

THE INFLUENCE OF JOB SCOPE AND WORK CONTEXT  
SATISFACTION ON RETAIL MANAGERS'  
ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT

By

CHERYL LYNN WILCH JORDAN

Bachelor of Science in Home Economics  
Kansas State University  
Manhattan, Kansas  
1968

Master of Science  
Kansas State University  
Manhattan, Kansas  
1971

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College  
of the Oklahoma State University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the Degree of  
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY  
December, 1987



THE INFLUENCE OF JOB SCOPE AND WORK CONTEXT  
SATISFACTION ON RETAIL MANAGERS'  
ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT

Thesis Approved:

Beverly Lister  
Thesis Adviser

Laura D. Jolly

Elaine Jensen

Charles R. Hee

Norman N. Durham  
Dean of the Graduate College

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wishes to thank her major professor, Dr. Lynn Sisler, for her suggestions, encouragement, and guidance throughout the graduate program and during the process of completing this study. Appreciation is also extended to committee members Dr. Charles R. Greer, Dr. Laura D. Jolly, and Dr. Elaine Jorgenson for their advisement in the development of the study. To former members of the advisory committee, Dr. Beverly Crabtree and Dr. James Gentry, acknowledgment is given for their helpful suggestions and encouragement in the early stages of the dissertation process.

Special appreciation is extended to the executive recruitment and placement managers of the participating retail stores and their management personnel who made completion of this study possible. Their cooperation and willingness to participate was greatly appreciated.

To Helen Berg, Pam Bodenroeder, and Suzy Maresh of the Survey Research Center at Oregon State University, sincere thanks is extended for their technical assistance and advice in the development of the questionnaire and in the statistical analysis of the study data. Special appreciation is also extended to the writer's current and former colleagues in the Department of Apparel, Interiors and Merchandising at Oregon State University for their advice, support, and encouragement throughout the graduate program and to Dr. David Andrews for his interest and advisement in the statistical analysis of the study.

Specific acknowledgment is made for the technical assistance of Mary Lou Wheeler in the preparation of the dissertation manuscript and in the handling of numerous details in the graduate process. The author is particularly grateful for the sincere friendship of her graduate school contemporaries Karen, Joel, Debbie, and Sarah. Their continual encouragement and support were critical in the completion of this endeavor.

I extend heartfelt thanks to my parents, Clarence and Ethelda Wilch, for their understanding and constant support of my decision to pursue the doctoral degree. To my husband, Jim, who gave continuous encouragement, love, financial and emotional support, and tolerated a long-distance marriage, I dedicate this undertaking.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
Purpose of the Study . . . . .	3
Objectives . . . . .	4
Definition of Terms . . . . .	4
Importance of the Study . . . . .	6
Summary . . . . .	9
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE . . . . .	11
Organizational Commitment . . . . .	11
Early Career Influences on Organizational Commitment. . . . .	14
Antecedents of Organizational Commitment . . . . .	19
Job Scope . . . . .	20
Overall Job Satisfaction . . . . .	24
Work Context Satisfaction . . . . .	27
Demographic Characteristics . . . . .	31
III. METHODOLOGY . . . . .	36
Introduction . . . . .	36
Hypotheses . . . . .	37
Research Design . . . . .	37
Sample . . . . .	38
Research Instrument . . . . .	39
Measurement of Job Scope . . . . .	40
Measurement of Overall Job Satisfaction . . . . .	41
Measurement of Work Context Satisfaction . . . . .	42
Measurement of Organizational Commitment . . . . .	43
Measurement of Demographic Characteristics . . . . .	44
Pilot Test of the Questionnaire . . . . .	44
Data Collection . . . . .	47
Characteristics of the Participating Stores . . . . .	48
Implementation of the Data Collection Process. . . . .	49
Data Analysis . . . . .	50
Summary . . . . .	53
IV. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION . . . . .	54
Questionnaire Response Rate . . . . .	54
Analysis Preliminary to Hypothesis Testing . . . . .	55

Chapter	Page
Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents . .	57
Estimates of Scale Reliabilities . . . . .	60
Descriptive Analysis of Variables . . . . .	62
Results of Hypothesis Testing . . . . .	65
Organizational Commitment in Relation to Demographic Variables . . . . .	65
Organizational Commitment in Relation to Job Scope and Overall Job Satisfaction . . . . .	68
Organizational Commitment in Relation to Facets of Work Context Satisfaction . . . . .	73
Analysis Subsequent to Hypothesis Testing . . . . .	76
Summary . . . . .	85
V. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . .	86
Summary of Procedures . . . . .	86
Summary of Findings . . . . .	87
Conclusions . . . . .	92
Recommendations for Future Research . . . . .	93
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	96
APPENDIXES . . . . .	104
APPENDIX A - CORRESPONDENCE FOR THE SURVEY . . . . .	105
APPENDIX B - QUESTIONNAIRE . . . . .	110
APPENDIX C - CORRELATION MATRIX OF STUDY VARIABLES . . . . .	117

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Reliability Estimates of Scales, Based on Pilot Study Data . . . . .	46
II. Questionnaire Response Rate . . . . .	56
III. Demographic Characteristics of Respondents Categorical Data . . . . .	58
IV. Demographic Characteristics of Respondents Continuous data . . . . .	59
V. Reliability Estimates of Scales, Based on Principal Study Data . . . . .	61
VI. Descriptive Statistics of Variables . . . . .	63
VII. Results of One-Way Anova for Organizational Commitment Scores by Categorical Demographic Characteristics . . . . .	66
VIII. Results of One-Way Anova for Organizational Commitment Scores by Educational Level and Academic Major . . . . .	69
IX. Results of Regression Analysis for Job Characteristics on Organizational Commitment . . . . .	71
X. Results of Regression Analysis for Job Scope and Overall Job Satisfaction on Organizational Commitment . . . . .	72
XI. Results of Regression Analysis for Facets of Work Context Satisfaction on Organizational Commitment . . . . .	74
XII. Results of One-Way Anova for Job Characteristics by Gender . . . . .	77
XIII. Results of One-Way Anova for Job Characteristics by Job Type . . . . .	79
XIV. Results of One-Way Anova for Facets of Work Context Satisfaction by Store . . . . .	80

Table	Page
XV. Results of Regression Analyses for Job Characteristics on Overall Job Satisfaction . . . . .	82
XVI. Results of Regression Analyses for Facets of Work Context Satisfaction on Overall Job Satisfaction . . . . .	83



## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

In the highly competitive business of retailing, merchants have not been as concerned with their management of human resources as they have been with their management of the operating, merchandising, and promoting functions. Social, economic, and technological trends have been analyzed primarily for the purpose of projecting new business opportunities (Sheth, 1983). As retailers struggle to develop competitive market strategies, however, they also face new challenges in personnel management (Lusch & Stampf, 1983).

During the past two decades, numerous developments have influenced the personnel management function of American organizations. Strauss (1982) summarized some of these significant developments:

. . . the growing movement for individual job rights and personal privacy; the minority and women's rights movements; the discovery of long-range occupational health hazards and resultant federal regulations; an increasing concern for job security; and above all, the baby-boom generation, large in numbers and generally strong in its insistence on creative jobs and the freedom to determine how and when to work.  
(p. 504)

The collective effect on employee and organization relationships of the environmental changes noted appears to lead in one direction: "significantly reduced or weakened linkages" (Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982, p. 12). Lusch and Stampf (1983) pointed out that "the lifestyle customer that retailers increasingly sought in the 1970s through market segmentation strategy has become the lifestyle employee available for

hire in the 1980s" (p. 124). This new type of employee has been profiled as one who in return for his/her work, seeks psychological incentives in addition to economic rewards (Hall, 1986; Yankelovich, 1981).

Believing that the jobs and career opportunities that they provided employees with were fulfilling; retailers, traditionally, have discounted the existence of a relatively high turnover rate among college recruited managers (Gable & Hollon, 1984; Gable, Hollon, & Dangelo, 1984; Lake, 1982; Lusch & Stampfl, 1983). There is, however, recent evidence of an increased and justified concern on the part of organizations regarding the causes and remedies for reduced organizational commitment and increased voluntary turnover among employees (Gable & Hollon, 1984; Mowday et al., 1982; Powell & Feinberg, 1984).

Lusch and Stampfl (1983) stated that the current environment implies that

Retailers need to engineer jobs to create satisfaction and need fulfillment while at the same time insuring that a link exists between employee satisfaction and corporate sales and/or profit. But the retailer's initial focus must be on employee satisfaction and need fulfillment or the ultimate ROI [return on investment] goal of the retailer will be jeopardized by increasing turnover. (p. 125)

Although numerous researchers have examined the concepts of job scope, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment and have attempted to isolate their antecedents in a variety of organizational settings, little attention has been given to the study of these concepts in retail organizations. Thus, there is little empirical evidence to provide guidance for the design of retail jobs to enhance employee satisfaction and need fulfillment. Those few studies which have been conducted in retail settings have been limited primarily to the

assessment of job attitudes and work outcomes among sales associates (Burstiner, 1975-1976; Donnelly & Etzel, 1977; Dubinsky & Skinner, 1984a, 1984b; Teas, 1981). Results of research, conducted in business settings, have suggested that managerial positions in an organization can be anticipated to produce differing relationships between job factors than those for nonmanagement positions (Lucas, 1985). Hence, it appears that a particularly important group, retail managers, is a needed focus for empirical investigation.

Identification of specific work content and context factors which influence the commitment of managers during their early-employment years, could be of use in the development of training programs, as well as in the design of jobs. Several investigators have postulated that an individual's reaction to his/her job may be affected not only by the characteristics of the job, but also by the nature of the work context or organizational environment surrounding the job (Lawler, 1971; Porter, Lawler, & Hackman, 1975). Research findings suggest that interpersonal relationships, financial rewards, supervisory practices and aspects of the organizational structure can influence career development in significant ways (Brousseau, 1983; Dunham, 1977; Oldham, 1976; Oldham & Hackman, 1980; Oldham, Hackman, & Pearce, 1976).

#### Purpose of the Study

The central purpose of this exploratory study was to clarify the relationship of job scope and work context satisfaction to the concept of organizational commitment. The major research question to be investigated was: How well do job scope and work context satisfaction account for variations in the level of organizational commitment? The

focus of the study was on department store managers who had held a management position in their employing organization for four years or less.

The Hackman and Oldham (1976) model of job characteristics provided the theoretical basis for the study. The model posits that certain job characteristics influence employee motivation, performance, job satisfaction and organizational commitment. These characteristics are combined into a single index, job scope, that indicates the overall potential of a job to influence positive work outcomes. As a framework for job design research, this model has become an accepted conceptual explanation of the effects of job scope on employees' affective and behavioral reactions to their jobs (Farh & Scott, 1983).

### Objectives

The objectives of the study were to:

1. Determine whether the relationships found in previous research among job scope, overall job satisfaction, and organizational commitment exist for retail managers;
2. Determine if there is a relationship between separate facets of work context satisfaction (workload, financial rewards, co-worker relations, supervision, and promotion opportunities) and organizational commitment;
3. Identify demographic factors that are associated with organizational commitment.

### Definition of Terms

The following terms were defined for reference throughout the study:

Job Scope - the level at which five key job characteristics are perceived by the worker to exist in a job; these are: (1) skill variety - the various skills and talents utilized in doing the job; (2) task identity - the degree to which the responsibilities of the job can be identified as contributing to the primary goals of the organization; (3) task significance - the degree to which the work makes a contribution to the well-being of others; (4) autonomy - the degree to which the worker is allowed to determine how the work is to be performed; and (5) feedback - the degree to which explicit information is given about the effectiveness of the worker's performance (Hackman & Oldham, 1976).

Multiunit Department Store - a retail establishment that employs 25 or more people and is engaged in selling general lines of merchandise in each of three categories: (1) furniture, home furnishings, appliances, radio and television sets; (2) general lines of apparel and accessories for men, women, and children; and (3) housewares and household linens (Stone & Samples, 1985). A multiunit firm operates store units in two or more locations and is merchandised and managed from a parent store (Greenwood & Murphy, 1978; Stone & Samples, 1985).

Organizational Commitment - "the relative strength of an individual's identification with and involvement in a particular organization" (Porter, Steers, Mowday, & Boulian, 1974, p. 604).

Overall Job Satisfaction - "an overall measure of the degree to which the employee is satisfied and happy with the job" (Hackman & Oldham, 1975, p. 162).

Work Context Satisfaction - the degree to which an employee is satisfied with aspects of the work environment such as pay, supervision,

co-worker relations, workload, and opportunities for promotion (Katerberg, Hom, & Hulin, 1979; Oldham et al., 1976).

### Importance of the Study

The major objective of the study was to determine the contribution of job scope and selected work context factors to retail managers' organizational commitment. The importance of commitment as a work-related value can be most readily understood from the perspective of the organization. The building of strong relationships between employees and the organization would appear critical. The consequences of diminished commitment, absenteeism and turnover (Koch & Steers, 1978; Porter, Crampon, & Smith, 1976; Steers, 1977), involve substantial costs to the organization. These costs include, but are not limited to, the expenses incurred in recruiting, training, developing and compensating employees.

Gable and Hollon (1984) called for "more empirical research in this important area because the costs associated with turnover are so high" (p. 56) and these costs impact on retail profits. Powell and Feinberg (1984) stated that employee turnover is an enormous problem for which retailers have not found a satisfactory solution. The extent of the problem can be illustrated, somewhat, by a review of reported turnover statistics.

Cohen and Schwartz (1980) reported the aggregate rate of employee separation in the retail sector to be 31.3 percent annually. For general merchandise and apparel and accessory stores the rate of employee separation was reported as 30.3 percent. The magnitude of managerial turnover within the retail industry is indicated, in part, by several

recent studies. Porter, Crampon, and Smith (1976) reported that 24 percent of the management trainees of a multinational department store chain voluntarily left the organization during their initial 15-month period of employment. Data obtained by Gable and Hollon (1984) from an eastern regional department store chain indicated that among college-recruited executive trainees, voluntary turnover was 59 percent during the 5-year period examined. Gable, Hollon, and Dangelo (1984) found within the 2 1/2 year time-frame of their study that 49 percent of the trainees in the management training program of a national retail chain store voluntarily left the organization. From a survey of department stores, Powell and Feinberg (1984) concluded that 30 percent of the voluntary turnover among "effective employees, those who produce successful results, is strategically avoidable" (p. 54).

Schein (1978) suggested that the high rate of turnover among college recruits during the early employment period is indicative of a breakdown in the employee and organization adaptive process, resulting in consequent costs to both parties. Academicians and personnel executives cited the following reasons for retailing's high separation rate among college-recruited personnel: the lack of positive feedback on job performance, disillusionment, and the rapid job rotation which reduces the ability to develop professionalism, self-esteem, or job satisfaction (Lake, 1982). Few of these posited causes of reduced organizational commitment among retail managers have been verified by empirical investigation.

Prior empirical work focusing on managers in retail settings has explored such issues as selection criteria for retail store buyers (Saunders & Deeble, 1965-1966); the relationship between need

satisfaction and buyers' and department managers' job performance (Harvey & Smith, 1972; Siegal & Sevin, 1974); consequences of store managers' role conflict, role clarity, and job tension (Kelly, Gable, & Hise, 1981); prediction of voluntary turnover from personal information given on the employment application (Gable, Hollon, & Dangello, 1984); the prediction of management trainee turnover from the variation in levels of organizational commitment over time (Porter et al., 1976); and relationships among store managers' job satisfaction, job performance, and turnover tendencies (Lucas, 1985). Although these research efforts have made valuable contributions to the present body of knowledge concerning job variables in retail settings, few have identified specific sources of work context satisfaction or job characteristics which may influence work responses of retail managers.

Organizational commitment, a work response which has generated a great deal of scholarly interest, has been found to be significantly and consistently related to turnover (Angle & Perry, 1981; Hom, Katerberg, & Hulin, 1979; Koch & Steers, 1978; Porter et al., 1974; Porter et al., 1976; Steers, 1977). Although the literature indicates that there is little consensus with respect to the definition of the concept of commitment, most scholars agree that commitment involves a form of psychological exchange between people and organizations (Buchanan, 1974; March & Simon, 1958). Individuals enter organizations with a composite of needs, desires, and skills; anticipating that the work environment will provide them the opportunity to use their abilities and satisfy some of their needs (Schein, 1978). When an organization provides employees with challenging and meaningful work, commitment is likely to increase (Steers, 1977). When, however, the



organization is viewed by employees as unreliable or fails to effectively utilize its employees' abilities, commitment levels are posited to diminish.

Bateman and Strasser (1984) stated that if research could reveal antecedents of commitment that the organization can directly influence, several benefits could be derived. First, appropriate interventions could be developed such that some of the costs associated with managerial turnover could possibly be reduced. Second, improvements in commitment levels may have the positive behavioral and attitudinal consequences necessary for the effective development of employees.

Knowledge of specific job characteristics and work context factors which influence commitment could be of use in the development of management training programs that consider the work-related needs of managers. Brousseau (1983) stated that temporal considerations, the scope of the job and the organizational context surrounding the job, play important roles in identifying the types of work experiences required for optimal career development.

### Summary

Turnover among retail managers is relatively high with consequent costs to both employee and retail firm. Previous research has found organizational commitment to be consistently related to turnover. Although numerous investigations have been carried out to identify factors which influence organizational commitment, few of these have been conducted in retail settings. Those studies which focused on retail positions have primarily involved lower-level positions, sales associates. Thus, retail management has been given only limited

direction from empirical research for the structuring of managerial job responsibilities, training programs, and for the development of strategies to recruit and retain effective employees (Lucas, 1985).

The focus of this study was department store managers who had held a management position in their retail organization for four years or less. The Hackman and Oldham (1976) model of job characteristics provided the theoretical framework for the study. Job characteristics, facets of work context satisfaction, and demographic factors were analyzed in relation to organization commitment.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The purpose of the study was to examine job scope and work context satisfaction in relation to the organizational commitment of retail managers. This review provides a summary of the literature related to the independent and dependent variables. Basis for the study and formation of the major hypotheses were established by a review of the following topics: organizational commitment, early career influences on organizational commitment, and antecedents of organizational commitment.

#### Organizational Commitment

Two major theoretical approaches to the study of commitment have evolved from previous research. Commitment has been viewed by organizational behavior scholars as a process by which employees develop an identity with the mission and values of the organization and become attached to the organization (Buchanan, 1974; Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1979; Porter, Crampon, & Smith, 1976). The development of organizational commitment has been operationalized as the employee's desire or intent to maintain membership in the organization. This approach has been labeled by Staw (1980) as attitudinal commitment. Commitment is posited as an attitude of attachment to the organization from which particular work outcomes can be predicted. For example,

committed employees are less likely to voluntarily leave the organization than are less committed employees (Porter et al., 1976). The focus of this body of research has been the behavioral outcomes of commitment attitudes.

A second theoretical approach of organization research that has emerged from the work of several social psychologists (Kanter, 1968; Kiesler, 1971) concentrates on the significance of particular types of behaviors for subsequent attitudes. This concept of behavioral commitment is concerned with the process by which an employee's past behavior binds him to the organization. For example, when members have made personal sacrifices and investments, such as completion of a long training program, to join or remain with an organization they are more likely to develop attitudes that justify maintaining membership in that organization (Kanter, 1968; Salancik, 1977). Salancik (1977) claimed that a self-reinforcing cycle is created in which behavior produces the development of accordant attitudes and these attitudes lead to additional behaviors. Thus, over time, the individual increases both behavioral and attitudinal linkages with the organization.

The organizational behavior theory of commitment has emphasized the influence of attitudes on behavior, whereas the social psychological theory has emphasized the influence of committing behaviors on attitudes. Staw (1980) argued that the question of which approach is superior is not an issue; rather the concept of commitment is clarified by viewing these two approaches as interrelated. In agreement with this position, Mowday, Steers, and Porter (1982, p. 47) stated that it is important to recognize that commitment may be developed through a "subtle interplay of attitudes and behaviors over time."

Recognition of the presence of this attitudinal/behavioral dichotomy in the literature assists in understanding the diversity of definitions given for the term "commitment." From a review of several studies on organizational commitment the following diverse definitions for "commitment" were found.

A partisan, affective attachment to the goals and values of an organization, to one's role in relation to goals and values, and to the organization for its own sake, apart from its purely instrumental worth. (Buchanan, 1974, p. 533)

The nature of the relationship of the member to the system as a whole. . . .[as influenced by] the rewards [a person] has received from the organization and the experiences he has had to undergo to receive them. (Grusky, 1966, p. 489)

The process by which the goals of the organization and those of the individual become increasingly integrated or congruent. (Hall, Schneider, & Nygren, 1970, p. 176)

A structural phenomenon which occurs as a result of individual-organizational side bets or investments over time. (Hrebiniak & Alutto, 1972, p. 556)

Some degree of belongingness, loyalty, or shared characteristics. (Lee, 1971, p. 214)

A state of being in which an individual becomes bound by his actions and through these actions to beliefs that sustain the activities and his own involvement. (Salancik, 1977, p. 62)

The seeming lack of consensus concerning the meaning of commitment can be understood in light of the two theoretical approaches to its study. Each of the preceding definitions can be classified as based on either the attitudinal or behavioral approach.

The operational definition of organizational commitment used for this study follows that of current organizational research (Angle & Perry, 1981; Bateman & Strasser, 1984; Katerburg, Hom, & Hulin, 1979; Marsh & Mannari, 1977; Morris & Steers, 1980). The construct is viewed as multidimensional, involving an employee's identity with the organization's mission and values, willingness to exert effort for the benefit

of the organization, and intent to maintain membership in the organization (Porter et al., 1974).

The development of organizational commitment among persons holding management positions appears crucial to the operation of an organization. Buchanan (1974) described the importance of managerial commitment for an organization:

The commitment of managers is essential for the survival and effectiveness of large work organizations because the fundamental responsibility of management is to maintain the organization in a state of health necessary to carry on its work. Effective management thus presupposes a proprietary concern, a sense or responsibility for and dedication to sustaining the well-being of the organization. (p. 534)

Development of organizational commitment among entry-level managers would seem to be particularly important for an organization. The literature supports the contention that work experiences during the early-employment period have a major influence on the resultant level of employee commitment.

#### Early Career Influences on Organizational Commitment

Research interest in examining organizational commitment during the early-employment period has been generated by several issues. First, a large percentage of voluntary managerial turnover has been found to occur during this early period of employment (Hall, 1976; Schein, 1978). Several investigators have consistently found organizational commitment to be a significant predictor of employee turnover (Bluedorn, 1982; Hom et al., 1979; Koch & Steers, 1978; Marsh & Mannari, 1977; Porter et al., 1976; Waters, Roach, & Waters, 1976). Second, the career development literature indicates that certain developmental tasks and

concerns are unique to employees in a particular stage of their career (Hall, 1976; Hall & Nougaim, 1968; Schein, 1978). Third, it is generally assumed that during the initial years of organizational membership employees form important attitudes which will influence how later organizational experiences will be interpreted (Berlew & Hall, 1966; Bray, Campbell, & Grant, 1974).

Research on the life and career stages through which individuals progress has generated several different models of career stage development (Dalton, Thompson, & Price, 1977; Hall & Nougaim, 1968, Schein, 1978; Super, Crites, Hummel, Moser, Overstreet, & Warnath, 1957). Although these models differ in the number of explicit stages an individual experiences and in the degree to which each stage is age-linked, each of the models designates a particular stage by a unique composite of demands and needs. Brousseau (1983) argued that the differences which exist among career stage models can be resolved by recognizing that each reflects a fundamentally different type of career. The models proposed by Dalton et al. (1977) and Super et al. (1957) tend to describe the stages of a professional or technical career, one marked by life-long involvement with emphasis on progressive refinement of specialized skills and knowledge. Schein's (1978) model appears to integrate, expand, and refine the work of other career theorists (Milkovich & Anderson, 1982).

The Hall and Nougaim (1968) model has been viewed as the one having congruence with the stages of a managerial career (Brousseau, 1983; Gould & Hawkins, 1978). Based on a longitudinal study of management trainees and their careers in the American Telephone and Telegraph Company, Hall and Nougaim (1968) proposed three hierarchical stages

through which individuals pass as they move upward in an organization: (1) establishment, during which an individual seeks security, a means of gaining recognition, defining the structure of his/her position, and integrating him/herself into the organization; (2) advancement, the stage at which achievement and esteem needs become paramount and the individual seeks opportunities for promotion; (3) maintenance, the reaching of a career achievement plateau resulting in a decreased need or opportunity to compete and the seeking of gratification from sources other than career advancement.

The focus of this study was on retail managers whose tenure in their organizations was four years or less, therefore only the establishment and advancement stages will be discussed in the following review. Hall and Nougaim (1968) do not specify the precise career period of each stage in terms of biological age or tenure in an organization. From their discussion it is evident that the establishment stage commences upon an employee's decision to join the organization. During the first year of employment, safety concerns are dominant for all employees. The newcomer is primarily concerned with defining his environment and with feeling secure in it (Hall & Naugaim, 1968).

In Schein's (1978) career stage model, similar to that of Hall and Naugaim, the establishment period is delineated in three substages of development. The first of these is labeled by Schein (1978, p. 82) as "entry" and includes the individual's preparation and training; the recruitment, selection, and hiring decision which occurs prior to joining the organization; and the initial job placement. The primary obstacle to be dealt with during this period is the development of a



realistic view of the occupation especially when the potential employee and employer tend to conspire to hide distasteful realities of the work (Schein, 1978).

The second substage, socialization, is the learning process of how to "make it" in the organization, how to deal with the interpersonal relationships, and how to work. Schein (1978, p. 82) describes this period as a time of "mutual testing by the individual and the organization;" a time when the individual develops a view of the organization and his/her future in it and the organization develops an assessment of the career potential of the employee.

Studies of this socialization period suggest that certain elements of the work environment can influence future success in an organization (Berlew & Hall, 1966, Bray et al., 1974; Feldman, 1976). In a study of relationships among early job challenge, early performance, and later success, Berlew and Hall (1966) found that newcomers were anxious to assert their competence by displaying their abilities to learn and adjust to the demands of the work environment. First-year job challenge was found to correlate with later performance and success. Bray, Campbell, and Grant's (1974) eight-year study of management trainees' career progression, supports these findings. In their analysis of relationships between aspects of the work environment and achievement, they found that early-period job stimulation and challenge and supervision from superiors, to be highly correlated with later career success.

The importance of early job challenge and effective supervision is emphasized by Hall and Nougaim (1968).

This is often a period during which the person feels highly disillusioned and sees little fit between his training and the organization's requirements. Even if the job is, in fact, highly challenging, he may not be aware of the choices he has

in attacking a problem his own way. Faced with little formal structure or with few clear organizational expectations, he may see this lack of structure as a lack of challenge. (p. 27)

Further support of this contention is evidenced by Feldman's (1976) findings. He concluded that when an organization provides challenging work, an effective supervisor, and supportive co-workers, new employees tend to develop positive attitudes toward the organization which in turn influence performance.

Mutual acceptance, Schein's (1978) third and final substage of the establishment period, is marked by the processes of formally and informally offering the newcomer membership through initiation rituals, the awarding of promotion and/or salary increases, and the offering of more challenging job assignments. Schein (1978) stated that:

At the end of this period the new employee is a fully accepted member of the organization, but is still in the early stages of the career and has not yet achieved "tenure" or permanent membership. All that has been established is that there is enough of a match between what the individual needs and expects and what the organization needs and expects to continue the career in that organization. (p. 82)

These early-career situations lead to one of two outcomes. The newcomer is either effectively socialized into the organization or there is recognition that the magnitude of the mismatch with the organization is so great that termination, initiated by either the employee or the organization, is necessary (Wanous, 1977). Organizational commitment has been utilized as a measure of an employee's acceptance of the work environment and the organization. In their study of management trainees over a 15-month period, Porter, Crampon, and Smith (1976) found that voluntary leavers had begun to show a decline in organizational commitment prior to termination.

If the employee/organizational match is mutually acceptable, it is assumed that the employee then moves on to the advancement stage of his/her career. At this intermediate stage one is not so concerned with fitting into the organization as he/she is with accepting higher levels of responsibility, developing competence, and establishing a clear identity in the organization (Hall & Nougaim, 1968; Schein, 1978). The results of Hall and Nougaim's study indicated that regardless of the degree of success a manager experienced in the organization, there was a significant increase in the strength of his achievement and esteem concerns between the first and fifth years of employment.

In summary, there has been little research to verify Hall and Nougaim's model or any of the other career stage models (Milkovich & Anderson, 1982). The number of stages which an individual may experience and the degree to which career stages are age-linked and/or tenure-linked remains questionable. There is reason, however, to believe that there are stages through which individuals pass during their work life and that knowledge of these stages is important to the understanding of employees' behaviors and attitudes (Buchanan, 1974; Milkovich & Anderson, 1982). Previous empirical work on the early employment period consistently supports the postulate that the type of work experiences encountered by the new employee can influence his/her attitudes toward and later success in an organization.

#### Antecedents of Organizational Commitment

Previous research provides a vast collection of findings on both the antecedents and consequences of organizational commitment. The results of this research have, within recent years, begun to converge

with findings from the career development research area (Brousseau, 1983). Mowday et al. (1982) stated that employee commitment is best characterized as a process that occurs over time. To expand and illuminate what is currently known about the commitment process, "it is necessary to focus on factors that may influence the development of commitment at different stages of an employee's career" (Mowday et al., 1982, p. 45).

The purpose of this study was to identify job characteristics and factors of the work context that influence the organizational commitment of retail managers during the early-employment period. The following discussion will focus on previous research findings with respect to the influence of job scope, job satisfaction, work context satisfaction, and demographic characteristics on the development of organization commitment during the early stages of a managerial career.

### Job Scope

A conceptual framework that assists in the integration of previous research findings is Salancik's (1977) postulate that any characteristic of an individual's work situation which reduces his/her felt responsibility will reduce his/her commitment. Thus, the primary antecedents of commitment are found in the characteristics of the job and the work context surrounding the job that increase the employee's felt responsibility (Mowday et al., 1982). Felt responsibility, it is posited, stimulates employees to become more involved in their work. "Greater behavioral involvement should, other factors held constant, lead to greater attitudinal commitment as employees develop attitudes consistent with their behavior" (Mowday et al., 1982, p. 58).

The correlation between job scope, a summary construct of separate job characteristics, and organizational commitment has been the focus of research in a wide variety of organizational settings. Investigations among diverse occupational groups at various career stages have consistently found job scope to be positively related to commitment (Buchanan, 1974; Marsh & Mannari, 1977; Steers, 1977; Stevens, Beyer, & Trice, 1978). An explanation of this finding was offered by Mowday et al. (1982). They postulated that job characteristics such as autonomy, significance, and task identity may enhance the behavioral involvement of employees in their work and subsequently increase employees' felt responsibility.

Hall and Schneider's (1972) findings suggest that in the early employment period, challenging work provides a necessary test of one's abilities and thus, an opportunity to experience psychological success and a sense of competence. In a study of managers in governmental and industrial organizations, Buchanan (1974) found first-year job challenge to be significantly and positively related to commitment.

Hackman and Oldham's (1976) job characteristics model provides a needed conceptual framework for clarifying the components of job scope and how the scope of the job influences the challenge employees experience and their subsequent level of commitment. Based on the earlier work of Hackman and Lawler (1971), this integrated model of affective and behavioral work responses posits that employee performance and commitment are primarily functions of the characteristics of the job. According to the model, five job characteristics or "core job dimensions" are postulated to influence critical work outcomes (Hackman & Oldham, 1976, p. 255). The five job characteristics are: (1) skill variety,

the degree to which the job requires the use of a number of skills and talents; (2) task identity, the degree to which the responsibilities of the job can be identified by the employee as contributing to the primary goals of the organization; (3) task significance, the degree to which the job requires work that makes an important contribution to the lives of others; (4) autonomy, the degree to which the worker is allowed to determine how the work is to be performed, and (5) feedback, the degree to which explicit information is given about the effectiveness of the worker's performance.

These job characteristics are posited to be contributors to three psychological conditions. Work outcomes are affected by job satisfaction and motivation, and these attitudes are determined by the three crucial psychological states. These three psychological conditions are: experienced meaningfulness of the work, experienced responsibility for work outcomes, and knowledge of the results of job performance. Hackman and Oldham (1980) stated that although these psychological states are internal to people and cannot be directly controlled; the changeable properties of the work, its characteristics, that foster these states can be manipulated. Three of the five characteristics are posited to contribute to the experienced meaningfulness of the job, one contributes to experienced responsibility, and another contributes to knowledge of job performance.

According to Hackman and Oldham (1980), jobs that are perceived as having a substantial amount of variety, task identity, and significance provide employees the necessary conditions to feel that their work is meaningful and valuable. In jobs that have a high level of autonomy, individuals feel more personal responsibility and accountability for

their work; jobs that provide a high level of feedback allow the employee to assess his/her effectiveness in performing the job.

Jobs that employees perceive as having a high level of the five characteristics are considered high in job scope. Knowledge and skill of the employee and his/her satisfaction with the work context surrounding the job are considered moderators between the job characteristics and the psychological states; and between these states and the predicted work outcomes. Thus, if the individual possesses the skill and knowledge for optimal performance and is satisfied with the work context (e.g., compensation, job security, co-workers, supervisors) then a high degree of job satisfaction and organizational commitment should result from a job high in scope.

Although the knowledge and skill of the employee and satisfaction with the work context are posited as moderators of the relationship between job scope and work outcomes, there is evidence that temporal aspects may moderate these relationships. Katz (1978) found that workers' reactions to job characteristics vary with job tenure or the length of time the employee has been employed in the same job. For new employees, those whose job tenure was three months or less, only task significance and feedback were found to be positively correlated with overall job satisfaction. Autonomy was negatively correlated with new employees' job satisfaction. However, for employees with one to three years of job tenure, satisfaction was found to correlate positively with all five job characteristics. After three years in the same job, progressively weaker correlations were found between each of the variables examined. These findings imply that failure to control for the influence of job tenure on employee attitudes may result in accurate estimates of employee response to job scope (Brousseau, 1983).

However, from his earlier review of the literature on individual moderators of job scope and work response relationships, White (1978) stated that the moderating influences which were found were modest and inconsistent. Many studies reported that no moderating effects were evidenced. Based on the amount of empirical research on the topic and the soundness of many of these investigations, White (1978) concluded that "at best, moderators can be expected to hold up only for narrowly defined constructs and specific samples and situations" (p. 278).

Katerberg, Hom, and Hulin (1979) examined the moderating effects of facets of the work context satisfaction on the job scope and commitment relationship. They reported evidence suggesting that these variables function better as predictors than they do as moderators. Thus, the generalizability of individual moderators may be inhibited by the nature of the sample, whereas work context variables are better predictors than moderators of work responses.

In summary, job scope (a global measure of the degree to which specific characteristics exist in a job) and organizational commitment have consistently been found to be positively related in research studies conducted in a wide variety of organizational settings. Hackman and Oldham's (1976) model of job characteristics provides a theoretical framework for explaining relationships between job characteristics and work outcomes. Research utilizing the model has provided evidence that employee responses to job scope may change over time.

#### ✓ Overall Job Satisfaction

Attitudinal investigations of turnover, historically, have focused on the construct of job satisfaction as a predictor of organizational



tenure. A consistent, although moderate, relationship has usually been found across various occupational groups between a high degree of job satisfaction and propensity to remain in the organization (Herzberg, Mausner, Peterson, & Capwell, 1957; Muchinsky & Tuttle, 1979; Porter & Steers, 1973). More recent studies however, have found organizational commitment to be significantly and inversely related to turnover; suggesting that commitment is a better predictor of turnover than is satisfaction (Angle & Perry, 1981; Farrell & Rusbult, 1981; Hom et al., 1979; Koch & Steers, 1978; Porter et al., 1974; Porter et al., 1976). Porter et al. (1974) argued that job satisfaction is a transitory and less stable construct over time than is commitment. This argument is based on the supposition that the development of commitment is a process which occurs over time which is not the case for job satisfaction. Porter et al. (1974) stated that the degree of an employee's job satisfaction appears to be related to tangible aspects of the work environment; an affective work response which may be more rapidly formed than is commitment. They found commitment and satisfaction to be related yet distinguishable variables with the highest correlations occurring between commitment and satisfaction with the work itself.

On that premise, job satisfaction has been considered by subsequent investigators to be an attitudinal cause of commitment (Bluedorn, 1982; Marsh & Mannari, 1977; Price & Mueller, 1981). There is, however, evidence that job satisfaction may be a result, rather than a cause, of organizational commitment (Bateman & Strasser, 1984). From a longitudinal study of 129 nurses, Bateman and Strasser (1984) found organizational commitment to be a determinant of job satisfaction rather than an outcome of it. They concluded that employees may possibly become

committed to their organization prior to the development of satisfaction attitudes. This conclusion is supported by Staw's (1980) review of previous research which suggests that an individual may develop attitudes that are compatible with his/her existing level of organizational commitment. These findings sustain the supposition made by Porter et al. (1974) regarding the stability of the commitment over time. Thus, whether job satisfaction is a result of commitment rather than a determinant remains unclear. The weight of evidence provided by prior empirical research would clearly indicate that job satisfaction is an antecedent of commitment; however, Bateman and Strasser's (1984) finding raises additional questions.

Most correlates of commitment have also been studied as determinants of job satisfaction. It has been consistently found that a positive relationship exists between job scope and job satisfaction (Aldag & Brief, 1975; Hackman & Oldham, 1976; Sims & Szilagyi, 1976; Stone, Mowday, & Porter, 1977). Few investigators, however, who have examined the relationship between job scope and organizational commitment (Buchanan, 1974; Steers, 1977) have also addressed the potential intervening factor of job satisfaction. There is evidence that job scope is indirectly related to commitment. Hall and Schneider (1972) found that for the two occupational groups studied--priests and scientists--the relationship between job challenge and organizational commitment was mediated by job satisfaction. In their study of retail sales managers' commitment, Oliver and Brief (1977-78) found that the criterion variable was significantly related only to job satisfaction. They concluded that satisfaction had mediated the relationship between each of the role dimensions examined in the study and organizational commitment.

In summary, job satisfaction has been studied as a determinant and as an outcome of commitment. Many of the same variables which have been found associated with overall job satisfaction have also been related to organizational commitment. Research findings have established that overall job satisfaction and organizational commitment are distinct empirical concepts. The weight of evidence provided by previous research findings supports the premise that overall satisfaction is antecedent to commitment. There is, however, some evidence that the relationship between job scope and organizational commitment may be moderated by overall job satisfaction.

#### Work Context Satisfaction

In examining the relationship between commitment and job satisfaction, most investigators have used a global measure of satisfaction. Neither the sources of satisfaction with the work context nor the contributions of specific sources of satisfaction to the variability of organizational commitment have been delineated.

Several management scientists have pointed out that work outcomes may be affected not only by the characteristics of the job, but also by the nature of the work context or organizational environment surrounding the job (Lawler, 1971; Porter et al., 1975). Research findings suggest that factors such as supervisory practices, co-worker relationships, financial rewards, opportunities for advancement, and workload can influence work responses in important ways (Brousseau, 1983; Buchanan, 1974; Dunham, 1977; Katerberg, Hom, & Hulin, 1979; Oldham, 1976; Oldham et al., 1976).

For example, Oldham et al. (1976) found that individuals who were satisfied with contextual factors tended to respond more favorably to jobs high in scope than did those who were less satisfied with these factors. Additional findings indicated that in some cases dissatisfied employees responded negatively to jobs that had been increased in scope. The investigators concluded that efforts to redesign jobs to be high in scope may cause negative work outcomes, if dissatisfaction with the work setting exists.

Supervision. Satisfaction with the work environment would also appear influential in the development of organizational commitment. Salancik (1977) posited that high levels of employee commitment should be related to supervision. In conducting a thorough but not exhaustive literature search, no studies were found that examine this facet of satisfaction in relation to commitment. If supervision involves clarifying job responsibilities and performance expectations, increasing employees' felt responsibility, commitment, Salancik hypothesized, should increase. Supervisory practices have been found by Hall (1976) to be important influences on the effective organizational socialization of employees in the establishment stage of their careers.

Co-worker Relations. Findings of previous empirical studies have indicated a positive association between organizational commitment and favorable work-group attitudes toward the organization (Buchanan, 1974; Sheldon, 1971). Few studies however, have examined employees' satisfaction with their immediate work group in relation to commitment. Katerberg, Hom, and Hulin (1979) examined the moderating effect of co-worker satisfaction and other work context factors on the relationship

between job scope and job responses including commitment. They concluded that work context factors function better as predictors than as moderators of employee work responses. A review of literature by Muchinsky and Tuttle (1979) presented substantial empirical support for negative relationships between facets of work context satisfaction and turnover. For example, Evan (1963) found that satisfaction with peer-group interactions correlated negatively with turnover for a group of management trainees in an engineering firm.

Financial Rewards. Because financial rewards provide an important incentive for employees to maintain membership in an organization (Mowday et al., 1982), satisfaction with pay is posited to be positively related to commitment. Little empirical support has been found for this postulate in studies of employees with an average organizational tenure of five years or more (Steers, 1977; Morris & Steers, 1980). Gould and Hawkins (1978), however, found satisfaction with pay to be significant for employees whose tenure in the organization was two years or less. Extrinsic satisfaction has been consistently found to influence employees' decisions to remain with their present employers (Muchinsky & Tuttle, 1979). There is substantial empirical evidence that pay satisfaction and turnover are negatively related (Porter & Steers, 1973).

Opportunities for Promotion. Opportunities for promotion have also been found to be negatively correlated with turnover (Porter & Steers, 1973). The opportunity for advancement, which Hall (1976) posited as salient during the early-career years, has not been examined in relation to commitment. Knowledge of and satisfaction with one's opportunities for advancement or promotion would appear to provide an incentive for

employees to invest more of themselves in their work roles, thus increasing their level of involvement in the organization.

Explanation of why satisfaction with pay and promotional opportunities have been found as consistent correlates of turnover and their potential importance in predicting organizational commitment may be found in exchange theory (March & Simon, 1958; Vroom, 1964). The theory predicts that an individual may use perceived benefits and costs to evaluate multiple influences that form his/her attitudes and job responses. The central concept of the theory is that individuals evaluate their situation and make decisions concerning their behavior based on what they think is a fair exchange of output for expected rewards. The employee will maintain his investment of time and effort in the organization as long as he/she perceives a fair return on that investment is probable. One's degree of organizational commitment, especially his/her degree of organizational involvement, would appear to be influenced by the extent to which he/she perceives that the organization's compensation and promotion policies are equitable in relation to one's performance and workload.

Workload. Few investigators have studied the possible influence of workload on organizational commitment. In their study of managers in federal government organizations, Stevens, Beyer, and Trice (1978) found work overload to be an important and negative predictor of organizational commitment. Although the authors did not describe how work overload was measured, their results indicated that among the role-related variables studied, work overload accounted for the largest portion of commitment variance.

Based on the tenets of exchange theory and the findings of Stevens et al. (1978), satisfaction with workload appeared to merit further investigation. In addition, frequently stated disadvantages of a managerial career in retailing include long work hours and heavy workload (Beisel, 1987; Lewison & DeLozier, 1986); however, previous research conducted in retail settings has failed to examine this facet of work context satisfaction.

In summary, few facets of work context satisfaction have been empirically examined in relation to organizational commitment. Theory posits that satisfaction with supervision, co-workers, financial rewards, advancement opportunities, and workload should positively affect commitment, especially during the early-employment period. Work context satisfaction has been hypothesized as moderating the relationship between job scope and organizational commitment (Hackman & Oldham, 1976). However, subsequent research has reported evidence that work context variables are stronger predictors than they are moderators of work responses such as commitment (Katerberg et al., 1978).

#### Demographic Characteristics

In an effort to predict employee's satisfaction and probability of long-term organizational membership, numerous studies have been made of the relationships between demographic or personal characteristics and these work outcomes. Demographic characteristics studied in relation to organizational commitment have included age, tenure in the organization, educational level, and gender.

In general, both age and tenure have been found to be positively correlated with commitment (Angle & Perry, 1981; Bateman & Strasser,

1984; Hall & Schneider, 1972; Lee, 1971; Sheldon, 1971; Steers, 1977). The most frequent explanation given for these relationships is that increasing age and organizational tenure tend to limit the employee's opportunities for alternative employment and therefore may increase his/her commitment to the present employer (Angle & Perry, 1981). An explanation for positive relationships found between commitment and tenure among employees in their early career years may be that those who have remained in the organization have found an agreeable work situation (Buchanan, 1974). Those new employees continuing their organizational membership may be given progressively more challenging job responsibilities, thus increasing their organizational commitment (Schein, 1978).

The organizational tenure of new employees may be influenced by previous work experience. Gable, Hollon, and Dangelo (1984) found that retail management trainees having more retail work experience prior to their entry into the organization were more likely to remain in the organization. Previous work experience in the occupational area prior to taking the first major job in the career field may be considered one type of realistic job preview. For example, previous retail work experience may assist in reducing what Hall (1976, p. 66) described as the "reality shock" that is often experienced during the early career period. Realistic job previews, in which potential employees are exposed to both the positive and negative aspects of the career field, have consistently been found to reduce employee turnover (Wanous, 1977). However, the influence of previous, related work experience on the development of organizational commitment among newcomers to the organization has not been examined.



In comparison to age and organizational tenure, educational level has frequently been found to be negatively related to both commitment and job satisfaction (Angle & Perry, 1981; Herzberg et al., 1957; Kelly et al., 1981; Morris & Steers, 1980; Steers, 1977); however, the findings have not been completely consistent (Lee, 1971; Lucas, 1985; Steers & Spencer, 1977). Several explanations for these findings have been posited. One supposition commonly given is that more highly educated individuals tend to have higher expectations in regard to the job and/or the organization (Mowday et al., 1982; Steers, 1977). Another frequent explanation is that more highly educated employees have greater employment opportunities than do less educated workers; therefore, they are less committed to the organization (Angle & Perry, 1981). Finally, some contend that more educated employees tend to be less committed to the organization because their primary commitment is to their profession or technical specialty (Mowday et al., 1982; Steers, 1977).

Lucas (1985) offered an alternative explanation for his findings. In a study of retail store managers, Lucas (1985) did not find a significant relationship between educational level and either intrinsic or extrinsic job satisfaction. He concluded that the absence of a significant relationship among these variables may be a "consequence of store managers receiving their formal education in other areas, while their retailing skills are developed" on the job (p. 55). Lucas stated that there is a need for future research to examine the relationships between the retail manager's major area of study and other job factors.

In an effort to clarify the general nature of the relationship between educational level and commitment, Mottaz (1986) examined the association between these variables across diverse occupational groups.

His findings indicated that education has an indirect positive relationship with organizational commitment by increasing work rewards, although when work rewards are held constant the effect is direct and negative. Mottaz (1986) delineated work rewards as three categories of variables; intrinsic rewards were defined as autonomy, task significance, and task involvement which provide meaning and self-fulfillment from the job; the second category, extrinsic social rewards, consisted of satisfaction with co-worker and supervisory relationships; and the third group, organizational rewards, included working conditions, pay equity, promotional opportunity, adequacy of fringe benefits, and income level. From his findings Mottaz (1986) concluded

. . . that education tends to significantly increase the importance assigned to intrinsic rewards and generally decrease the value attached to extrinsic rewards. Thus, if the organization is perceived as providing opportunities for intrinsic rewards, commitment tends to increase among better educated workers. (p. 225)

The results of this study assist in explaining the inconsistencies found in previous research. Mottaz (1986) clearly stated that the possible moderating effects of sex, tenure, marital status, job level, and type of occupation were held constant during the data analysis; however, mention is neither made as to the possible influence of age nor was the age range of the sample given.

Although much of what is known about organizational behavior has been based on the results of studies using samples predominantly male in gender or from studies in which respondent's gender was not reported, a few studies have examined the influence of gender on work outcomes. Among those investigating gender in relation to organizational commitment the findings have been fairly consistent. Women as a group were found to be more committed than men (Angle & Perry, 1981; Grusky, 1966;

Hrebiniak & Alutto, 1972). The standard justification given for such findings is that women usually have to surmount more obstacles to obtain their positions in a given organization; thus organizational membership is more valued than it is for men (Angle & Perry, 1981; Grusky, 1966).

Other nonwork factors such as marital status, employment status of partner or spouse, and number of children living in the household have not been examined in relation to commitment. There is some indication in the literature that commitment in one area of a person's life may hinder their commitment to other areas (Mowday et al., 1982). For example, the employee who is strongly committed to his/her family may be less prone to develop a high level of commitment to the organization.

In summary, few demographic or personal characteristics have been identified as determinants of organizational commitment. Variables which have been found to correlate with commitment include age, organizational tenure, education, and gender. However, the magnitude of some of these relationships has varied across studies possibly due to differences in the career stages examined and general nature of the sample.

## CHAPTER III

### METHODOLOGY

The methodology by which the study was conducted is explained in this chapter. First, the hypotheses, derived from theory and previous research, are listed. Second, the research design and the study sample are discussed. The research instrument, including the scales used to measure each of the variables are described. Results of the pilot test used in the refinement of the questionnaire are also presented in this section. The closing sections of the chapter describe the data collection and statistical analysis procedures.

#### Introduction

The research question investigated was: how well do job scope and work context satisfaction account for variations in the level of organizational commitment? The focus of the study was on department store managers who had held a management position in their employing organization for four years or less. The theoretical framework used as a basis for the study was Hackman and Oldham's (1976) job characteristics model. Job scope, a summary construct of five job characteristics, is posited to influence overall job satisfaction. Overall job satisfaction is hypothesized to influence organizational commitment. Satisfaction with the work context (supervision, co-worker relations, financial rewards, opportunities for promotion, and workload) is posited to

moderate the job scope, job satisfaction, and commitment relationships. However, these facets of work context satisfaction were analyzed as predictors of commitment as suggested by the work of Katerburg et al. (1979).

### Hypotheses

The following null hypotheses guided the research and were developed as a result of the review of literature cited previously:

H<sub>0</sub>1: There is no relationship between the criterion variable organizational commitment and the independent variables; gender, age, organizational tenure, and amount of previous retail experience.

H<sub>0</sub>2: There is no relationship between the criterion variable organizational commitment and the independent variables, educational level and academic major.

H<sub>0</sub>3: There is no relationship between the criterion variable organizational commitment and the independent variables, job scope and overall job satisfaction.

H<sub>0</sub>4: There is no relationship between the criterion variable organizational commitment and the independent variables (facets of work context satisfaction), supervision, co-worker relations, financial rewards, opportunities for promotion, and workload.

### Research Design

The empirical investigation was based on a field study of retail managers from two multiunit department stores. Kerlinger (1973) defined a field study as an ex post facto scientific inquiry with the purpose of studying "relations and interactions among sociological and

psychological variables in real social structures" (p. 405). The nature of the study was ex post facto research in which no independent variables were manipulated. The research methodology involved a mailed questionnaire survey. To test the research hypotheses, the following data were collected: 1) demographic characteristics of retail managers, 2) manager's perceptions of the scope of their present job, 3) overall satisfaction with their present job, 4) satisfaction ratings for facets of the work context surrounding the job, and 5) organizational commitment ratings.

### Sample

A nonprobability, purposive sample of retail managers from two multiunit regional department stores located on the west coast of the United States was used for the study. The study sample included only those managers who were in the process of or had completed, within the last four years, the organization's management training program. The executive recruitment and training manager of each participating store provided the researcher with a current and complete listing of the management personnel within their organization who met the study criteria. A potential sample of 214 managers was obtained.

In general, multiunit department store jobs would be expected to differ from those in national department store chains, discount, specialty, or other types of retail firms. Most department stores provide a combination of classroom and sequential on-the-job training for management candidates (Arnold, Capella, & Smith, 1983). Department store positions commonly assigned to executive candidates are jobs such as department or area sales manager, divisional or branch store sales

manager, customer service manager, assistant buyer, associate buyer, department buyer, personnel training coordinator, and operations coordinator. These jobs have been described by Packard (1983) as entry-level management positions typical of department store retailing.

The research of Van Maanen and Katz (1976) indicated that organizational tenure of two years was a juncture at which changes occurred in career-related attitudes. However, Katz (1978) found evidence that work responses were influenced by job longevity; the length of time one has worked in his/her present job. Buchanan's (1974) research supported predictions made by career-stage theorists that the first four years of a managerial career are critical in the development of organizational commitment attitudes.

Although the assignment of a specific career-stage cutoff-point by organizational tenure or job longevity is arbitrary, an attempt was made to delineate this point through a review of the research on career stages. Hence, the sample included only those managers who had been selected by their organization as management candidates and had held a management position in the organization for four years or less. The sample restrictions regarding career stage, managerial position, and type of retail operation appeared necessary in order to control for these extraneous variables.

### Research Instrument

Data were collected by means of a mailed questionnaire survey. The questionnaire (Appendix B) included a combination of scales previously developed and used in a variety of organizational settings. The measures of job scope, overall job satisfaction, work context

satisfaction, organizational commitment, and demographic characteristics are described in this section.

### Measurement of Job Scope

Job characteristics (task variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy, feedback from the job itself, and feedback from superiors) were measured by six three-item scales of the Job Diagnostic Survey (JDS) developed by Hackman and Oldham (1975). The three items of the task identity sub-scale were modified to reflect managerial responsibilities of the potential respondents (Appendix B, items 1b., 2b., and 2i.). Items for each scale of the JDS are divided between two sections of the questionnaire. In the first section (Appendix B, question 1, items a. through f.), respondents indicated on a 7-point continuum the extent to which each job characteristic was present in their job as they perceived it. In the next section (question 2, items a. through l.), responses were elicited in terms of accuracy of given statements about properties of the job. One item in each of the sub-scales is reverse-scored. A mean score was calculated, as suggested by Hackman and Oldham (1975), across the three items in each sub-scale, with a possible range of 1 to 7, the latter signifying the substantial presence of the job characteristic.

Internal reliability coefficients using Spearman-Brown procedures were reported by Hackman and Oldham (1975) from a sample of 658 workers. For each of the six scales the coefficients reported were: skill variety, 0.71; task identity, 0.59; task significance, 0.66; autonomy, 0.66; feedback from the job, 0.71; and feedback from superiors, 0.78. Durham (1976) reported alpha coefficients for a sample of 784 retail



employees and managers of 0.76, 0.72, 0.72, 0.73, 0.75 for the first five job characteristics listed in the above sequence. Similar alpha coefficients (0.68, 0.70, 0.68, 0.69 and 0.69) were obtained from 5,945 employees in a study conducted by Dunham, Aldag, and Brief (1977).

The measure of overall job challenge or job scope was calculated taking the mean of an unweighted sum of five scales (autonomy, skill variety, task significance, task identity, and job feedback) as suggested by Dunham (1976), Hackman and Oldham (1980), Katerberg, Hom, and Hulin (1979), and Pierce, Dunham, and Blackburn (1979). From an extensive review of the research utilizing the JDS job characteristics scales, Cook, Hepworth, Wall, and Warr (1981, p. 182) concluded that the "joint use of separate sub-scale scores together with an unweighted MPS [job scope] score might prove advisable" due to the lack of evidence that distinct and separate characteristics exist.

#### Measurement of Overall Job Satisfaction

General job satisfaction "an overall measure of the degree to which the employee is satisfied and happy with the job" was measured using five items from the Job Diagnostic Survey (Hackman & Oldham, 1975, p. 162). The items feature 7-point responses, ranging from 1 strongly disagree to 7 strongly agree in each case (Appendix B, question 4, items a. through e.). In a study of 658 employees across a variety of jobs in seven organizations, Hackman and Oldham (1976) reported a mean score of 4.62 and a Spearman-Brown internal reliability coefficient of 0.76. From normative data obtained from 6,930 employees Hackman, Oldham and Stepina (cited in Hackman & Oldham, 1980) reported a mean score of 4.90 and a standard deviation of 1.0 for managerial employees. Wall, Clegg,

and Jackson (1978), in a replication of Hackman and Oldham's 1975 study, reported a mean Overall Job Satisfaction score of 4.23 and a coefficient alpha of 0.74 for a group of blue-collar workers.

#### Measurement of Work Context Satisfaction

Based on a review of the literature five facets of the work context were selected for examination: satisfaction with supervision, co-worker relations, financial rewards, opportunities for promotion, and workload. Each facet was measured by three items from the Index of Organizational Reactions (IOR) developed by Smith (cited in Dunham, Smith, & Blackburn, 1977). Each item has its own 5-point response continuum, scored from 1 to 5, with a score of 5 indicating the highest degree of satisfaction (Appendix B, questions 5 through 19). A mean score is calculated for each of the five sub-scales.

Dunham et al. (1977) reported the following Kuder-Richardson internal reliability estimates for each of the sub-scales: supervision, 0.90; co-worker relations, 0.77; financial rewards, 0.85; opportunities for promotion, 0.83; and workload, 0.77. These data represented median internal reliability estimates across five samples containing a total of 12,971 respondents. In an examination of the discriminant validity of the Index of Organizational Reactions compared with that of the Job Descriptive Index and the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire, Dunham et al. (1977) concluded that the IOR was superior in that aspect.

Additional reliability estimates have been reported by Dunham (1977). From a sample of 784 retail executives of a multinational department store chain, alpha coefficients were cited as: supervision, 0.88; financial rewards, 0.77; opportunities for promotion, 0.78; and

workload, 0.72. Using two items of the IOR to measure each of three work context facets, Katerburg et al. (1979) reported alpha coefficients of 0.73 for supervision, 0.71 for co-worker relations, and 0.82 for financial rewards from a sample of 395 National Guardsmen.

A measure of overall work context satisfaction was formed by taking the mean of an unweighted sum of each of the facet sub-scales. This procedure was similar to the formulation of the job scope measure of overall job challenge.

#### Measurement of Organizational Commitment

Retail managers' organizational commitment was measured by the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) developed by Porter and Smith (cited in Porter, Steers, Mowday, & Boulin, 1974). The OCQ consists of 15 items, six of which are negatively phrased and reverse-scored. All items are scored on a 7-point response continuum, ranging from 1 strongly disagree to 7 strongly agree (Appendix B, question 3, items a. through o.). Item scores were summed and the mean was used as the indicator of level of commitment as suggested by Porter et al. (1974). Thus, the scores can range from one to seven, and the higher the score the more organizationally committed the employee is considered to be.

In a review of nine studies in which the instrument has been used, Mowday, Steers, and Porter (1979) summarized the reliability evidence from a total of 2,563 employees across diverse jobs and organizational settings. They reported a consistently high coefficient alpha, ranging from 0.82 to 0.93, with a median of 0.90. Scale means were cited as ranging from 4.0 to 6.1, with a median of 4.5; standard deviations ranged from 0.64 to 1.30, with a median of 1.06 (Mowday et al., 1979).

### Measurement of Demographic Characteristics

The demographic variables, present job title, average number of hours of work per week, number of months in the present job, organizational tenure, number of months of previous retail work experience, present salary level, age, gender, educational level attained, academic major, marital status, employment status of spouse/partner, and number of children were measured by single-item, self-report responses (Appendix B, questions 20-30). These items were developed following the guidelines presented by Dillman (1978) and with the assistance of personnel in the Survey Research Center of the university where the researcher was employed.

### Pilot Test of the Questionnaire

The research instrument was reviewed by several clothing and textiles faculty, graduate students, and personnel at the Survey Research Center. Based on their comments and suggestions, editorial and format revisions were made prior to conducting a pilot test of the questionnaire. A pilot test was undertaken to estimate the potential response rate, to clarify items included in the questionnaire, and to estimate the reliability of the measures used.

For the purposes of pretesting the questionnaire, a sample of merchandising graduates was drawn from the college alumni records of the university where the researcher was employed. Names and addresses of merchandising majors graduating between 1981 and fall term 1987 were cross-referenced with department alumni records to verify most recent employment and home address. A sample of 39 graduates known to be employed in retail management positions by firms other than those to be

contacted for participation in the principal study was drawn for the pilot test.

An initial mailing followed three weeks later by a second mailing to nonrespondents, elicited a total of 26 responses. Three questionnaires were returned by the post office because no forwarding address had been filed by addressees who had moved. A 72.22% response rate was obtained from 36 deliverable questionnaires.

A preliminary assessment of the reliability of each measurement scale was made, based on the pilot sample data. The reliability estimates using Cronbach's coefficient alpha formulation for the data obtained from 24 respondents are presented in Table I. Due to missing data, estimates were based on a sample of 24, rather than on the total pilot sample.

For both the pilot and principal study, Cronbach's alpha was used because the mean reliability coefficient is determined for all possible ways of comparing the homogeneity of a group of items (Peter, 1979). Peter further stated that this approach to estimating reliability is the most commonly accepted formulation for assessing scales with multi-point items and can be effectively employed for scales that include a minimum of three items.

The reliability estimates derived from responses to the pilot study compared favorably with the scale reliability estimates reported in the literature. However, these estimates were viewed as tentative due to the fact that a 10 to 1 ratio of respondents to items for each scale was not satisfied. Nunnally (1967) suggested that for any type of multivariate or item analysis a minimum of five respondents per item should be maintained, preferably there should be no less than 10 times

TABLE I  
RELIABILITY ESTIMATES OF SCALES, BASED  
ON PILOT STUDY DATA

Scale	Coefficient Alpha
JDS Autonomy	.85
JDS Task Identity	.85
JDS Skill Variety	.62
JDS Task Significance	.76
JDS Job Feedback	.68
JDS Feedback from Superiors	.89
JDS Overall Job Satisfaction	.92
IOR Workload Satisfaction	.82
IOR Supervision Satisfaction	.93
IOR Co-worker Satisfaction	.58
IOR Financial Satisfaction	.78
IOR Promotion Satisfaction	.95
OCQ Organizational Commitment	.94

Note. Source of the scales, JDS = Job Diagnostic Survey;  
IOR = Index of Organizational Reactions; OCQ =  
Organizational Commitment Questionnaire.

as many respondents as items. Thus, the coefficients reported in Table I were considered to be somewhat higher than might be expected if the sample size had met Nunnally's criteria.

Editorial revisions were made in the questionnaire based on the results of the pilot test. Several items were reworded for greater simplicity and clarity. The format of the questionnaire was also revised to improve readability, ease of responding, and ease of coding responses.

#### Data Collection

The sample was obtained by contacting executive recruitment and training managers of multiunit department stores located on the west coast. A preliminary telephone contact was made by the researcher to explain the purpose of the study and the potential benefits for participating stores. Subsequent to the telephone contact, a three-page proposal accompanied by an introductory letter was sent to the personnel manager contacted. This written material briefly explained the importance of the study, potential benefits for the store, what was needed from the participating stores to conduct the study, and answered questions concerning confidentiality in regard to the participating store and potential respondents.

Seven multiunit department stores were contacted to elicit participation. Three stores, initially, agreed to participate. Subsequently, one store withdrew from the study because of its acquisition by a new corporate ownership group.

The participating stores provided the researcher with a listing of the names, job titles, and store addresses of their retail managers who were in the process of or had completed the store's management training

program within the last four years, 1983 to 1987. In addition, each store's personnel division provided, at the request of the researcher, a letter to their managers explaining that the store had approved the research project and that potential respondents were not violating store policy by completing and returning the questionnaire to the researcher. This letter from the participating store organization was included with the questionnaire in the initial mailing.

### Characteristics of the Participating Stores

Both of the multiunit department stores which participated in the study were divisions of major retail corporations. Each operated store units in a geographic location relatively close to its main or headquarters location. Both stores provided structured management training programs including classroom instruction and on-the-job training for their management candidates. For both stores, the average annual salary offer given to college-recruited management trainees was within the average range for bachelor's degree candidates going into retailing, \$15,600 to \$24,000, reported by the College Placement Council (1987). In each store the first managerial job assigned to employees after completion of the training program was department (area) sales manager.

During the time period in which the study was conducted, Store A operated eight store units in the Northwest. Approximate annual sales volume for 1986 was in excess of \$200 million (Schulz, 1987) or an average of over \$25 million per store unit operated. Store B, headquartered in the Southwest, operated 43 store units in that geographic location. Annual sales volume for 1986 was in excess of \$900 million (Schulz, 1987) or an average of \$20 million per store unit operated.



Approximately, 50% of Store B's management candidates, in a given year, are "internal upgrades"; lower-level employees who are promoted to management training. The remaining half of the management candidates are recruited through college placement facilities. Both the internal upgrades and the college-recruited management candidates complete the same training program. Store A maintained two training programs, one for its college-recruited management candidates and another for its employees who were promoted to management status from within the organization. The monitoring or tracking system differed for the two groups, therefore, only the college-recruited management candidates for Store A were included in the study sample. The study sample included both internal upgrades and college-recruited managers for Store B, because the personnel record system being used did not provide an efficient means of identifying managerial employees by recruitment origin.

#### Implementation of the Data

##### Collection Process

The process by which the data collection was conducted followed Dillman's (1978) guidelines for implementing mail surveys. The questions in the questionnaire were ordered such that those appearing at the beginning were ones which were thought to appear most important to the respondent. Secondly, questions that were similar in content and type of response format were grouped together to decrease the amount of effort required to complete the questionnaire. The questionnaire was constructed in a booklet format and commercially printed.

The initial mailing sent to the total potential sample of 214 included the participating store's letter to its managers, a cover letter

from the researcher (Appendix A), the questionnaire, and a self-addressed, postage-paid business-reply envelope. A number was assigned to each name on the address list as a means of identifying the respondent's employing store and the nonrespondents for follow-up mailings. To assure respondent confidentiality, this identification number was stamped in the lower right-hand corner of the business-reply envelope, no number was placed on the questionnaire booklet.

The follow-up sequence included three mailings. One week after the initial mailout, a postcard reminder was sent to everyone. The postcard served as a thank you for those who had responded and as a reminder to those who had not (Dillman, 1978). After three weeks had elapsed, a second letter (Appendix A) and questionnaire were sent to nonrespondents. A final mailing was sent to nonrespondents after seven weeks had passed. Another letter (Appendix A) and replacement questionnaire were enclosed.

### Data Analysis

The questionnaire data were coded and transferred to a data file for computer analysis. Preliminary analysis included the calculation of frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations for descriptive purposes. Frequency analysis revealed only small amounts of missing data. All of the missing data values appeared to be randomly distributed throughout the data set with the exception of several missing data units on the demographic variables which were located on the last page of the questionnaire. It was assumed that the four respondents who did not complete the section failed to recognize that the questionnaire continued on the back page. The amount and pattern of missing data was assumed to pose no critical problems in subsequent

analysis. Tabachnick and Fidell (1983, pp. 68-69) stated that "the problems created by minor amounts of missing data randomly dispersed throughout a data set are not serious and nearly all procedures for handling them produce similar outcomes."

To assess the reliability of the attitude measures, a reliability coefficient was calculated for each scale using Cronbach's alpha formulation. The attitude scales were assumed to adequately approximate interval measurement. Kerlinger (1973, p. 440) stated that "though most psychological scales are basically ordinal, we can with considerable assurance often assume equality of interval." Guilford (1954) and Nunnally (1967) argued that since such scales sufficiently approach the condition of equal intervals, there is tolerable error in utilizing parametric statistical methods.

One-way analysis of variance using a general linear model framework for unequal cell sizes was used to test for differences in mean scores among subgroups within each independent categorical variable. These categorical variables included gender, store, marital status, employment status of spouse/partner, job type, educational level, academic major, and salary level. Separate analyses were completed using organizational commitment as the dependent variable in each test.

The relationship between organizational commitment and each of the continuous variables was initially assessed using simple correlation analysis. Pearson product-moment coefficients were calculated for each bivariate relationship. Missing data were handled by pairwise deletion in which all available pairs of values were used to calculate the correlations.

Job scope, overall job satisfaction, and facets of work context satisfaction were the independent variables used in multiple regression analysis to test the third and fourth hypotheses. Multiple regression is a method of analyzing the strength of relationship between a dependent variable and a set of independent variables (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1983). An equation is developed which represents a line where the sum of the squared deviations between values of the dependent variable obtained from measurement and their predicted values estimated as a linear combination of the dependent variables are minimized. The coefficient of multiple determination ( $R^2$ ) is a measure of the proportionate variation in the dependent variable associated with the linear combination of independent variables in the model (Neter, Wasserman, & Kutner, 1983).

Prior to multiple regression analysis, the criterion variable organizational commitment was regressed on each separate component (job characteristic) of the summary variable job scope and each facet of work context satisfaction utilizing simple linear regression. These analyses were undertaken to assess the amount of variance in the dependent variable that was explained by a component variable versus the amount that could be explained by using a summary variable. Multiple regression was then employed to analyze the relationships between job scope and overall satisfaction in accounting for variations in organizational commitment and in assessing the relationships among facets of the work context in accounting for variations in the criterion variable.

Since the independent variables used in the multiple regression models were moderately intercorrelated, it was assumed that the

regression coefficients reflected a proportion of variance shared with other independent variables in addition to that shared with the criterion variable. To assess the contribution of each independent variable to the variation in the dependent variable, semipartial correlations were calculated as suggested by Tabachnick and Fidell (1983). Squared semipartial correlation indicates the unique contribution of a given independent variable as a proportion of the total variance of the dependent variable (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1983).

#### Summary

The research question investigated was: how well do job scope and work context satisfaction account for variations in the level of organizational commitment? The theoretical framework used as a basis for the study was Hackman and Oldham's (1976) job characteristics model. The focus of the study was on department store managers who had held, for four years or less, a management position in their organization. The study consisted of a mailed questionnaire survey. One-way analysis of variance and multiple regression analyses were utilized to test the four research hypotheses.

## CHAPTER IV

### FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

In this chapter, questionnaire response rates and demographic characteristics of the respondents are presented. Also discussed are the analyses which were conducted prior to hypothesis testing, including estimates of scale reliabilities and descriptive statistics for the continuous variables. Results of the one-way analysis of variance and multiple regression analyses are presented as they related to the four major hypotheses of the study. In the final section of the chapter, analyses conducted subsequent to the hypothesis testing are reported.

#### Questionnaire Response Rate

The data collection procedure employed in the study consisted of a mailed questionnaire survey. Of the 214 questionnaires mailed to department store managers in two multiunit department stores, a total of 158 were returned. Five questionnaires were returned by the stores because the addressees had terminated their employment. Thus, the total potential sample size was reduced to 209 reachable respondents of which 73.2% or 153 returned questionnaires. Response rate for Store A was 85.2% or 52 returns from 61 questionnaires sent, for Store B the rate was 68.2% or 101 returns from 148 sent.

The initial questionnaire mailing was followed by a postcard reminder and two subsequent mailings to nonrespondents. The incremental

response rate percentage for each of the mailings is presented in Table II. Incremental response rate percentages were calculated using tallies, by post office cancellation date, for returned questionnaires. The incremental response rates for the present study compared favorably with those presented by Dillman (1978). From a study of return rates for five surveys, Dillman found that 19 to 27 percent of mailed questionnaires were returned prior to respondents' receipt of postcards. The percentage increment of returns after the postcard mailing, but prior to the third mailing ranged from 15 to 25 percent. In the present study these return rates were 22.4 and 27.1 percent respectively (Table II).

Three of the questionnaires contained a substantial amount of incomplete data. The pages with missing data were photocopied and returned to the respondent with a note explaining the need for complete data. Two-thirds of those contacted returned the completed pages. For the one respondent who did not comply with the request, the employing store was contacted to obtain some of the missing demographic data. Thus, 153 usable questionnaires were obtained for the study.

#### Analysis Preliminary to Hypothesis Testing

In this section, the analyses which were conducted prior to hypothesis testing are presented. Descriptive statistics of the demographic variables are reported. In the remaining portion of this section, estimates of reliability for each of the attitude scales and descriptive statistics of these variables are presented.

TABLE II  
QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSE RATE

Item	Number	Percentage <sup>a</sup>
<u>Initial Mailing</u>		
Questionnaires mailed	214	
Returned	48	22.4
<u>Postcard Mailing</u>		
Postcards mailed	214	
Questionnaires returned	58	27.1
<u>Second Follow-up Mailing</u>		
Questionnaires mailed	111	
Returned	38	17.8
Nonreachable, addressee left company	5	2.3
<u>Third Follow-up Mailing</u>		
Questionnaires mailed	74	
Returned	9	4.2
<u>Total Returns from Respondents</u>	153	73.2 <sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Percentage increment of responses based on a potential sample of 214.

<sup>b</sup>Response rate = 
$$\frac{\text{Total Number Returned [153]}}{\text{Sample [214] - Nonreachable [5]}} (100)$$



### Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents

Various demographic and work-related characteristics are reported in Tables III and IV. Over one-half (64.1%) of the 153 respondents were female. The majority (64.1%) were department or area sales managers in first-level management positions. One-fourth (25.5%) of the respondents were assistant buyers, 3.3% were buyers, and 7.2% were in managerial positions (other functional specialty) such as customer service manager, employment training coordinator, training specialist, and accounting manager. Two-thirds (66.7%) of the managers earned between \$20,000 and \$25,999 in their present position.

Less than one-fourth (24.2%) were married; a large percentage were single (62.1%) and 3.3% were divorced. Of the 49 respondents living with a partner or married, 35 indicated that their spouse or partner was employed full-time outside the home. Very few of the respondents had children. Six indicated having one child under the age of five years, with only one respondent indicating more than one child. None had children five years or older.

All of the 153 managers had attained some level of college education. The majority (80.4%) had attained a bachelor's degree, an additional 7.1 percent had done some graduate work and another 3.3 percent had graduate degrees. The largest percentage (53.6%) indicated having a bachelor's degree in business administration. Of those graduating in business nearly one-fourth (24.8%) specialized in marketing. Of those graduating in home economics (11.1%), all indicated specializing in clothing and textiles and/or merchandising. Almost one-fourth (24.8%) of the respondents had majored in liberal

TABLE III  
DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDENTS  
CATEGORICAL DATA

Characteristic	Number	Percentage	Characteristic	Number	Percentage
<u>Gender</u>			<u>Number of Children Over Age 5</u>		
Male	55	35.9	None	149	97.4
Female	98	64.1	No response	4	2.6
	<u>153</u>	<u>100.0</u>		<u>153</u>	<u>100.0</u>
<u>Job Type</u>			<u>Educational Level</u>		
Dept. (Area) Sales Manager	98	64.1	Some community college	1	0.7
Assistant Buyer	39	25.5	Two-year college degree	12	7.8
Buyer	5	3.3	Some four-year college	1	0.7
Other Functional Specialty	11	7.2	Bachelor's degree	123	80.4
	<u>153</u>	<u>100.0</u>	Some graduate work	11	7.1
<u>Salary Level</u>			Graduate degree	5	3.3
\$15,000-19,999	33	21.5		<u>153</u>	<u>100.0</u>
\$20,000-25,999	102	66.7	<u>Bachelor's Degree - Major</u>		
\$26,000-30,999	13	8.5	None	14	9.2
\$31,000-35,999	2	1.3	Business Administration		
\$36,000-40,999	1	0.7	General	10	13.1
No response	2	2.6	Marketing	38	24.8
	<u>153</u>	<u>100.0</u>	Management	16	10.5
<u>Marital Status</u>			Finance	8	5.2
Single	95	62.1		<u>82</u>	<u>53.6</u>
Divorced/separated	5	3.3	Home Economics		
Living with a partner	12	7.8	Merchandising	17	11.1
Married	37	24.2	Liberal Arts		
No response	4	2.6	Economics	4	2.6
	<u>153</u>	<u>100.0</u>	Psychology	11	7.2
<u>Employment Status of Partner/Spouse</u>			Speech Communications	8	5.2
No partner/spouse	100	65.4	Political Science	4	2.6
Employed full-time	35	22.9	Other Liberal Arts	11	7.2
Employed part-time	11	7.2		<u>38</u>	<u>24.8</u>
Not working outside the home	3	1.9	Science		
No response	4	2.6	Biology	2	1.3
	<u>153</u>	<u>100.0</u>		<u>153</u>	<u>100.0</u>
<u>Number of Children Under Age 5</u>					
None	142	92.8			
One	6	3.8			
Three	1	0.7			
No response	4	2.6			
	<u>153</u>	<u>100.0</u>			

TABLE IV  
 DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDENTS  
 CONTINUOUS DATA  
 (N = 152)

Characteristic	Range	Mean	<u>SD</u>
Age	21-35	24.70 Years	2.16
Prior Retail Experience	0-120	16.75 Months	26.06
Longevity in Present Job	1-25	9.83 Months	6.49
Length of Work Week	40-75	50.72 Hours	6.86
Organizational Tenure	2-108	26.06 Months	19.18

arts, with the largest percentage (7.2%) obtaining degrees in psychology. Only two respondents graduated in science and each had a degree in biology.

The managers' average age was 24.7 years, and they had, on the average, 16.75 months of retail experience prior to joining their present organization (Table IV). The average length of time managers had been in their present job (job longevity) was approximately 10 months and the length of their work week ranged from 40 to 75 hours with an average of nearly 51 hours. Their average tenure in their employing organization was approximately 26 months.

#### Estimates of Scale Reliabilities

Scales from the Job Diagnostic Survey (JDS) were used to measure job characteristics and managers' overall job satisfaction. Facets of work context satisfaction were measured using scales from the Index of Organizational Reactions (IOR). The Organizational Commitment Questionnaire was used to measure managers' commitment to their organization. In Table V, the alpha coefficients calculated from the data to estimate the reliability of the scales are reported. The reliability findings for each of the scales compared favorably with the reported alpha coefficients in the literature. All but three of the standardized estimates of internal consistency for the scales exceeded .70; the autonomy scale at .69, the task significance scale at .66, and co-worker satisfaction scale at .63, were the exceptions. The organizational commitment, supervision satisfaction, and feedback from superiors measures were found to have high alpha coefficients at .90. According to Nunnally (1967) reliabilities of .50 or .60 are adequate for the

TABLE V  
RELIABILITY ESTIMATES OF SCALES, BASED  
ON PRINCIPAL STUDY DATA  
(N = 153)

Scale	Coefficient Alpha
JDS Autonomy	.69
JDS Task Identity	.72
JDS Skill Variety	.70
JDS Task Significance	.66
JDS Job Feedback	.80
JDS Feedback from Superiors	.90
JDS Overall Job Satisfaction	.84
IOR Workload Satisfaction	.74
IOR Supervision Satisfaction	.90
IOR Co-worker Satisfaction	.63
IOR Financial Satisfaction	.90
IOR Promotion Satisfaction	.85
OCQ Organizational Commitment	.91

Note. Source of the scales, JDS = Job Diagnostic Survey;  
IOR = Index of Organizational Reactions; OCQ =  
Organizational Commitment Questionnaire.

purposes of basic research. Thus, the scales used in the study were assumed to be reliable.

### Descriptive Analysis of Variables

Means and standard deviations of managers' responses to the primary variables of the study are presented in Table VI. Responses on the job characteristics scales ranged from one to seven, with the latter indicating the substantial presence of the characteristic. The mean total scores for the job characteristics ranged from a high of 5.50 for task identity to a low of 4.17 for feedback from superiors. Hackman, Oldham, and Stepina (cited in Hackman & Oldham, 1980) reported similar mean scores for persons in managerial positions. From normative data collected from a range of industries and organized by job type they reported mean scores for characteristics of managerial jobs as follows: autonomy, 5.4 with a standard deviation of .92; task identity, 4.7 with a standard deviation of 1.1; skill variety, 5.6 with a standard deviation of .94; task significance, 5.8 with a standard deviation of .85; feedback from the job itself, 5.2 with a standard deviation of 1.0; and feedback from superiors, 4.4 with a standard deviation of 1.2. The retail managers in the present study indicated higher mean scores than those reported in the normative data (5.50 compared to 4.7) for task identity. This may have occurred because the three items measuring task identity were reworded to more clearly reflect the managerial responsibilities of the sample. All other job characteristic means for the present study were somewhat lower than those reported in the literature, with the greatest differences occurring for task significance (5.15 in the present study compared to 5.8 reported in the literature) and for skill variety (5.03 compared to 5.6).

TABLE VI  
DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS OF VARIABLES

Variable	<u>N</u>	Mean	<u>SD</u>
<u>Job Scope</u>	153	5.21 <sup>a</sup>	0.83
Autonomy	153	5.28 <sup>a</sup>	0.99
Task Identity	153	5.50 <sup>a</sup>	1.02
Skill Variety	153	5.03 <sup>a</sup>	1.26
Task Significance	153	5.15 <sup>a</sup>	1.12
Job Feedback	152	5.07 <sup>a</sup>	1.19
Feedback from Superiors	153	4.17 <sup>a</sup>	1.55
<u>Overall Job Satisfaction</u>	153	4.36 <sup>a</sup>	1.30
<u>Work Context Satisfaction</u>	153	3.35 <sup>b</sup>	0.61
Workload Satisfaction	152	2.95 <sup>b</sup>	0.80
Supervision Satisfaction	152	3.32 <sup>b</sup>	1.14
Co-worker Satisfaction	152	3.81 <sup>b</sup>	0.63
Financial Satisfaction	152	3.00 <sup>b</sup>	1.06
Promotion Satisfaction	152	3.68 <sup>b</sup>	0.97
<u>Organizational Commitment</u>	153	4.80 <sup>a</sup>	1.13

<sup>a</sup>Measured on a seven-point scale.

<sup>b</sup>Measured on a five-point scale.

For overall job satisfaction, measured on a seven-point scale with responses ranging from (1) strongly disagree to (7) strongly agree, the total mean score was 4.36. It appeared that the retail managers in the study, on the average, were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied with their jobs. Hackman et al. (cited in Hackman & Oldham, 1980) reported a mean overall job satisfaction score of 4.9 and standard deviation of 1.0 for managerial employees. Thus, respondents in the present study appeared to be somewhat less satisfied with their jobs than managerial employees in general.

The five facets of work context satisfaction were measured on five point scales, with a score of five indicating the highest degree of satisfaction. Total mean scores ranged from a high of 3.81 for co-worker satisfaction to a low of 2.95 for workload satisfaction. Smith, Roberts, and Hulin (1976) reported mean values for work context facets for 40,340 blue and white collar job incumbents as follows: workload satisfaction, 3.06; supervision satisfaction, 3.19; co-worker satisfaction, 3.41; financial rewards satisfaction, 2.77; and promotion satisfaction, 3.09. Retail managers in the present study appeared, in general, to be more satisfied with their possibilities of promotion than did the aggregate group of workers in Smith et al.'s (1976) study.

For organizational commitment, measured on a seven-point response continuum, ranging from (1) strongly disagree to (7) strongly agree; the mean total score was 4.80 with a standard deviation of 1.13. This result was within the range of means cited in the literature. Mowday, Steers, and Porter (1979) reported Organizational Commitment Questionnaire means ranging from 4.0 to 6.1, with a median of 4.5; standard deviations ranged from 0.64 to 1.30, with a median of 1.06 for the nine studies they reviewed.



## Results of Hypothesis Testing

In the following section, results of the testing of the four major hypotheses are presented. One-way analysis of variance using the general linear models framework for unbalanced cell size was used to test the relationship between demographic categorical variables and organizational commitment in the first two hypotheses. The relationship between continuous demographic variables and the criterion variable were assessed using Pearson product-moment correlations. The third and fourth hypotheses were tested using multiple regression analysis. A discussion of the analytical results is included with the findings for each hypothesis.

### Organizational Commitment in Relation to Demographic Variables

The first null hypothesis, that there is no relationship between the criterion variable organizational commitment and the independent variables, gender, age, organizational tenure, and amount of previous retail experience, could not be rejected. The results of the one-way analysis of variance, testing differences between mean scores for organizational commitment by gender, are presented in Table VII. No significant difference was found between males and females in their degree of organizational commitment. Pearson product-moment correlations for each of the continuous variables age ( $r = -.08$ ), organizational tenure ( $r = -.04$ ), and amount of previous retail experience ( $r = -.04$ ) in association with organizational commitment indicated weak, nonsignificant correlations (see correlation matrix in Appendix C).

TABLE VII  
RESULTS OF ONE-WAY ANOVA FOR ORGANIZATIONAL  
COMMITMENT SCORES BY CATEGORICAL  
DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

Independent Variable	<u>n</u>	Group Means	<u>SD</u>	<u>F</u> -Statistic	<u>p</u> -Value
<u>Gender</u>				.29	.5941
Male	55	4.73	1.21		
Female	98	4.84	1.08		
<u>Retail Organization</u>				4.36	.0385
Store A	52	5.06	1.12		
Store B	101	4.66	1.12		
<u>Job Type</u>				.04	.9588
Department Manager	98	4.80	1.12		
Assistant Buyer	39	4.77	1.07		
Other Specialty	16	4.87	1.36		
<u>Salary Level</u>				.62	.5406
\$15,000-19,999	33	4.73	1.27		
\$20,000-25,999	102	4.77	1.12		
\$26,000-35,999	15	5.09	.80		
<u>Marital Status</u>				.66	.4191
Single	100	4.75	1.19		
Married	49	4.91	.99		
<u>Employment Status Partner/Spouse</u>				2.19	.1464
Full-time	35	4.83	1.04		
Part-time	11	5.38	.76		

Since the findings of these preliminary tests were not significant, no further analysis was conducted to test the hypothesis.

Although it was expected that organizational commitment scores may differ by gender as had been found in previous studies, this was not the case in the present study. Females have, usually, been found to be more committed than males (Angle & Perry, 1981; Grusky, 1966; Hrebiniak & Alutto, 1972). The standard explanation given is that females generally have to overcome more obstacles to obtain organizational membership, thus this membership is more valued (Angle & Perry, 1981; Grusky, 1966). In the present study, females as a group had higher mean organizational commitment ratings (4.84) than males (4.73); however, these were not significantly different. One explanation may be that this group of managers was young and from a different generation than workers sampled in previous studies. Thus, younger females may view organizational membership as an opportunity that is not unique but equal to that afforded to males.

The weak correlations between age, organizational tenure, and retail experience prior to joining the present organization may have been due to the nature of the sample. These variables have been found positively related to commitment in previous studies, however in the present study the correlations indicated little association and were negative in nature.

Additional analyses were conducted to assess differences in organizational commitment by other demographic characteristics. The results of these analyses are reported in Table VII. No significant differences among mean scores for commitment were found by job type, salary level, marital status, or the employment status of partner or

spouse. Only one indicator variable was found to make a significant difference ( $p < .05$ ) in the mean rating of commitment and that was the particular retail organization in which the manager was employed. Managers' employed by Store A were significantly more committed to their organization than those employed by Store B.

The second null hypothesis, that there is no relationship between organizational commitment and the independent variables, educational level and academic major, could not be rejected. Results of the one-way analysis of variance revealed no significant differences by either educational level or academic major (Table VIII). The fact that no differences in commitment ratings by educational level were found is not surprising since there was little diversity among the respondents in educational level attained. Over 90.8% had at minimum a baccalaureate degree.

Although home economics and business majors had higher mean commitment ratings than did liberal arts majors, these differences were not significant. Thus, the findings of the present study did not provide evidence to support Lucas' (1985) conclusion that relationships between job factors and education may be influenced by a retail manager's area of study.

#### Organizational Commitment in Relation to Job Scope and Overall Job Satisfaction

The third null hypothesis of the study, that there is no relationship between the criterion variable organizational commitment and the independent variables, job scope and overall job satisfaction, was rejected. The results of the regression analyses are reported in

TABLE VIII  
RESULTS OF ONE-WAY ANOVA FOR ORGANIZATIONAL  
COMMITMENT SCORES BY EDUCATIONAL LEVEL  
AND ACADEMIC MAJOR

Independent Variable	<u>n</u>	Group Means	<u>SD</u>	<u>F</u> -Statistic	<u>p</u> -Value
<u>Educational Level</u>				1.54	.2179
Some College	14	5.00	.82		
Bachelor Degree	123	4.72	1.16		
Graduate Work/Degree	16	5.20	1.08		
<u>Academic Major</u>				1.80	.1694
Business Administration	82	4.85	1.08		
Home Economics	17	5.03	1.01		
Liberal Arts	38	4.49	1.34		

Tables IX and X. Prior to hypothesis testing, simple linear regressions were conducted on each job characteristic in relation to organizational commitment to determine their individual predictive ability (Table IX). Results of these analyses revealed that, of the separate job characteristics, task significance explained the highest proportion of variance in commitment ( $R^2 = .28$ ).

Multiple regression analysis of the five characteristics, posited by Hackman and Oldham (1976) to be components of job scope, indicated that these variables explained approximately 40% of the variance in commitment (Table IX). The adjusted R-square value was (.38) when adjustment was made for the number of parameters appearing in the model. However, task identity and autonomy were not significant in the model containing the five characteristics. Collinearity analysis indicated that task identity, task significance, and skill variety were strongly intercorrelated, although the model itself did not suffer from a high degree of multicollinearity. Eigenanalysis indicated a multicollinearity index of 2.70 which was much lower than 30, the proposed value necessary to indicate a high degree of multicollinearity (Freund & Littell, 1986).

Simple linear regression analysis of the separate effects of job scope and overall job satisfaction on organizational commitment, indicated that job scope predicted 40% and overall job satisfaction alone predicted 58% of the variance in the criterion variable (Table X). Multiple regression analysis of job scope and overall job satisfaction resulted in the explanation of 62% of the variance in organizational commitment. To assess the unique contribution of each independent variable as a proportion of total variance in the criterion variable,

TABLE IX  
RESULTS OF REGRESSION ANALYSIS FOR JOB CHARACTERISTICS  
ON ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT  
(N = 152)

Regression Equation	R <sup>2</sup>	ADJ R <sup>2</sup>	F-Statistic
AUTO	.14	---	23.42*
TID	.23	---	45.27*
SKILL	.24	---	46.35*
TASK	.28	---	57.74*
JFEED	.24	---	47.78*
SFEED	.11	---	18.62*
AUTO + TID + SKILL + TASK + JFEED	.40 <sup>a</sup>	.38	19.86*

Note. AUTO = Autonomy; TID = Task Identity; SKILL = Skill Variety; TASK = Task Significance; JFEED = Feedback from the Job Itself; SFEED = Feedback from Superiors. ADJ R<sup>2</sup> = R-squared adjusted for the number of parameters in the model according to formula:  $1 - (1 - R^2) [(n - 1) / (n - m - 1)]$ ; n = number of observations; m = number of parameters.

<sup>a</sup>Task Identity and Autonomy were not significant in the model.

\*p < .0001

TABLE X  
RESULTS OF REGRESSION ANALYSIS FOR JOB SCOPE AND OVERALL  
JOB SATISFACTION ON ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT  
(N = 152)

Regression Equation	R <sup>2</sup>	ADJ R <sup>2</sup>	F-Statistic
JS	.40	---	100.610*
OJSAT	.58	---	208.156*
JS + OJSAT	.62	.61	121.669*
JS + OJSAT + INT	.63 <sup>a</sup>	.62	83.210*

Note. JS = Job Scope; OJSAT = Overall Job Satisfaction; INT = Interaction term JS x OJSAT. ADJ R<sup>2</sup> = R-squared adjusted for the number of parameters in the model according to the formula:  
 $1 - (1 - R^2) [(n - 1) / (n - m - 1)]$ ; n = number of observations;  
 m = number of parameters.

<sup>a</sup>Interaction term was not significant in the model.

\*p < .0001



squared semipartial correlations were calculated (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1983). The squared semipartial correlations for job scope and overall job satisfaction were .04 and .22 respectively.

An additional multiple regression model including the interaction term job scope x overall job satisfaction, was tested. Results indicated a one percent increase in  $R^2$ , however the interaction term was not significant in the model ( $p = .0844$ ) when job scope and overall job satisfaction had already been included.

Thus, overall job satisfaction was the best single predictor of organizational commitment ratings. Although job scope was significant in the model and alone accounted for 40% of the variance explained in organizational commitment, its unique contribution diminished when overall job satisfaction was included in the model. It appeared that job scope and overall job satisfaction were to some extent redundant in predicting commitment (Kerlinger, 1973). A sizable portion (36%) of the explained variance was shared by these two independent variables.

#### Organizational Commitment in Relation to Facets of Work Context Satisfaction

The fourth null hypothesis, that there is no relationship between the criterion variable organizational commitment and the independent variables, facets of work context satisfaction (supervision, workload, financial rewards, co-worker relations, and opportunities for promotion), was rejected. Results of the regression analyses regarding this hypothesis are reported in Table XI. Simple linear regression analysis of each of the facets in relation to organizational commitment indicated that satisfaction with opportunities for promotion was the single best

TABLE XI  
RESULTS OF REGRESSION ANALYSIS FOR FACETS OF WORK CONTEXT  
SATISFACTION ON ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT  
(N = 150)

Regression Equation	$R^2$	ADJ $R^2$	F-Statistic
Supervision Satisfaction	.21	---	38.329*
Workload Satisfaction	.14	---	24.818*
Financial Satisfaction	.13	---	22.464*
Co-worker Satisfaction	.12	---	20.034*
Promotion Satisfaction	.49	---	141.612*
Work Context Satisfaction	.47	---	129.243*
SUP + WKL + PAY + COWK + FUT	.54 <sup>a</sup>	.53	34.406*

Note. Work Context Satisfaction is a summary variable of the five facets. SUP = Supervision Satisfaction; WKL = Workload Satisfaction; PAY = Financial Satisfaction; COWK = Co-worker Satisfaction; FUT = Promotion Satisfaction. ADJ  $R^2$  = R-squared adjusted for the number of parameters in the model according to formula:  $1 - (1 - R^2) [(n - 1) / (n - m - 1)]$ ; n = number of observations; m = number of parameters.

<sup>a</sup>Financial, co-worker, and supervision satisfactions were not significant in the model.

\* $p < .0001$

predictor ( $R^2 = .49$ ) of organizational commitment. Work context satisfaction, a summary variable of the five facets, predicted 47% of the variation in commitment.

Multiple regression analysis including each of the five facets increased the coefficient of multiple determination by seven percent over that explained by the summary variable, work context satisfaction. Financial rewards, co-worker relations, and supervision satisfactions were not significant in the five facet model, their probability values were .1922, .0680, and .4323 respectively. Results from eigenanalysis of the model indicated that multicollinearity was not present, however promotion satisfaction was strongly related to supervision satisfaction. Although promotion satisfaction ( $r = .71$ ) and supervision satisfaction ( $r = .45$ ) were found to be the most highly correlated of the five facets to organizational commitment, their correlation with each other was significant ( $r = .57$ ) in simple correlation analysis (Appendix C). Satisfactions with financial rewards and co-worker relations were found to be only moderately correlated, ( $r = .36$ ) and ( $r = .35$ ) respectively, with organizational commitment in simple correlation analysis. Thus, the fact that these facets did not appear significant in the model could be expected.

Promotion satisfaction accounted for the largest (.18) proportion of commitment variance explained by the five facet model. The semi-partial correlations squared for the other independent variables were as follows: workload, .02; financial rewards, .005; co-worker relations, .01; and supervision, .004. Hence, promotion satisfaction was the single best predictor of commitment among the five facets, as indicated by the results of both the simple linear and multiple regression analysis.

### Analysis Subsequent to Hypothesis Testing

Additional analysis was conducted to assess the importance of the categorical demographic characteristics in relation to overall job satisfaction, job scope, and work context satisfaction. Results of one-way analysis of variance revealed no significant differences in overall job satisfaction by either retail organization, gender, job type, salary level, marital status, educational level, or academic major.

The same type of analysis using job scope as the dependent variable indicated significant differences in job scope ratings by sex and by job type. Females as a group, had significantly higher job scope ratings ( $\bar{M} = 5.33$ ) than did males ( $\bar{M} = 4.98$ ),  $F(1, 151) = 6.52$ ,  $p = .0117$ . It appeared that females perceived their management positions as significantly more challenging than did male respondents. Results of analysis of variance for separate job characteristics ratings by gender indicated that females perceived their jobs as providing significantly more skill variety, task identity, and task significance than did males (Table XII). These three core characteristics have been posited by Hackman and Oldham (1976) to contribute to experienced meaningfulness of the work. Thus, females appeared to experience significantly more meaningfulness in their retail positions than did males.

Significant differences, also, were found among job scope ratings by job type,  $F(2, 150) = 5.95$ ,  $p = .0033$ . Scheffe's procedure was used to evaluate the posteriori contrasts. Results indicated significant differences ( $p < .05$ ) for department (area) sales managers ( $\bar{M} = 5.26$ ) compared to assistant buyers ( $\bar{M} = 4.88$ ) and for assistant buyers compared to managers in other functional specialties ( $\bar{M} = 5.65$ ). It

TABLE XII  
RESULTS OF ONE-WAY ANOVA FOR JOB  
CHARACTERISTICS BY GENDER  
(N = 153)

Dependent Variable	Group Means	<u>SD</u>	<u>F</u> -Statistic	<u>p</u> -Value
<u>Skill Variety</u>			6.58	.0113
Males	4.69	1.38		
Females	5.22	1.14		
<u>Task Identity</u>			9.18	.0029
Males	5.18	1.00		
Females	5.68	.99		
<u>Task Significance</u>			9.59	.0023
Males	4.79	1.31		
Females	5.36	.94		
<u>Autonomy</u>			.45	.5034
Males	5.20	.87		
Females	5.32	1.05		
<u>Job Feedback</u>			.01	.9060
Males	5.05	1.29		
Females	5.08	1.13		
<u>Feedback from Superiors</u>			.23	.6287
Males	4.09	1.54		
Females	4.22	1.56		

Note. For Males, n = 55; Females, n = 98.

appeared that assistant buyers viewed their jobs as much less challenging than did either department managers or managers in other functional specialties.

Results of analysis for each job characteristic by job type, confirmed this conclusion (Table XIII). Significant differences ( $p < .05$ ) by job type were found for task identity, autonomy, job feedback, and feedback from superiors. Tests of pairwise contrasts using Scheffe's procedure indicated significant differences ( $p < .05$ ) between assistant buyers and those in other functional specialties on task identity ratings. Significant differences were found between both job groups, department managers and those in other specialties, compared to assistant buyers on ratings for autonomy. Assistant buyers' rated job feedback and feedback from superiors significantly lower than did managers in other functional specialties, but no significant differences were found between either assistant buyers and department managers or department managers and those in other functional specialties.

Results of analysis of variance using work context satisfaction, the summary construct of the context facets, as the dependent variable indicated a significant difference only by retail organization. Managers of Store A were significantly more satisfied ( $M = 3.61$ ) with the context in which they worked, than were Store B's managers ( $M = 3.22$ ),  $F(1, 151) = 15.02$ ,  $p = .0002$ . Analysis by individual facets of the work context indicated significant differences between the two groups of managers for promotion satisfaction and financial satisfaction, with Store A's managers rating these facets significantly higher than those from Store B (Table XIV).

TABLE XIII  
RESULTS OF ONE-WAY ANOVA FOR JOB CHARACTERISTICS BY JOB TYPE  
(N = 153)

Dependent Variable	Group Means	SD	F-Statistic	p-Value
<u>Skill Variety</u>			1.03	.3583
Department Manager	5.03	1.31		
Assistant Buyer	4.88	1.16		
Other Specialty	5.42	1.14		
<u>Task Identity</u>			4.26	.0159
Department Manager	5.55	.98		
Assistant Buyer	5.17	1.11		
Other Specialty	6.00	.83		
<u>Task Significance</u>			2.69	.0711
Department Manager	5.17	1.11		
Assistant Buyer	4.91	1.11		
Other Specialty	5.67	1.14		
<u>Autonomy</u>			7.30	.0009
Department Manager	5.44	.97		
Assistant Buyer	4.78	.94		
Other Specialty	5.52	.85		
<u>Job Feedback</u>			4.52	.0124
Department Manager	5.13	1.11		
Assistant Buyer	4.68	1.30		
Other Specialty	5.67	1.07		
<u>Feedback from Superiors</u>			3.68	.0274
Department Manager	4.19	1.57		
Assistant Buyer	3.78	1.51		
Other Specialty	5.00	1.22		

Note. For Department Managers,  $\underline{n}$  = 98; Assistant Buyers,  $\underline{n}$  = 39; Other Functional Specialties,  $\underline{n}$  = 16.

TABLE XIV  
RESULTS OF ONE-WAY ANOVA FOR FACETS OF  
WORK CONTEXT SATISFACTION BY STORE  
(N = 152)

Dependent Variable	Group Means	<u>SD</u>	<u>F</u> -Statistic	<u>p</u> -Value
<u>Supervision Satisfaction</u>			.08	.7756
Store A	3.36	1.23		
Store B	3.30	1.09		
<u>Co-worker Satisfaction</u>			.94	.3332
Store A	3.88	.61		
Store B	3.77	.64		
<u>Promotion Satisfaction</u>			4.64	.0328
Store A	3.92	.87		
Store B	3.56	1.00		
<u>Financial Satisfaction</u>			110.17	.0001
Store A	3.95	.74		
Store B	2.50	.84		
<u>Workload Satisfaction</u>			.00	.9739
Store A	2.95	.79		
Store B	2.95	.80		

Note. For Store A, n = 52; Store B, n = 100.



Multiple regression analysis was conducted using the strongest commitment predictors identified in previous analysis; promotion satisfaction, job scope, and overall job satisfaction. These three independent variables accounted for 67% of the variance in organizational commitment (adjusted R-squared = .66;  $p = .0001$ ). However, semipartial correlations squared indicated that only a small portion of the variance explained was due to the individual contribution of any one independent variable. Overall job satisfaction made the largest unique contribution (.11), followed by satisfaction with opportunities for promotion (.05) and job scope (.01). Hence, approximately 50% of the explained variance in commitment was shared by these independent variables. Eigenanalysis indicated a collinearity index of 21; evidence that substantial, but not severe, multicollinearity was present. Overall job satisfaction and promotion satisfaction were strongly inter-correlated.

Another set of regression analyses was conducted using overall satisfaction, rather than commitment, as the criterion variable. This was investigated for several reasons. First, several of the variables used in the present study have been found to be antecedent to satisfaction, as well as predictors of commitment. Second, Hackman and Oldham's (1976) model posits that job characteristics influence job satisfaction and motivation which in turn affect commitment. Finally, the examination of these relationships might provide additional information for interpreting the results of the commitment analyses.

Tables XV and XVI report the results of these analyses. In bivariate analyses, three of the job characteristics; autonomy, job feedback, and feedback from superiors, explained a larger proportion of

TABLE XV  
RESULTS OF REGRESSION ANALYSES FOR JOB CHARACTERISTICS  
ON OVERALL JOB SATISFACTION  
(N = 153)

Regression Equation	R <sup>2</sup>	ADJ R <sup>2</sup>	F-Statistic
TASK	.22	---	41.391*
TID	.16	---	28.600*
SKILL	.16	---	27.738*
AUTO	.27	---	54.589*
JFEED	.26	---	52.387*
SFEED	.17	---	30.413*
JS	.41	---	102.764*
AUTO + SFEED + TASK + JFEED	.44	.42	28.585*

Note. TASK = Task Significance; TID = Task Identity; SKILL = Skill Variety; AUTO = Autonomy; JFEED = Job Feedback; SFEED = Feedback from Superiors; JS = Job Scope. ADJ R<sup>2</sup> = R-squared adjusted for the number of parameters in the model according to formula:  
 $1 - (1 - R^2) [(n - 1) / (n - m - 1)]$ ; n = number of observations;  
 m = number of parameters.

\*p < .0001

TABLE XVI  
RESULTS OF REGRESSION ANALYSES FOR FACETS OF WORK CONTEXT  
SATISFACTION ON OVERALL JOB SATISFACTION  
(N = 152)

Regression Equation	R <sup>2</sup>	ADJ R <sup>2</sup>	F-Statistic
FUT	.41	---	102.754*
SUP	.31	---	65.911*
WKL	.17	---	31.195*
PAY	.11	---	17.613*
COWK	.09	---	13.792*
WCSAT	.47	---	132.754*
SUP + WKL	.37	.36	42.980*

Note. FUT = Promotion Satisfaction; SUP = Supervision Satisfaction;  
WKL = Workload Satisfaction; PAY = Financial Satisfaction;  
COWK = Co-worker Satisfaction; WCSAT = Work Context Satisfaction.  
ADJ R<sup>2</sup> = R-squared adjusted for the number of parameters in the  
model according to formula:  $1 - (1 - R^2) [(n - 1) / (n - m - 1)]$ ;  
n = number of observations; m = number of parameters. (Only the  
significant regression equations were included in the table.)

\*p < .0001

variance in overall job satisfaction than in commitment (Table XV). The summary variable, job scope, accounted for 41% of the variance in overall satisfaction compared to 40% for commitment.

Results of multiple regression analysis using six and then five job characteristics indicated that skill variety and task identity were not significant in the models. Analysis of the model including only the strongest predictors; autonomy, feedback from superiors, task significance, and job feedback indicated that these four variables accounted for 44% of the explained variance in overall job satisfaction.

Bivariate analysis of work context facets indicated that two facets, supervision satisfaction and workload satisfaction, explained a larger proportion of the variance in overall job satisfaction than in commitment (Table XVI). Of the individual facets, satisfaction with opportunities for promotion accounted for the largest proportion of explained variance in overall satisfaction. However, it previously had been found to be a stronger predictor ( $R^2 = .49$ ) of commitment than of overall satisfaction. The summary variable, work context satisfaction, accounted for the same proportion of variance in overall job satisfaction as it had for commitment. Co-worker and financial satisfactions were not significant in a multiple regression model including all five facets. In addition, supervision and promotion satisfactions were strongly intercorrelated. Two of the strongest predictors of overall job satisfaction were supervision and workload, accounting for 37% of the explained variance.

From the results of these analyses it appears that several variables may be antecedent to overall job satisfaction, rather than to commitment. Among the job characteristics variables, autonomy, job

feedback, and feedback from superiors appeared more strongly associated with overall job satisfaction than with commitment. Similarly, supervision and workload satisfaction appeared to be more powerful in predicting overall satisfaction than as contributors to organizational commitment.

Finally, regression analyses were conducted to evaluate the possibility of spurious results due to combining data across two retail organizations. An indicator variable for retail organization was entered into the regression equations. The results of the previously reported regression models were unaffected, R-squared was unchanged when adjusted for the number of parameters in the model. Only in the commitment model including job scope and overall job satisfaction, did the contribution of the store variable approach significance ( $p = .0910$ ).

### Summary

Of the four null hypotheses of the study, two failed to be rejected and two were rejected. Results of the statistical analysis for the first and second hypotheses revealed no significant differences in organizational commitment ratings by the demographic characteristics posited. For the third and fourth hypotheses, significant relationships were found between organizational commitment and the proposed independent variables. Models explaining a substantial proportion of the variance in organizational commitment were found significant. Thus, the third and fourth null propositions were rejected.

## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of the research was to examine how well job scope and facets of work context satisfaction account for variations in retail managers' organizational commitment. Hackman and Oldham's (1976) job characteristics model was the theoretical framework used as a basis for the study. The focus was on department store managers who had held, for four years or less, a management position in their employing organization. The objectives of the study were to: (1) determine whether the relationships found in previous research among job scope, overall job satisfaction, and organizational commitment exist for retail managers; (2) determine if there is a relationship between separate facets of work context satisfaction (workload, financial rewards, co-worker relations, supervision, and promotion opportunities) and organizational commitment; and (3) identify demographic characteristics that are associated with organizational commitment.

#### Summary of Procedures

A purposive sample of 214 managers was obtained from two regional multiunit department stores located on the west coast of the United States. The study sample included only those managers who were in the process of or had completed, within the last four years, their store's management training program.

The survey was conducted using a mailed, self-administered questionnaire. Utilizing a combination of standard scales previously developed and tested in a variety of organizational settings, data pertaining to the following were collected: (1) demographic characteristics; (2) managers' perceptions of the scope of their present job; (3) overall job satisfaction; (4) satisfaction with facets of the work context; and (5) organizational commitment. The questionnaire response rate was 73.2 percent ( $N = 153$ ) from 209 potential respondents.

Relationships were analyzed between independent variables including demographic characteristics, job scope, overall job satisfaction, and facets of work context satisfaction, and the criterion variable organizational commitment. The major hypotheses were tested using one-way analysis of variance, Pearson product-moment correlations, and multiple regression analysis. Subsequent analyses were conducted to assess the relationships between demographic characteristics, job scope, facets of the work context and overall job satisfaction.

Several study limitations must be acknowledged. The present study involved a specific group of retail managers from only two multiunit department stores. The survey data were collected at one period in time. Thus, the results of the study will require testing across a variety of retail settings before their external validity can be determined.

### Summary of Findings

Results of the multiple regression analyses clearly indicated that the posited predictors of retail managers' organizational commitment accounted for a substantial proportion of the variance in the construct.

The explanatory strength of the primary variables (job scope, overall job satisfaction, and work context satisfaction) used in the study compared favorably with prior organizational commitment research (Bateman & Strasser, 1984; Katerberg, Hom, & Hulin, 1979; Steers, 1977; Stevens, Beyer, & Trice, 1978). Of the variables analyzed, three accounted for most of the variance in commitment: overall job satisfaction, job scope, and satisfaction with opportunities for promotion. Although the regression model including these three independent variables explained 67% of the variance in organizational commitment, only a small portion of the explained variance was due to the unique contribution of any one of the variables. A major portion of the explained variance in commitment was shared by overall job satisfaction, job scope, and promotion satisfaction. However, overall job satisfaction and satisfaction with opportunities for promotion were found to be consistently strong and significant predictors of organizational commitment.

Results of the present study differ, in part, from those previously reported in regard to the relationships of demographic characteristics and organizational commitment. Age, gender, organizational tenure, and education have consistently been found to be positively and significantly correlated with commitment (Angle & Perry, 1981; Buchanan, 1974; Hall & Schneider, 1972; Lee, 1971; Sheldon, 1971; Steers, 1977); however, this was not the case in the present study. This lack of significant findings may be due, somewhat, to the fairly homogeneous nature of the sample in regard to these characteristics.

Age, organizational tenure, amount of previous retail experience, average length of work week, and job longevity were found to have either weak or little association with commitment and were negative in nature.



Although Gable, Hollon, and Dangelo (1984) found that the amount of previous retail experience a manager had prior to joining his/her present organization was a significant predictor of voluntary turnover, such was not the case in relation to commitment.

Finding no significant relationship between retail managers' education and intrinsic job satisfaction, Lucas (1985) suggested that future studies conducted in retail settings examine the associations between area of study and other job factors. The findings of the present study provided no evidence of association between either retail managers' education or area of academic preparation and any of the work outcomes investigated.

Contrary to the findings of previous studies (Angle & Perry, 1981; Grusky, 1966; Hrebiniak & Alutto, 1972), significant differences in organizational commitment ratings by gender were not found. Female managers' commitment ratings were not significantly higher than those of males; a finding possibly due to the younger age of these managers and changes in the current social environment compared to those factors in previous studies.

Analyses conducted subsequent to hypothesis testing revealed significant differences in job scope ratings by job type and by gender. Managers in assistant buyer positions rated their jobs as significantly less challenging than did either department (area) sales managers or managers in other functional specialties. Examination of individual job characteristics revealed that assistant buyers found their jobs significantly lower in task identity, autonomy, job feedback, and in feedback from superiors compared to those in other functional specialties or those in department manager positions. These findings might be

expected considering the differences in the job responsibilities of assistant buyers compared to those of either department managers or other functional specialties. Although the assistant buying job is considered a line position in most retail firms, the actual responsibilities of the assistant buyer are similar to those of a staff position in that the results of one's job performance are not easily evaluated. In comparison, those in sales management positions such as department managers are directly responsible for the operation of their assigned department, a situation in which task identity is more visible, and receive some feedback from the job itself in the form of daily sales reports. Thus, the results and the nature of the assistant buyer position suggest that job scope may be enhanced through more constructive feedback from superiors.

The finding of significant differences by gender indicated that females, as a group, found their positions to be higher in scope than did their male counterparts. In regard to specific job characteristics, females rated their positions as significantly higher in skill variety, task identity, and task significance than did males. No differences in ratings by gender were found for either autonomy, job feedback, or feedback from superiors. It appeared that females found their retail positions to be significantly more meaningful than did males. Whether this finding was due to differences between males and females regarding career expectations, orientation, and/or planning was beyond the scope of the present study, however it is an area that should be addressed in future research.

Work context satisfaction ratings were significantly influenced by only one demographic factor, the retail organization in which the

managers were employed. Managers employed by Store A were significantly more satisfied with the overall context in which they worked than were those of Store B. Of the five separate work context facets examined, significant differences between the two groups of managers were found for satisfaction with opportunities for promotion and for satisfaction with financial rewards. Store A's managers rated these two facets significantly higher than did managers from Store B. Satisfaction with financial rewards was rated higher, by Store A's managers, than any other facet of the work context. A finding possibly due to the fact that Store A's average initial salary offer to college-recruited graduates was approximately \$4,000 higher than that offered by Store B and was in the upper end of the national retail salary range reported by the College Placement Council (1987).

Finally, another set of regression analyses was performed using overall job satisfaction as the criterion variable to compare the predictive power of the primary variables in relation to a dependent variable other than commitment. Many of the variables used in the present study have been found, in previous research, to be antecedents of commitment and also predictors of overall job satisfaction (Bateman & Strasser, 1984; Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982). Results of analyses using simple linear regression indicated that several job characteristic and work context variables were stronger in the prediction of job satisfaction than in accounting for variation in commitment. Among the job characteristic variables, autonomy, job feedback, and feedback from superiors accounted for a larger proportion of the variance in overall job satisfaction than in commitment. Similarly, supervision and workload satisfactions appeared to be more strongly associated with job

satisfaction than as direct correlates of commitment. To determine whether these variables are, in fact, antecedent to overall job satisfaction, rather than direct determinants of commitment was beyond the scope of the present study, but is a needed objective for future research.

### Conclusions

While conclusions drawn from the results of one exploratory study must be carefully considered, the findings of the present study contribute to the current knowledge of specific aspects of the work environment which influence the organizational commitment of retail managers. Although numerous investigations have been conducted for the purpose of identifying factors which influence commitment, a major portion of those investigators used samples of workers from the public sector. Of those few investigations carried out in the retail sector, most have involved lower-level positions or chain store managers. Thus, retail management, particularly department store executives, have been given limited direction from empirical research for the formulation of strategies to develop and retain effective entry-level managers.

The findings of the present study revealed several significant correlates of commitment and overall job satisfaction that retail organizations may be able to influence. The substantial power of satisfaction with opportunities for promotion in predicting organizational commitment provides some evidence as to the importance of informing managers of their career potential and of the career possibilities within the organization. The seeking of opportunities for promotion and the need for achievement have previously been found to be of particular

importance during the advancement stage of a managerial career (Hall & Nougaim, 1968).

Strongly related to overall job satisfaction, the best single predictor of commitment, and to promotion satisfaction was supervision satisfaction. Feedback from superiors was also found to be a significant predictor of overall job satisfaction. Both commitment and overall job satisfaction may be enhanced through retail management's efforts to improve constructive communication between managers and their superiors. Previous research on management trainees in a large communications firm found that in addition to early-employment period job challenge, effective supervision from superiors was highly correlated with later career success (Bray, Campbell, & Grant, 1974). The importance of feedback was also emphasized by the respondents of the present study, through their written comments on the questionnaire. A large percentage made reference to the lack of feedback from superiors or that the only feedback given was negative in nature.

The findings of the present investigation have also made a contribution to the academic body of knowledge. Few studies have investigated both components and global measures of job scope and work context satisfaction. The findings generated from this research provided a richer understanding of the interrelationships among the primary constructs by including analysis of the construct components.

#### Recommendations for Future Research

Based on the results of the present study, the following recommendations for future research are proposed.

1. Replication of the present study, with the following revisions, is needed to test the external validity of the findings for managerial positions in retailing.

- a. Use a larger sample of retail managers from department or specialty stores located in other geographic areas.
- b. Reliability of the co-worker satisfaction scale from the Index of Organizational Reactions (Dunham, Smith, & Blackburn, 1977) may be improved by specifying the co-worker reference group (other managers or subordinates) to be evaluated by the potential respondent.
- c. Reliability of some of the sub-scales from the Job Diagnostic Survey (Hackman & Oldham, 1975) may be improved by using the suggestions recently proposed by Idaszak and Drasgow (1987).

2. An especially critical research need is the examination of causal relationships between the primary variables of the present study. This type of investigation would require studies of longitudinal and/or experimental design, however the practical feasibility of such studies in a field setting is questionable.

3. The strong relationships of supervision satisfaction and feedback from superiors with overall job satisfaction and indirectly with commitment pose a need to examine the frequency, nature, and content of the feedback given the new manager regarding his/her past and current job performance and future career potential.

4. Few empirical studies have examined the influence of nonwork factors, such as personal goals, values, and lifestyle considerations on work outcomes such as organizational commitment and overall job satisfaction. This may prove a particularly fruitful area of research for

expanding current knowledge concerning retail manager's responses to work factors. Retail practitioners often state that an individual's orientation to retailing is dichotomous in nature; either a love or hate relationship. If further research could identify nonwork characteristics, goals, and/or values that contribute to manager's personal compatibility with his/her retail career, several benefits could be derived. This information would be of particular importance to academic advisers, instructors, and personnel development managers in making decisions concerning the preparation, educational needs, and recruitment of future retail managers. For individuals considering retail careers such information would be of specific import during their process of career assessment and planning.

## SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aldag, R. J., & Brief, A. P. (1975). Impact of individual differences on affective responses to task characteristics. Journal of Business Research, 3, 311-321.
- Angle, H. L., & Perry, J. L. (1981). An empirical assessment of organizational commitment and organizational effectiveness. Administrative Science Quarterly, 26, 1-13.
- Arnold, D. R., Capella, L. M., & Smith, G. D. (1983). Strategic retail management. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Bateman, T. F., & Strasser, S. (1984). A longitudinal analysis of antecedents of organizational commitment. Academy of Management Journal, 27, 95-112.
- Beisel, J. L. (1987). Contemporary retailing. New York: Macmillan.
- Berlew, D. E., & Hall, D. T. (1966). The socialization of managers: Effects of expectations on performance. Administrative Science Quarterly, 11, 207-223.
- Bluedorn, A. C. (1982). A unified model of turnover from organizations. Human Relations, 35, 135-153.
- Bray, D. W., Campbell, R. J., & Grant, D. L. (1974). Formative years in business. New York: Wiley.
- Brousseau, K. R. (1983). Toward a dynamic model of jobperson relationships: Findings, research questions, and implications for work system design. Academy of Management Review, 8, 33-45.
- Buchanan, B. (1974). Building organizational commitment: The socialization of managers in work organizations. Administrative Science Quarterly, 19, 533-546.
- Bustiner, I. (1975-76). Current personnel practices in department stores. Journal of Retailing, 51(4), 3-14, 86.
- Cohen, M. S., & Schwartz, A. R. (1980). U. S. labor turnover: Analysis of a new measure. Monthly Labor Review, 103(11), 9-13.
- College Placement Council. (1987). CPC salary survey (CPC Report No. 2). Bethlehem, PA: Author.



- Cook, J. D., Hepworth, S. J., Wall, T. D., & Warr, P. B. (1981). The experience of work: A compendium and review of 249 measures and their use. New York: Academic Press.
- Dalton, G. W., Thompson, P. H., & Price, R. (1977). Career stages: A model of professional careers in organizations. Organizational Dynamics, 6(3), 19-42.
- Dillman, D. A. (1978). Mail and telephone surveys: The total design method. New York: Wiley.
- Donnelly, J. H., & Etzel, M. J. (1977). Retail store performance and job satisfaction: A study of anxiety-stress and propensity to leave among retail employees. Journal of Retailing, 53(2), 23-28.
- Dubinsky, A. J., & Skinner, S. J. (1984a). Impact of job characteristics on retail salespeople's reactions to their jobs. Journal of Retailing, 60(2), 35-62.
- Dubinsky, A. J., & Skinner, S. J. (1984b). Turnover tendencies among retail salespeople: Relationships with job satisfaction and demographic characteristics. American Marketing Association Educators' Proceedings, 50, 153-157.
- Dunham, R. B. (1976). The measurement and dimensionality of job characteristics. Journal of Applied Psychology, 61(4), 404-409.
- Dunham, R. B. (1977). Reactions to job characteristics: Moderating effects of the organization. Academy of Management Journal, 20, 42-65.
- Dunham, R. B., Aldag, R. J., & Brief, A. P. (1977). Dimensionality of task design as measured by the Job Diagnostic Survey. Academy of Management Journal, 20(2), 209-223.
- Dunham, R. B., Smith, F. J., & Blackburn, R. S. (1977). Validation of the Index of Organizational Reactions with the JDI, the MSQ and Faces scales. Academy of Management Journal, 20, 420-432.
- Evan, W. M. (1963). Peer-group interaction and organizational socialization: A study of employee turnover. American Sociological Review, 28, 436-440.
- Farh, J., & Scott, W. E. (1983). The experimental effects of "autonomy" on performance and self-reports of satisfaction. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 31, 203-222.
- Farrell, D., & Rusbult, C. E. (1981). Exchange variables as predictors of job satisfaction, job commitment, and turnover: The impact of rewards, costs, alternatives, and investments. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 28, 78-95.
- Feldman, D. C. (1976). A contingency theory of socialization. Administrative Science Quarterly, 21, 433-452.

- Freund, R. J., & Littell, R. C. (1986). SAS system for regression. Cary, NC: SAS Institute.
- Gable, M., & Hollon, C. (1984). Employee turnover of managerial trainees in a department store chain. Retail Control, 52(5), 54-61.
- Gable, M., Hollon, C. J., & Dangelo, F. (1984). Predicting voluntary managerial trainee turnover in a large retailing organization from information on an employment application blank. Journal of Retailing, 60(4), 43-63.
- Gould, S., & Hawkins, B. L. (1978). Organizational career stage as a moderator of the satisfaction-performance relationship. Academy of Management Journal, 21, 434-450.
- Greenwood, K. M., & Murphy, M. F. (1978). Fashion innovation and marketing. New York: Macmillan.
- Grusky, O. (1966). Career mobility and organizational commitment. Academy of Management Journal, 10, 488-503.
- Guilford, J. (1954). Psychometric methods (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1975). Development of the Job Diagnostic Survey. Journal of Applied Psychology, 60(2), 159-170.
- Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1976). Motivation through the design of work: Test of a theory. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 16, 250-279.
- Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1980). Work redesign. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Hall, D. T. (1976). Careers in organizations. Pacific Palisades, CA: Goodyear.
- Hall, D. T. (1986). An overview of current career development theory. In D. T. Hall (Ed.), Career development in organizations (pp. 1-20). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hall, D. T., & Nougaim, K. (1968). An examination of Maslow's need hierarchy in an organizational setting. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 3, 12-35.
- Hall, D. T., & Schneider, B. (1972). Correlates of organizational identification as a function of career and organizational type. Administrative Science Quarterly, 17, 340-350.
- Hall, D. T., & Schneider, B., & Nygren, H. T. (1970). Personal factors in organizational identification. Administrative Science Quarterly, 15, 176-190.

- Harvey, R. A., & Smith, R. D. (1972). Need satisfaction in retail management: An empirical study. Journal of Retailing, 48(3), 89-95.
- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., Peterson, R. O., & Capwell, R. (1957). Job attitudes: Review of research and opinions. Pittsburg, PA: Pittsburg Psychological Services.
- Hom, P. W., Katerberg, R., & Hulin, C. L. (1979). Comparative examination of three approaches to the prediction of turnover. Journal of Applied Psychology, 64(3), 280-290.
- Hrebiniak, L. G., & Alutto, J. A. (1972). Personal and role related factors in the development of organizational commitment. Administrative Science Quarterly, 17, 555-573.
- Idaszak, J. R., & Drasgow, F. (1987). A revision of the Job Diagnostic Survey: Elimination of a measurement artifact. Journal of Applied Psychology, 72(1), 69-74.
- Kanter, R. M. (1968). Commitment and social organization: A study of commitment mechanisms in utopian communities. American Sociological Review, 33, 499-517.
- Katerberg, R., Hom, P. W., & Hulin, C. L. (1979). Effects of job complexity on the reactions of part-time employees. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 24, 317-332.
- Katz, R. (1978). Job longevity as a situational factor in job satisfaction. Administrative Science Quarterly, 23, 204-223.
- Kelly, J. P., Gable, M., & Hise, R. T. (1981). Conflict, clarity, tension, and satisfaction in chain store manager roles. Journal of Retailing, 57(1), 27-42.
- Kerlinger, F. N. (1973). Foundations of behavioral research (2nd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.
- Kiesler, C. A. (1971). The psychology of commitment: Experiments linking behavior to belief. New York: Academic Press.
- Koch, J. L., & Steers, R. M. (1978). Job attachment, satisfaction, and turnover among public sector employees. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 12, 119-128.
- Lake, M. A. (1982, April). Recruiting. Stores, 64, 63-67, 70-71.
- Lawler, E. E., III. (1971). Pay and organizational effectiveness: A psychological view. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Lewison, D. M., & DeLozier, M. W. (1986). Retailing (2nd ed.). Columbus, OH: Merrill.
- Lucas, G. H. (1985). The relationships between job attitudes, personal characteristics, and job outcomes: A study of retail store managers. Journal of Retailing, 61(1), 35-62.

- Lusch, R. F., & Stampfl, R. W. (1983). New realities of retail management. Proceedings of the American Marketing Association Educators' Conference, pp. 122-132.
- March, J. G., & Simon, H. A. (1958). Organizations. New York: Wiley.
- Marsh, R. M., & Mannari, H. (1977). Organizational commitment and turnover: A prediction study. Administrative Science Quarterly, 22, 57-75.
- Milkovich, G. T., & Anderson, J. C. (1982). Career planning and development systems. In K. M. Rowland & G. R. Ferris (Eds.), Personnel management (pp. 364-389). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Morris, J., & Steers, R. M. (1980). Structural influences on organizational commitment. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 17, 50-57.
- Mowday, R. T., Porter, L. W., & Steers, R. M. (1982). Employee-organizational linkages: The psychology of commitment, absenteeism, and turnover. New York: Academic Press.
- Mowday, R. T., Steers, R. M., & Porter, L. W. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 14, 224-247.
- Muchinsky, P. M., & Tuttle, M. L. (1979). Employee turnover: An empirical and methodological assessment. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 14, 43-77.
- Neter, J., Wasserman, W., & Kutner, M. H. (1983). Applied linear regression models. Homewood, IL: Irwin.
- Nunnally, J. C. (1967). Psychometric theory. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Oldham, G. R. (1976). Job characteristics and internal motivation: The moderating effect of interpersonal and individual variables. Human Relations, 29, 559-569.
- Oldham, G. R., & Hackman, J. R. (1980). Work design in the organizational context. In B. M. Staw & L. L. Cummings (Eds.), Research in organizational behavior (Vol. 2, pp. 247-278). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Oldham, G. R., Hackman, J. R., & Pearce, J. L. (1976). Conditions under which employees respond positively to enriched work. Journal of Applied Psychology, 61, 395-403.
- Oliver, R. L., & Brief, A. P. (1977-78). Determinants and consequences of role conflict and ambiguity among retail sales managers. Journal of Retailing, 53(Winter), 47-58, 90.
- Peter, J. P. (1979). Reliability: A review of psychometric basics and recent marketing practices. Journal of Marketing Research, 16(1), 6-17.

- Pierce, J. L., Dunham, R. B., & Blackburn, R. S. (1979). Social systems structure, job design, and growth need strength: A test of a congruency model. Academy of Management Journal, 22, 223-240.
- Porter, L. W., Crampon, W. J., & Smith, F. J. (1976). Organizational commitment and managerial turnover: A longitudinal study. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 15, 87-98.
- Porter, L. W., Lawler, E. E., III., & Hackman, J. R. (1975). Behavior in organizations. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Porter, L. W., & Steers, R. M. (1973). Organizational, work, and personal factors in employee turnover and absenteeism. Psychological Bulletin, 80, 151-176.
- Porter, L. W., Steers, R. M., Mowday, R. T., & Boulian, P. V. (1974). Organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover among psychiatric technicians. Journal of Applied Psychology, 59, 603-609.
- Powell, A., & Feinberg, R. A. (1984). Maybe we want them to leave: A further look at employee turnover in retailing. Retail Control, 52(10), 50-57.
- Price, C. L., & Mueller, C. W. (1981). A causal model of turnover for nurses. Academy of Management Journal, 24, 543-565.
- Salancik, G. R. (1977). Commitment and the control of organizational behavior and belief. In B. M. Staw & G. R. Salancik (Eds.), New directions in organizational behavior. Chicago: St. Clair Press.
- Saunders, C. B., & Deebie, C. T. (1965-66). The personality structure of a group of chain store buyers, with implications for management. Journal of Retailing, 41(Winter), 37-47.
- Schein, E. G. (1978). Career dynamics: Matching individual and organizational needs. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Schulz, D. P. (1986). Top 100 department stores. Stores, 68(7), 13-24.
- Sheldon, M. E. (1971). Investments and involvements as mechanisms producing commitment to the organization. Administrative Science Quarterly, 16, 142-150.
- Sheth, J. N. (1983). Emerging trends for the retailing industry. Journal of Retailing, 59(3), 6-18.
- Siegel, J. P., & Slevin, D. P. (1974). Need satisfaction and performance of department store buyers and department managers: Implications for management. Journal of Retailing, 50(Spring), 67-72.

- Sims, H. P., & Szilagyi, A. D. (1976). Job characteristics relationships: Individual and structural moderators. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 17, 211-230.
- Smith, F., Roberts, K. H., & Hulin, C. L. (1976). Ten year job satisfaction trends in a stable organization. Academy of Management Journal, 19, 462-469.
- Staw, B. M. (1980). Rationality and justification in organizational life. In B. M. Staw & L. L. Cummings (Eds.), Research in organizational behavior (Vol. 2, pp. 45-80). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Steers, R. M. (1977). Antecedents and outcomes of organizational commitment. Administrative Science Quarterly, 22, 46-56.
- Stevens, J. M., Beyer, J., & Trice, H. M. (1978). Assessing personal, role, and organizational predictors of managerial commitment. Academy of Management Journal, 21, 380-396.
- Stone, E. F., Mowday, R. T., & Porter, L. W. (1977). Higher order need strengths as moderators of the job scope-job satisfaction relationship. Journal of Applied Psychology, 62(4), 466-471.
- Stone, E., & Samples, J. A. (1985). Fashion merchandising, an introduction (4th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Strauss, G. (1982). Personnel management: Prospect for the eighties. In K. M. Rowland & G. R. Ferris (Eds.), Personnel management (pp. 504-545). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Super, D., Crites, J., Hummel, R., Moser, H., Overstreet, P., & Wanath, C. (1957). Vocational development: A framework for research. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (1983). Using multivariate statistics. New York: Harper & Row.
- Teas, R. K. (1981). A test of a model of department store salespeople's job satisfaction. Journal of Retailing, 57(1), 3-25.
- Van Maanen, J., & Katz, R. (1976). Individuals and their careers: Some temporal considerations for work satisfaction. Personnel Psychology, 29, 601-616.
- Vroom, V. (1964). Work and motivation. New York: Wiley.
- Wall, T. D., Clegg, C. W., & Jackson, P. R. (1978). An evaluation of the Job Characteristics Model. Journal of Occupational Psychology, 51, 183-196.
- Wanous, J. P. (1977). Organizational entry: Newcomers moving from outside to inside. Psychological Bulletin, 84, 601-618.

- Waters, L. K., Roach, D., & Waters, C. W. (1976). Estimates of future tenure, satisfaction, and biographical variables as predictors of termination. Personnel Psychology, 29, 57-60.
- White, J. K. (1978). Individual differences and the job quality-worker response relationship: Review, integration and comments. Academy of Management Review, 3, 267-280.
- Yankelovich, D. (1981, April). New rules in American life: Searching for self-fulfillment in a world turned upside down. Psychology Today, pp. 35-91.

## APPENDIXES



## APPENDIX A

### CORRESPONDENCE FOR THE SURVEY

## O K L A H O M A   S T A T E   U N I V E R S I T Y

## Department of Clothing, Textiles &amp; Merchandising

May 1987

Name  
Address

In the past few years there has been a great deal of discussion about the development of retail managers and working conditions in retailing. Some of the questions being asked within the retail industry and by educators include these: do instructional programs adequately prepare individuals for the realities of retailing; how do retail managers feel about their job responsibilities and working environment; and how should management training and job assignments be designed to maximize the career development of retail managers?

As a retail manager, (store name) is interested in what you think about these issues. Your input is particularly important to personnel development managers, instructors and advisers since it will help them in making decisions about the preparation and training needs of future retail managers.

You have been selected as one of a small number of managers employed by (store name) to give your opinions on these matters. Your participation in the study is completely voluntary, however in order that the results will truly represent the thinking of retail managers in your organization, it is important that each questionnaire be completed and returned. You may be assured of complete confidentiality. The identification number on the outside of the return envelope is for mailing purposes only. This is so your name can be removed from the mailing list when the questionnaire is returned. Neither your name nor the identification number will be placed on the questionnaire.

The results of this research will be made available to officials and representatives at Oklahoma State University. A summary of the results will be given to the management of (store name) and other interested retail firms. You may receive a summary of results by writing "copy of results requested" on the back of the return envelope, and printing your name and address below it. Please do not put this information on the questionnaire itself.

We would be most happy to answer any questions you might have. Please feel free to write us at the above address or call (503) 754-3796 or (503) 929-4099. Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Cheryl L. Jordan  
Graduate Student

Dr. Grovalynn Sisler, Professor  
and Head of Department

(Postcard Reminder)

May, 1987

Last week a questionnaire seeking your opinion about the career development of retail managers and working conditions in retailing was mailed to you. Your name was drawn in a sample of retail managers who completed the management training program in your organization.

If you have already completed and returned it, please accept our sincere thanks. If not, please do so today. Because it has been sent to only a small, but representative, sample of retail managers, it is extremely important that yours also be included in the study if the results are to accurately represent the opinions of managers in your organization.

If by some chance you did not receive the questionnaire, or it got misplaced, please call right now, collect (503-929-4099) and we will get another one in the mail to you today.

Sincerely,

Cheryl L. Jordan  
Graduate Student

Dr. Grovalynn Sisler, Professor  
and Head of Department

## O K L A H O M A   S T A T E   U N I V E R S I T Y

Department of Clothing, Textiles &amp; Merchandising

June 1987

Name  
Address

About three weeks ago we wrote to you seeking your opinion on the career development of retail managers and working conditions in retailing. As of today we have not yet received your completed questionnaire.

Our research unit has undertaken this study because of the belief that managers' opinions should be taken into account in the formation of objectives for the preparation and training of future retail managers.

We are writing to you again because of the significance each questionnaire has to the usefulness of this study. Your name was drawn as one of a small number of managers employed by (store name). In order for the results of this study to be truly representative of the opinions of (store name) managers who completed the executive training program, it is essential that each person in the sample return their questionnaire. As stated in our last letter, you may be assured of complete confidentiality. Neither your name nor the identification number on the return envelope will be placed on the questionnaire. The identification number is for mailing purposes only.

In the event that your questionnaire has been misplaced, a replacement is enclosed.

Your cooperation is greatly appreciated.

Cordially,

Cheryl L. Jordan  
Graduate StudentDr. Grovalynn Sisler, Professor  
and Head of Department

## O K L A H O M A   S T A T E   U N I V E R S I T Y

Department of Clothing, Textiles &amp; Merchabdising

June 1987

Name

Address

We are writing to you about our study of manager opinions regarding the career development of retail managers and working conditions in retailing. We have not yet received your completed questionnaire.

The large number of questionnaires returned is very encouraging. But, whether we will be able to describe accurately how retail managers feel about these important issues depends upon you and the others who have not yet responded. This is because our past experiences suggest that those of you who have not yet sent in your questionnaire may hold quite different opinions than those who have.

This is the first study of department store managers' perceptions of their job responsibilities, that has ever been done. Thus, the results are of particular importance to students considering retail management careers, educators, and personnel development managers who are in the process of making decisions concerning the types of preparation and training you feel would best meet the needs of retail managers like yourself. The usefulness of our results depends on how accurately we are able to describe what retail managers think about these issues.

It is for these reasons that we are sending you this letter. In case our other correspondence did not reach you, a replacement questionnaire is enclosed. May we urge you to complete and return it as quickly as possible.

We will be happy to send you a copy of the results, if you want one. Simply put your name, address, and "copy of results requested" on the back of the return envelope. We expect to have them ready to send this Fall.

Your contribution to the success of this study will be appreciated greatly.

Most sincerely,

Cheryl L. Jordan  
Graduate Student

Dr. Grovalynn Sisler, Professor  
and Head of Department

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE

1. An important purpose of this study is to learn more about the kinds of experiences managers encounter in their job. Thus, this part of the questionnaire asks you to describe your present job, as objectively as you can. On a scale from 1 to 7, please circle the ONE number, which is the most accurate description of your present job for each of the questions listed below.

EXAMPLE: To what extent does your job require you to work with computerized equipment?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very little; the job requires almost no contact with computerized equipment of any kind.			Moderately			Very much; the job requires almost constant work with computerized equipment.

If, for example your job requires you to work with computerized equipment a good deal of the time, but also requires some paper work to be done by hand, you might circle the number 6, as was done in the example above.

- a) How much autonomy is there in your job? That is, to what extent does your job permit you to decide on your own how to go about doing the work?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very little; the job gives me almost no personal "say" about when and how the work is done.			Moderate autonomy; many things are standardized and not under my control, but I can make some decisions.			Very much; the job gives me almost complete responsibility for deciding how and when the work is done.

- b) To what extent does your job involve completing identifiable job responsibilities? That is, does the job require you to complete specific responsibilities which can be identified as contributing to the primary goals of the company?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
My job makes only a minor contribution to the primary goals of the company.			My job makes a moderate contribution to the primary goals of the company.			My job makes a major contribution to the primary goals of the company.

- c) How much variety is there in your job? That is, to what extent does the job require you to do many different things at work, using a variety of your skills and talents?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very little; the job requires me to do the same routine things over and over again.			Moderate variety			Very much; the job requires me to do many different things, using a number of different skills and talents.

- d) In general, how significant or important is your job? That is, are the results of your work likely to significantly affect the lives or well-being of other people?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not very significant; the outcomes of my work are not likely to have important effects on other people.			Moderately significant			Highly significant; the outcomes of my work can affect other people in very important ways.

- e) To what extent do superiors let you know how well you are doing on your job?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very little; people almost never let me know how well I am doing.			Moderately; sometimes people may give me "feedback"; other times they may not.			Very much; superiors provide me with almost constant "feedback" about how well I am doing.

- f) To what extent does doing the job itself provide you with information about your work performance? That is, does the actual work itself provide clues about how well you are doing—aside from any "feedback" co-workers or superiors may provide?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very little; the job is set up so that I could work forever without finding out how well I am doing.			Moderately; sometimes doing the job provides "feedback" to me; sometimes it does not.			Very much; the job itself is set up so I get almost constant "feedback" as I work about how well I am doing.

(PLEASE TURN THE PAGE)

2. Listed below are a number of statements which could be used to describe a job. Please indicate how accurate or inaccurate each statement is in describing your job. Please try to be as objective as you can in deciding how accurately each statement describes your job—regardless of whether you like or dislike the job. (Circle ONE number for each statement.)

	Very Inaccurate	Mostly Inaccurate	Slightly Inaccurate	Uncertain	Slightly Accurate	Mostly Accurate	Very Accurate
a) The job requires me to use a number of complex or high-level skills.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
b) The job is arranged so that I do not have the chance to take on job responsibilities which make a contribution to the goals of the company.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
c) Just doing the work required by the job provides many chances for me to figure out how well I am doing.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
d) The job is quite simple and repetitive.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
e) My superiors almost <u>never</u> give me any feedback about how well I am doing in my job.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
f) This job is one where a lot of other people can be affected by how well the work gets done.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
g) The job denies me any chance to use my personal initiative or judgment in carrying out the work.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
h) Superiors often let me know how well they think I am performing the job.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
i) The job provides me the chance to take on job responsibilities which make an identifiable contribution to the goals of the company.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
j) The job itself provides very few clues about whether or not I am performing well.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
k) The job gives me considerable opportunity for independence and freedom in how I do the work.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
l) The job itself is not very significant or important in the broader scheme of things....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

3. The following statements represent possible feelings that individuals might have about work in general. With respect to your own feelings, about work in general, please indicate the degree of your own agreement or disagreement with each statement by circling ONE of the seven responses.

	Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Slightly Agree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree
a) I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help this organization be successful.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
b) I talk up this organization to my friends as a great organization to work for..	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
c) I feel very little loyalty to this organization.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

(PLEASE TURN THE PAGE)



	Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Slightly Agree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree
d) I would accept almost any type of job assignment in order to keep working for this organization.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
e) I find that my values and the organization's values are very similar.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
f) I am proud to tell others that I am part of this organization.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
g) I could just as well be working for a different organization as long as the type of work was similar.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
h) This organization really inspires the very best in me in the way of job performance.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
i) It would take very little change in my present circumstances to cause me to leave this organization.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
j) I am extremely glad that I chose this organization to work for over others I was considering at the time I was hired.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
k) There is not too much to be gained by sticking with this organization indefinitely.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

l) Often, I find it difficult to agree with this organization's policies on important matters relating to its employees.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
m) I really care about the fate of this organization..	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
n) For me this is the best of all possible organizations for which to work.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
o) Deciding to work for this organization was a definite mistake on my part.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

4. The statements below represent possible feelings you might have about your present job. In the following table, please indicate the degree of your own agreement or disagreement with each statement by circling ONE of the seven responses.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Neutral	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
a) Generally speaking, I am very satisfied with this job.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
b) I am generally satisfied with the kind of work I do in this job.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
c) I frequently think of quitting this job.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
d) Most of the other people in my organization who hold the same job as I do are very satisfied with the job...	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
e) Most of the other people in my organization who hold the same job as I do often think of quitting.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

(PLEASE TURN THE PAGE)

5. I feel my workload is: *(Circle one number)*
- 1 ALMOST ALWAYS TOO HEAVY
  - 2 OFTEN TOO HEAVY
  - 3 SOMETIMES TOO HEAVY
  - 4 SELDOM TOO HEAVY
  - 5 NEVER TOO HEAVY
6. How does the amount of work you are expected to do influence the way you do your job? *(Circle one number)*
- 1 IT NEVER ALLOWS ME TO DO A GOOD JOB
  - 2 IT SELDOM ALLOWS ME TO DO A GOOD JOB
  - 3 IT HAS NO EFFECT ON HOW I DO MY JOB
  - 4 IT USUALLY ALLOWS ME TO DO A GOOD JOB
  - 5 IT ALWAYS ALLOWS ME TO DO A GOOD JOB
7. How does the amount of work you are expected to do influence your overall attitude toward your job? *(Circle one number.)*
- 1 IT HAS A VERY UNFAVORABLE INFLUENCE
  - 2 IT HAS AN UNFAVORABLE INFLUENCE
  - 3 IT HAS NO INFLUENCE ONE WAY OR THE OTHER
  - 4 IT HAS A FAVORABLE INFLUENCE
  - 5 IT HAS A VERY FAVORABLE INFLUENCE
8. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the supervision you receive? *(Circle one number)*
- 1 I AM VERY DISSATISFIED
  - 2 I AM SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED
  - 3 I AM ONLY MODERATELY SATISFIED
  - 4 I AM SATISFIED
  - 5 I AM VERY SATISFIED
9. The supervision I receive is the kind that: *(Circle one number)*
- 1 GREATLY DISCOURAGES ME FROM GIVING EXTRA EFFORT
  - 2 TENDS TO DISCOURAGE ME FROM GIVING EXTRA EFFORT
  - 3 HAS LITTLE INFLUENCE ON ME
  - 4 ENCOURAGES ME TO GIVE EXTRA EFFORT
  - 5 GREATLY ENCOURAGES ME TO GIVE EXTRA EFFORT
10. How does the way you are treated by those who supervise you influence your overall attitude toward your job?  
*(Circle one number)*
- 1 IT HAS A VERY UNFAVORABLE INFLUENCE
  - 2 IT HAS A SLIGHTLY UNFAVORABLE INFLUENCE
  - 3 IT HAS NO REAL INFLUENCE
  - 4 IT HAS A SLIGHTLY FAVORABLE INFLUENCE
  - 5 IT HAS A VERY FAVORABLE INFLUENCE
11. How do you generally feel about the employees you work with? *(Circle one number)*
- 1 I DO NOT PARTICULARLY CARE FOR THEM
  - 2 I HAVE NO FEELING ONE WAY OR THE OTHER
  - 3 I LIKE THEM FAIRLY WELL
  - 4 I LIKE THEM A GREAT DEAL
  - 5 THEY ARE THE BEST GROUP I COULD ASK FOR
12. The example my fellow employees set: *(Circle one number)*
- 1 GREATLY DISCOURAGES ME FROM WORKING HARD
  - 2 SOMEWHAT DISCOURAGES ME FROM WORKING HARD
  - 3 HAS LITTLE EFFECT ON ME
  - 4 SOMEWHAT ENCOURAGES ME TO WORK HARD
  - 5 GREATLY ENCOURAGES ME TO WORK HARD
13. How much does the way co-workers handle their jobs add to the success of your organization? *(Circle one number)*
- 1 IT ADDS ALMOST NOTHING
  - 2 IT ADDS VERY LITTLE
  - 3 IT ADDS ONLY A LITTLE
  - 4 IT ADDS QUITE A BIT
  - 5 IT ADDS A VERY GREAT DEAL
14. To what extent are your needs satisfied by the pay and benefits you receive? *(Circle one number)*
- 1 ALMOST NONE OF MY NEEDS ARE SATISFIED
  - 2 VERY FEW OF MY NEEDS ARE SATISFIED
  - 3 SOME OF MY NEEDS ARE SATISFIED
  - 4 MANY OF MY NEEDS ARE SATISFIED
  - 5 ALMOST ALL OF MY NEEDS ARE SATISFIED
15. For the job I do, I feel the amount of money I make is: *(Circle one number)*
- 1 VERY POOR
  - 2 FAIRLY POOR
  - 3 NEITHER GOOD NOR POOR
  - 4 FAIRLY GOOD
  - 5 VERY GOOD
16. Considering what it cost to live in this area, my pay is: *(Circle one number)*
- 1 VERY INADEQUATE
  - 2 INADEQUATE
  - 3 BARELY ADEQUATE
  - 4 ADEQUATE
  - 5 MORE THAN ADEQUATE

(PLEASE TURN THE PAGE)

17. How do you feel about your future with this organization? (Circle one number)

- 1 I AM VERY WORRIED ABOUT IT
- 2 I AM SOMEWHAT WORRIED ABOUT IT
- 3 I HAVE MIXED FEELINGS
- 4 I FEEL GOOD ABOUT IT
- 5 I FEEL VERY GOOD ABOUT IT

18. The way my future with the company looks to me now: (Circle one number)

- 1 HARD WORK SEEMS ALMOST WORTHLESS
- 2 HARD WORK SEEMS HARDLY WORTHWHILE
- 3 HARD WORK SEEMS WORTHWHILE
- 4 HARD WORK SEEMS FAIRLY WORTHWHILE
- 5 HARD WORK SEEMS VERY WORTHWHILE

19. How do you feel about the progress you are making in the company? (Circle one number)

- 1 I AM MAKING NO PROGRESS
- 2 I AM MAKING VERY LITTLE PROGRESS
- 3 I AM NOT SURE
- 4 I AM MAKING SOME PROGRESS
- 5 I AM MAKING A GREAT DEAL OF PROGRESS

The following questions are designed to help us interpret our findings accurately. We would appreciate your answers.

20. What is your present job title?

\_\_\_\_\_ JOB TITLE

21. What is the average number of hours you work per week in your present job?

\_\_\_\_\_ AVERAGE HOURS PER WEEK

22. How many months have you been working in your present job?

\_\_\_\_\_ TOTAL MONTHS

23. How many months have you been employed by your present organization in any capacity?

\_\_\_\_\_ TOTAL MONTHS

24. How many months of full-time retail experience did you have prior to joining your present organization?

\_\_\_\_\_ TOTAL MONTHS

25. Which of the following best describes your annual salary, before taxes, for your present job? Your best estimate is fine. (Circle the number of the appropriate category)

- 1 UNDER \$10,000
- 2 \$10,000 TO \$14,999
- 3 \$15,000 TO \$19,999
- 4 \$20,000 TO \$25,999
- 5 \$26,000 TO \$30,999
- 6 \$31,000 TO \$35,999
- 7 \$36,000 TO \$40,999
- 8 \$41,000 OR MORE

26. How old were you on your last birthday?

\_\_\_\_\_ YEARS

27. You are:

- 1 MALE
- 2 FEMALE

28. What is the highest level of education you have completed? (Circle one number)

- 1 GRADE 11 OR LESS
- 2 HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMA OR EQUIVALENT
- 3 TECHNICAL OR TRADE SCHOOL BEYOND HIGH SCHOOL
- 4 SOME COMMUNITY COLLEGE
- 5 TWO-YEAR COLLEGE DEGREE OR CERTIFICATE
- 6 SOME FOUR-YEAR COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY
- 7 COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY BACHELOR'S DEGREE
- 8 SOME GRADUATE WORK
- 9 GRADUATE DEGREE

28A. Please list your degree(s) and major area(s) of study:

DEGREE (e.g., BA, MBA)	MAJOR AREA
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

(PLEASE TURN THE PAGE)

29. What is your present marital status? (Circle one number)

- 1 SINGLE, NEVER MARRIED
- 2 DIVORCED/SEPARATED
- 3 WIDOWED
- 4 LIVING WITH A PARTNER
- 5 MARRIED

29A. Is your spouse/partner presently: (Circle one number)

- 1 EMPLOYED FULL-TIME FOR PAY
- 2 EMPLOYED PART-TIME FOR PAY
- 3 NOT WORKING OUTSIDE THE HOME FOR PAY
- 4 UNEMPLOYED
- 5 RETIRED
- 6 OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY) \_\_\_\_\_

30. How many children, if any, are living in your household? Please indicate the number for each age group listed below.  
(If "none", write "0")

NUMBER OF CHILDREN:

- \_\_\_\_\_ UNDER 5 YEARS OF AGE
- \_\_\_\_\_ 5 TO 10 YEARS
- \_\_\_\_\_ 11 TO 15 YEARS
- \_\_\_\_\_ 16 AND OVER

31. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about your job, and/or your work environment? If so, please use the space below for that purpose.

---

YOUR CONTRIBUTION TO THIS EFFORT IS GREATLY APPRECIATED.  
THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION.

## APPENDIX C

### CORRELATION MATRIX OF STUDY VARIABLES

	AUTO	TID	SKILL	TASK	JFEED	SFEED	WKL	SUP	COWK	PAY	FUT	HRSWK	MOSPJ	TENURE	RETEXP	AGE	CHILD	JS	OJSAT	WCSAT	OCQ
AUTO	-----																				
TID	.34**	-----																			
SKILL	.24**	.55**	-----																		
TASK	.33**	.61**	.54**	-----																	
JFEED	.45**	.45**	.43**	.37**	-----																
SFEED	.33**	.41**	.25**	.24**	.46**	-----															
WKL	.24**	.11	.11	.18*	.14	.16*	-----														
SUP	.39**	.36**	.28**	.34**	.40**	.60**	.31**	-----													
COWK	.22**	.42**	.34**	.43**	.26**	.11	.15	.20*	-----												
PAY	.11	.24**	.24**	.22**	.17*	.16*	.20*	.19*	.26**	-----											
FUT	.39**	.51**	.48**	.50**	.47**	.46**	.33**	.57**	.32**	.38**	-----										
HRSWK	-.08	.05	.12	-.01	.05	.03	-.27**	-.09	-.19*	.09	.03	-----									
MOSPJ	.02	-.17*	-.16*	-.16*	.01	-.14	-.03	-.18*	-.15	-.24**	-.28**	-.18*	-----								
TENURE	.04	-.05	-.06	-.05	.03	-.05	.13	-.03	-.05	-.22**	-.12	-.24**	.18*	-----							
RETEXP	.07	.13	.14	.13	.06	.10	-.05	.08	.09	-.12	-.05	-.03	.06	-.11	-----						
AGE	-.15	-.16*	-.10	-.16*	.03	-.03	.01	-.10	-.11	-.20*	-.19*	-.01	.20*	.20*	.29**	-----					
CHILD	-.06	.01	-.02	.09	-.09	-.03	.16*	-.07	.03	.04	-.09	-.01	.03	.06	.04	.11	-----				
JS	.62**	.79**	.77**	.77**	.74**	.45**	.21*	.47**	.45**	.26**	.63**	.04	-.13	-.03	.15	-.14	-.02	-----			
OJSAT	.52**	.40**	.43**	.47**	.51**	.41**	.42**	.55**	.30**	.32**	.65**	-.13	-.23**	-.01	-.01	-.12	.04	.63**	-----		
WCSAT	.42**	.49**	.44**	.49**	.45**	.49**	.58**	.74**	.51**	.64**	.81**	-.03	-.27**	-.10	-.02	-.19*	.01	.61**	.69**	-----	
OCQ	.37**	.48**	.48**	.51**	.49**	.33**	.38**	.45**	.35**	.36**	.71**	.05	-.24**	-.04	-.04	-.08	.05	.63**	.76**	.68**	-----

Note: AUTO = Autonomy; TID = Task Identity; SKILL = Skill Variety; TASK = Task Significance; JFEED = Job Feedback; SFEED = Feedback from Superiors; WKL = Workload Satisfaction; SUP = Supervision Satisfaction; COWK = Co-worker Satisfaction; PAY = Financial Satisfaction; FUT = Promotion Satisfaction; HRSWK = Average Hours of Work per Week; MOSPJ = Months in Present Job; TENURE = Organizational Tenure; RETEXP = Months of Prior Retail Experience; AGE = Age; CHILD = Number of Children; JS = Job Scope; OJSAT = Overall Job Satisfaction; WCSAT = Work Context Satisfaction; OCQ = Organizational Commitment.

\*p < .05; \*\*p < .01

2  
VITA

Cheryl Lynn Wilch Jordan  
Candidate for the Degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy

Thesis: THE INFLUENCE OF JOB SCOPE AND WORK CONTEXT SATISFACTION ON  
RETAIL MANAGERS' ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT

Major Field: Home Economics-Clothing, Textiles and Merchandising

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Topeka, Kansas, November 7, 1945, the  
daughter of Clarence N. and B. Ethelda Wilch. Married  
James S. Jordan, August 2, 1969.

Education: Received Bachelor of Science Degree in Home Economics  
from Kansas State University, June 1968; received Master of  
Science Degree in Clothing and Textiles from Kansas State  
University, July 1971; completed requirements for the Doctor  
of Philosophy degree at Oklahoma State University in  
December, 1987.

Professional Experience: Retail management trainee at Halls,  
Kansas City, Missouri, June 1968 to July 1969; graduate  
teaching assistant, August 1969 to May 1970, graduate research  
assistant, August 1970 to May 1971, Department of Clothing,  
Textiles and Interior Design, Kansas State University;  
Substitute Teacher, U. S. Department of Defense Schools,  
Kenitra, Morocco, October 1972 to May 1974; Instructor and  
Assistant Professor, Department of Apparel, Interiors, and  
Merchandising, Oregon State University, September 1976 to  
present.

Professional Organizations: American Home Economics Association;  
Oregon Home Economics Association; Association of College  
Professors of Textiles and Clothing; Fashion Group;  
Institute for Managerial and Professional Women; Omicron Nu.