfaction and economic continuance commitment. Second, when role conflict and role ambiguity were introduced as mediating variables, most of the findings were significant. Third, this paper removed the normative commitment scale items as it showed that the normative commitment scale is not applicable when studying faculty members’ level of commitment. The researcher suggests that normative commitment should be overlooked when observing faculty members as the term derived from the normative commitment scale- company “man” and “woman” isn’t applicable to faculty members when measuring their level of commitment. Forth, the continuance commitment scale was divided into two subscales which were referred to as “Economic continuance commitment” and “Alternative continuance commitment” respectively. Thus, this study illustrates that not all types of organizational commitment should be used to measure faculty member’s level of commitment as faculty members’ nature of commitment differs than the commitment of other job positions. The result of a small sample size and applying the study on one university only were the main limitations of this study. Hence, the researcher recommends the implementation of training programs
and an open culture to enhance communication and reduce role conflict and role ambiguity in a workplace. At the end, the researcher suggests examining the mediating effect of generational gap or applying gender analysis as a recommendation for future research.
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Appendix: Survey and IRB Approval

Consent to participate in a Survey

The effect of role conflict and role ambiguity on employees’ job satisfaction and commitment.

I am a MSHRM student at the Lebanese American University, and I would like to invite you to participate in my thesis research. The purpose of this study is to measure the effect of role conflict and role ambiguity on the faculties’ job satisfaction and commitment at LAU. I would highly appreciate your input to my thesis by completing this survey. Kindly note that it will take approximately 20 minutes to complete the survey.

By continuing with the questionnaire, you agree with the following statements:

1. I have been given sufficient information about this research project.

2. I understand that my answers will not be released to anyone and my identity will remain anonymous.

3. I understand that all responses I provide for this study will remain confidential. When the results of the study are reported, I will not be identified by name or any other information that could be used to infer my identity. Only researchers will have access to view any data collected during this research however, data cannot be linked to me.
4. I understand that I may withdraw from this research any time I wish and that I have the right to skip any question I don’t want to answer.

5. I understand that my refusal to participate will not result in any penalty or loss of benefits to which I otherwise am entitled to.

6. I have been informed that the research abides by all commonly acknowledged ethical codes and that the research project has been reviewed and approved by the Institutional Review Board at the Lebanese American University.

7. I understand that if I have any additional questions, I can ask the research team listed below.

8. I have read and understood all statements on this form.

9. I voluntarily agree to take part in this research project by completing the following questionnaire.

If you have any questions, you may contact:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (PI)</th>
<th>Phone number</th>
<th>Email address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assil Homayed</td>
<td>+961 03 964 789</td>
<td><a href="mailto:assil.homayed@lau.edu">assil.homayed@lau.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you have any further questions about your rights as a participant in this study, or you want to talk to someone outside the research, please contact the:

**IRB Office**

Lebanese American University

3rd floor, Dorm A, Byblos Campus

Tel: 00 961 1 786456 ext. 2546
## DEMOGRAPHIC AND PERSONAL DATA

This portion of the survey is concerned with your background and work experience. This information will help identify trends in the data for different group of managers and employees. Please remember that your responses are completely confidential.

Please answer the following questions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age:</th>
<th>20-29</th>
<th>30-39</th>
<th>40-49</th>
<th>50-59</th>
<th>60+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender:</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of industry:</td>
<td>Senior management</td>
<td>Middle management</td>
<td>Operational management</td>
<td>Non-management</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational level:</td>
<td>Senior management</td>
<td>Middle management</td>
<td>Operational management</td>
<td>Non-management</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your educational level:</td>
<td>BS/BA</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company size:</td>
<td>50-99</td>
<td>100-249</td>
<td>250-500</td>
<td>Over 500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of work experience:</td>
<td>1--5</td>
<td>6--10</td>
<td>Over 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# ROLE AMBIGUITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please answer the following questions:</th>
<th>Totally disagree</th>
<th>Totally agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know exactly what is expected of me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel certain about how much authority I have.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear, planned goals exist for my job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know that I have divided my time properly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know what my responsibilities are.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation is clear of what has to be done.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# ROLE CONFLICT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please answer the following questions:</th>
<th>Totally disagree</th>
<th>Totally agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have to do things that should be done differently.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have to work on unnecessary things.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I receive an assignment without the proper manpower to complete it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I receive an assignment without adequate resources and materials to execute it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I work with two or more groups who operate quite differently.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have to buck a rule of policy in order to carry out an assignment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I receive incompatible requests from two or more people.

I do things that are apt to be accepted by one person and not accepted by others.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JOB SATISFACTION</th>
<th>Totally disagree</th>
<th>Totally agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Please answer the following questions:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I sometimes feel my job is meaningless
I like doing the things I do at work
I feel a sense of pride in doing my job
My job is enjoyable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affective commitment</th>
<th>Totally disagree</th>
<th>Totally agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Please answer the following questions:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization.
I enjoy discussing my organization with people outside it.
I really feel as if this organization's problems are my own.
<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I think I could easily become as attached to another organization as I am to this one.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not feel like 'part of the family' at my organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not feel 'emotionally attached' to this organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not feel a strong sense of belonging to my organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Continuance Commitment

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Please answer the following questions:</td>
<td>Totally disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am not afraid of what might happen if I quit my job without having another one lined up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It would be very hard for me to leave my organization right now, even if I wanted to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too much in my life would be disrupted if I decided I wanted to leave my organization now</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It wouldn't be too costly for me to leave my organization now</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right now, staying with my organization is a matter of necessity as much as desire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving this organization

One of the few serious consequences of leaving this organization would be the scarcity of available alternatives

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Normative commitment</th>
<th>Totally disagree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Totally agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Please answer the following questions:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think that people these days move from company to company too often</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not believe that a person must always be loyal to his or her organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jumping from organization to organization does not seem at all unethical to me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One of the major reasons I continue to work for this organization is that I believe that loyalty is important and therefore feel a sense of moral obligation to remain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If I got another offer for a better job elsewhere I
would not feel it was right to leave my
organization

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

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

I do not think that wanting to be a 'company man'
or 'company woman' is sensible anymore
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