

**A CROSS-CULTURAL COMPARISON OF  
RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN ORGANIZATIONAL  
COMMITMENT AND ORGANIZATIONAL  
COMMUNICATION**

**Cal W. Downs, University of Kansas**

**Allyson Downs Adrian, University of Maryland**

**Tammie Potvin, Price Waterhouse**

**Federico Varona, San Jose State University**

**John S. Gribas, University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire**

**and William Ticehurst, University of Technology-Sydney**

**Paper presented at the 46<sup>th</sup> Annual Conference of the  
International Communication Association.  
Albuquerque, New Mexico, May 23-27, 1996.**

Producing important organizational outcomes is the primary task of management. Understanding how an organization's internal processes relate to those outcomes has been a challenge for managers and for organizational scientists. While many investigations have focused on the ways that organizational processes relate either to organizational productivity or job satisfaction (Downs, Clampitt, & Laird, 1985), a growing emphasis focuses on the organizational commitment of employees.

Commitment is important because loyal employees who identify closely with the organization are seen as an organization's most important resources. Turnover is less among committed employees (Stumpf & Hartman, 1984), thus reducing costs and increasing productivity. Becker (1960) and Etzioni (1961) pioneered research on commitment and attempted to identify its dimensions. Kanter (1968) maintained that knowledge of commitment is central to the understanding of human motivation and system maintenance in organizations. Research by Koch and Steers (1978), and Curry, Wakefield, Price and Mueller (1986) indicates that commitment has an important impact on the working behavior of employees. Yet, Somers (1993) claims that "a generally accepted model of organizational commitment has yet to emerge" (p. 185).

If commitment is a desirable outcome, then it is necessary to find out how it is cultivated. The major premise of the current research is that communication factors constitute important organizational processes that relate to organizational commitment. There are two major research questions: 1) What are the relationships among organizational communication processes and organizational commitment? and 2) How do these relationships differ across countries?

First, exploring the ways that commitment is affected by the internal communication processes is important. Researchers have related commitment to: a) communication networks (Eisenberg, Monge, & Miller; 1983); b) job involvement (Buchanan, 1974); c) participation in decision-making (Antonovsky & Antonovsky, 1974); d) feedback (Tziner & Latham, 1989); e) top management relationships (Putti, Aryee, & Phua, 1990), and f) information adequacy (Uncapher, 1983). Kongchan (1985) examined the communication-commitment relationships among Business College faculty in ten universities and found significant correlations ( $r < .01$ ) between commitment and seven of the factors on the Downs-Hazen Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire (COMSAT).

Second, comparing studies across several different countries/cultures is important as economies globalize. Behavioral scientists must go outside parochial lines to internationalize their findings. To date, not many generalizable conclusions have been forthcoming because most studies have been organization specific.

## METHOD

The data described in this report are from four different studies using the same methodologies.

### SAMPLE AND RESEARCH SITES

The total sample includes nine organizations from three countries. In all cases, management endorsed the research and urged employees to cooperate. Questionnaires, however, were given directly to the respondents. Promises of anonymity make the identification of the specific organizations impossible, but they are characterized as follows.

#### United States (Potvin & Downs)

1. A major retail organization in the American southwest was growing rapidly so that four new stores were being opened in other cities. Questionnaires were given to all 214 employees in one store, and data were collected from 59.

2. The corporate headquarters of a Fortune 500, multibillion dollar high technology manufacturer and retailer had just opened two new plants and had expanded others. From a sample of 300, 161 responses were obtained.

3. A major health care network employing over 4,500 people in several hospitals, a mobile health care service, a home healthy care service, an office management company, a medical laboratory, and several fitness centers . From a stratified sample of 485 at the flagship hospital, data were obtained from 245.

#### Australia (A. Downs & C. Downs)

4. Several existing colleges were merged into a university, creating a great deal of uncertainty among employees. One hundred fifty faculty and staff from one of the colleges were surveyed, and 95 responded. The chairman of this institution's council made the statement that '70 say that they had gone through--indeed continues to go through-- period of substant worry and anxiety would be an understatement."

5. This technological leader in packaging was constructing a new building allowing this organization's full service operations to merge in one location for the first time. Data were collected from all 100 respondents surveyed. Guatemala (Varona & Downs, 1992)

6. A food factory of 400 employees was experiencing conflict between a union and the CEO. Data were obtained from 177. Six months later, the CEO was removed by the Board of Directors. United States (Downs & Gribas. 1992)

7. An advertising firm doubled in size in a short period and was experiencing some culture shock and employee conflict. An 85% return rate yielded data from 101.

8. An airline reservation unit had been stable for a long time but had recently been joined by a second airline, involving some major changes in management and allegiances. Responses were obtained from 203 employees.

9. A Civil Service organization coordinated purchases for the U.S. military and was experiencing reorganization and budget cuts from the Federal government. There was a lot of uncertainty among the 420 employees in this unit; yet they continued to win awards for merit. Data were obtained from 316 employees.

## RESEARCH MEASURES

Two standard research instruments are incorporated into these communication audits: 1) the Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire (COMSAT), and 2) the Organizational Commitment Inventory.

### Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire

The Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire (Downs & Hazen, 1977; Downs, 1989) contains 40 items, with 5 items on each of the 8 factors which measure employees levels of satisfaction with the area..

1. **Organizational Perspective** refers to information concerning the organization at large such as its goals and performance. It also encompasses information about external events which affect the organization.

2. **Organizational Integration** focuses on communication in the immediate work unit. These items include both information employees receive and their opportunities to participate in the unit.

3. **Personal Feedback** measures the degree to which employees feel their efforts are recognized, their superiors understand their problems, and the criteria by which they are being judged are clear.

4. **Relationship with Superiors** includes upward and downward communication. This dimension measures the openness of superiors to subordinates, their ability to listen, and their trust of the employees.

5. Horizontal and Informal Communication explores non-hierarchical communication and the accuracy of informal networks.

6. **Communication Climate** measures general attitudes toward communication at the organizational and individual levels. The questions assess the communication competence of employees, how well information flow assists the working process, and whether it builds identification with the organization.

7. **Media Quality** measures the helpfulness, clarity, and quantity of information associated with channels such as publications, memos, and meetings.

8. **Relationship with Subordinates** measures how supervisors or managers assess the receptivity of employees to downward communication and their willingness to send good information upward. Superiors are also asked about their degree of communication overload.

**Varona and Downs (1992), and Downs and Gribas (1992) include a ninth factor, described as follows:**

9. **Communication with Top Management** covers, not only how well they provide information to the employees, but also how well they use communication to tap information from the employees.

Several investigations (Clampitt, 1988; Clampitt and Girard, 1986; Crino and White, 1981) provide support for the reliability and validity of the COMSAT. In a review of the COMSAT, Hecht (1978,) commented:

The thoroughness of the construction of this satisfaction measure is apparent.... the strategies employed in this study are exemplary. Input into initial item construction was obtained from a wide variety of sources and items were tested and factor analyzed for variety of scaling styles. (p. 363)

Several other observations about the psychometric properties of the COMSAT are known. First, the item analysis performed by Downs and Hazen (1977) revealed that 83 of the original 88 items discriminated successfully between the satisfied and dissatisfied respondents. The five items that did not discriminate were eliminated. Second, test-retest reliability of the entire instrument was .94 when Downs and Hazen (1977) gave the COMSAT to a group of employees over a two week period. Furthermore, coefficient alpha reliabilities for the entire instrument and its factors have been consistently in the .80s and .90s; none of the reliabilities have gone below .70 (Downs, DeWine, & Greenebaum, 1994).

In addition to the psychometric properties discussed above, it should be noted that the COMSAT has been used in more than 30 dissertations and theses and translated into 6 languages. Its widespread use is a testament to the usefulness in assessing organizational communication.

For the purposes of other Guatemalan study (Varona, 1992), the COMSAT was translated into Spanish, and back translated into English. In Australia, minor alterations were made in the English test on the recommendation of Dr. Bill Ticehurst. For example, in Australia, people were asked to "tic" their answers, rather than to "check" them.

### **Organizational Commitment Inventory**

Cook and Wall (1980) define commitment as "...a person's affective reactions to characteristics of the employing organization" (40). Originally designed for use with British blue collar workers, the OCI was created to "develop robust, short, and general applicable instruments relevant to multivariate research into the quality of working life" (Cook and Wall, 1980, p.39). Although there are a number of commitment instruments that have been used widely, the Organizational Commitment Inventory(OCI) was selected for four reasons. First, it is short, containing only nine items on which respondents react on a 1-7 scale from Strong Agreement to Strong Disagreement. Second, it has been used widely, and Potvin (1991) reports that it has: a) a Cronbach's Alpha of .83; b) a .70 correlation with the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire by Mowday, Porter, and Steers, the most widely used measure of commitment; and c) a Pearson correlation of -.54 with the Job Search Intention Questionnaire. Therefore, the OCI appears to be respectable in terms of reliability and construct and discriminant validity. Third, while a composite score sums across all items, the OCI identifies the presence of multiple factors. (Barge & Schlueter, 1988). In creating the OCI, Cook and Wall (1980) drew upon Buehanan's (1974)' three components of commitment: 1) identification, 2) involvement, and 3) loyalty. The presence of valid multi-dimensional factors would facilitate future analyses to further illuminate the connection between communication and commitment. Fourth, the instrument has been widely used inside the United States, but it was actually developed in the United Kingdom. It seemed useful to make international comparisons, using such an instrument. The actual items are listed below according to the theoretical factors and using actual item numbers.

#### **IDENTIFICATION**

1. I am quite proud to be able to tell people who it is I work for.
5. I would not recommend a close friend to join our staff (Reverse Score).
8. I feel myself to be part of the organization.

#### **INVOLVEMENT**

3. I am not willing to put myself out just to help the organization.

6. In my work, I feel I am making some effort, not just for myself but for the organization as well.

9. To know that my own work had made a contribution to the good of the organization would please me.

### **LOYALTY**

2. I sometimes feel like leaving this organization for good-

4. Even if the firm were not doing well financially, I would be reluctant to change to another employer.

7. The offer of a bit more money with another employer would not make me think of changing my job.

## **RESULTS**

Two analyses are incorporated in the study to evaluate the OCI : a) Cronbach alphas to test the reliability, and b) principle components factor analyses to determine whether or not the three theorized factor solution is valid in each of the three cultures. Differences in factor loadings could also provide insight into unique meanings given to the concept of commitment across the three cultures.

The Cronbach alphas for Cook and Wall's Organizational Commitment Inventory ranged from .79 to .83 and were satisfactory except for the Guatemalan sample, where the alpha was only .55. The reliabilities for the COMSAT ranged from .89 to .97.

The commitment data were subjected to principle components factor analysis with varimax rotations. For a factor to be accepted, it had to have an eigenvalue of at least one, and items had to load on it at least at the .50 level with no contaminating loading on another factor above .40.

Two observations are important. First, a two factor solution emerged instead of the theorized three factor solution. These are reported in [Table 1](#). The Involvement factor contains items 3, 6, and 9, and is identical to the theorized involvement factor. With the exception of the Guatemalan sample, the Loyalty items of 2, 4, and 7 appear together on factor 1, with items 1,3, and 8 combining with them in various combinations. Thus, the theorized Loyalty factor (2,4,7) and the Involvement factor (3,6,9) emerged as quite stable. The breakdown in the theoretical structure, therefore, seems to be some weakness in the Identification factor.

Second, the Guatemalan sample had a different combination of items for Loyalty than did the other samples, and herein may lie an important cultural difference. It is noteworthy that items 4 and 7, which never appeared on a factor for Guatemalans, both focused on money. This raises a question as to

whether or not the Americans and Australians conceptualize commitment differently than do the Guatemalans in terms of financial rewards.

## THE RELATIONSHIP OF COMMUNICATION SATISFACTION TO COMMITMENT

The relationship of communication satisfaction to composite commitment was explored through 1) Pearson correlations and 2) regression analyses. The results are discussed below. Correlations Pearson correlations were computed for all communication satisfaction factors with the commitment composite. This was done ~or the data from individual organizations as well as for the entire data set. The results, contained in [Table 2](#), allow several observations.

Most correlations between the commitment composite and the communication satisfaction factors are not only significant ( $p < .01$ ); but for the entire data set, most are also functionally strong. e.g. a correlation above .35. There are just two outliers. Satisfaction with Relationship with Supervisor had a low correlation for the Guatemalans and Satisfaction with Relationship with Subordinates was no significant for the Australians.

There are three additional observations. First, although most of the correlations are statistically significant, the highest correlations are found to in American companies. In fact, with 21 correlations above .50, only one was for a non-American sample. The correlation between commitment and Satisfaction with Personal Feedback was .50 for the Australians. The higher correlations in the US sample raise the question of whether there is something unique about US society in regard to work. Second, it is also interesting to note that the highest correlations were between the OCI composite and Satisfaction with Communication Climate and Satisfaction with Media Quality. In the two studies where Satisfaction with Top Management Factor was incorporated, it had functionally high correlations with commitment. Third, the previous correlations indicate a significant relationship between commitment and all aspects of communication satisfaction. Regression analysis was used to probe this relationship more fully.

### Regression

Stepwise multiple regressions determined which communication satisfaction factors predict composite commitment. Again, these computations were made both for the entire data set and the individual organizations. Because only managers responded to items comprising the Satisfaction with Relationship with Subordinate factor, including it in the multivariate equations would have severely limited the possible number of valid cases. Therefore, it was not included in the regression analyses. [Tables 3 and 4](#) reveal the factors which were predictors of commitment and the frequencies of their predictions. Three major observations emerge from the analysis of these data.

First, 7 of the 9 COMSAT factors were found to be predictors of job commitment in at least one of the organizations. Different predictors were found in each of the organizations, and [Table 4](#) allows a quick overview of these relationships. While all the COMSAT factors have significant correlations with organizational commitment, it is noteworthy that the exact predictor of commitment varies considerably with individual organizations and their particular circumstances.

Second, despite individual differences in organizations, the summary in [Table 4](#) depicts graphically that the Satisfaction with Relationship with the Supervisor has the greatest predictive value for building job commitment in most organizations, both inside and outside the United States. Link this observation with the fact that the next most frequent predictor was Satisfaction with Horizontal Communication, and one becomes aware of just how important immediate work environments are in generating commitment. With all the current emphasis on empowerment, it is interesting that the factor Satisfaction with Organizational Integration was not a more significant predictor, as it contains the items relating to participation in one's immediate work unit.

Third, although the Satisfaction with Top Management factor ([Table 5](#)) was not used in the first two studies, it surfaced as a major predictor of job commitment in those American organizations (Downs and Gribas, 1992) in which it was used, but not in the Guatemalan organization. It should be emphasized that all three American organizations were going through major changes at the time of the communication audits; and, therefore, the visions and policies emanating from top management were vitally important to the employees. In fact, in two of the organizations important change strategies were implemented at the top management level because of these audits.

Since two of the derived factors for the OCI are very similar to the theoretical factors of Loyalty and Involvement, we decided to perform regressions to determine how the communication satisfaction factors predict the separate commitment factors. This analysis reveals more about the interactions among dimensions of communication and dimensions of commitment. The COMSAT factors were regressed against both the theoretical and derived commitment factors, with special emphasis on Loyalty and Involvement ([Table 5](#)).

Across all the organizations, six different communication factors predicted Loyalty to the organization, once again demonstrating the complexity of relationships among dimensions of communication satisfaction and commitment if individual organizations are taken into consideration. Satisfaction with Horizontal Communication predicted Loyalty in two studies (Potvin, 1991; Varona, 1991). Satisfaction with Personal Feedback never predicted composite commitment scores, but did surface in both Australia and the United States as a predictor for Loyalty. The relation of feedback to Loyalty may offer an important insight into the nature of commitment, since it is the supervisor who

provides the feedback. Of all the communicating a supervisor does, perhaps giving feedback is especially important in terms of generating Loyalty to the organization.

While Involvement had, several different predictors across the organizations, Satisfaction with Organizational Perspective was a ' significant predictor in three of the studies, including all but the Australians. Satisfaction with Organizational Perspective is the factor that assesses employee satisfaction with the types and amount of information they get about their organization in general. Given the fact that many of these organizations were going through some rather dramatic changes, it would be reasonable to expect them to want to know how those changes would affect them.

Finally, the Loyalty factor ([Table 5](#)) is the factor that has the closest pattern of regressions to that of the regressions for the OCI composite. In fact, regressions are very similar in both of the studies (Downs & Gribas, 1992; Potvin, 1991) involving US organizations. For the Guatemalans (Varona, 1991), Satisfaction with Horizontal Communication predicts both the OCI composite and Loyalty. This pattern suggests that, of the 3 factors on the OCI, Loyalty is the one that most completely explains commitment.

## DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The studies were designed to explore two questions: 1) What is the relationship between communication satisfaction and organizational commitment? , and 2) How do those links vary across organizations in different countries? The results of these studies give us a clearer answer to the first question than the second one.

First, satisfaction with dimensions of communication is significantly related to organizational commitment as shown through significant correlations and as predictor variables in the regression analyses. Although most of the correlations are significant ( $p < .01$ ), it is interesting to note that the highest correlations across all countries are with Satisfaction with Communication Climate.

Another trend is that the correlations run generally higher for the Americans. Certainly, both communication satisfaction and commitment are subject to cultural influences. Odagawa (1991) hypothesizes that "in the United States, humanistic management philosophy enhances communication satisfaction, commensurately attitudinal commitment "(p. 40 ) in ways not necessarily prevalent in other countries. Noticeable is the fact that the lowest correlations are for the Guatemalan organization, and it is particularly interesting to note that a significant correlation between commitment and Satisfaction with Relationship with Supervisor, one of the most important links in the USA and Australia, did not exist there.

The complex linkages among communication satisfaction and commitment are also demonstrated by the regression analyses, as 7 of the 9 factors surface as a significant predictor for at least one organization. Again, the fact that American companies tended to have more predictor than did either the Guatemalans or the Australians may indicate the influence of some humanistic management philosophies.

Second, the regressions reveal that the links between communication and commitment vary considerably and that comparability among sample companies is limited. The fact that 9 companies have 7 different predictors suggests not only that there is an important link between communication and commitment, but also that those links may vary over time with contingencies affecting the organization at that time. This important question of whether or not commitment is a stable work attitude or a situationally based construct has been raised by Banks and Henry (1993). The variability in predictors in the current research studies warrants an attempt to develop a contingency theory of the communication-commitment interface. As discussed earlier, profound change may produce Satisfaction with Organizational Perspective as the greatest predictor of commitment. When the organization's environment provides a different climate, other predictors may surface. Current results certainly suggest that there is no one communication satisfaction predictor of commitment and that interventionists would do well to investigate thoroughly the link between communication and commitment for a particular organization before they begin to intervene in the organization.

Third, despite the variability among organizations, results across the organizations show that the most frequent communication of commitment are Satisfaction with Relationship with Supervisor, Horizontal Communication, Communication Climate, and Top Management Communication. Of these, the frequency of Satisfaction with Relationship with Supervisor as a predictor is much greater than that of any other factor. These findings are as close to a pattern as can be found in past or current research; the identification of these patterns may have major implications for organizational management. It would seem that the best thing any company can do to build commitment in any culture is to train its supervisors to be good communicators.

Fourth, these studies do not reveal how commitment scores on the OCI correlate with actual behavior, which, in turn, might be influenced a great deal by such contingencies as how many jobs are available. Interviews revealed, for example, that lack of availability of other job possibilities was a major influence on the employees who worked in civil service.

Finally, this research points out some similarities and differences among the cultures. It would be unthinkable to characterize whole nationalities by the organizations used in these studies, but the current results offer a stepping stone to further comparisons of organizations in different countries. Similarities

across countries include: a) the fact that Relationship with Supervisor is a good predictor of commitment, and b) all aspects of communication have high correlations with commitment. However, there were some differences, also. For example, these data seem to indicate a closer tie between communication satisfaction in general and commitment for the Americans. Also intriguing is the fact that no items referring to money surfaced on commitment factors for the Guatemalans, while these same items were integral parts of the factor structures for both the Americans and the Australians. We are already in the process of developing hypotheses concerning COMSAT-commitment relationships across cultures using Hofstede's (1980) cultural dimensions, and plan to test these using structural equation models. The limitations of this reported study cannot explain the similarities and differences found, but the results do whet the appetite for more cultural studies to investigate the nature of commitment.

## REFERENCES

- Alutto, J. A., Hrebiniak, L. G. , & Alonso, R. C. (1973). On operationalizing the concept of commitment. Social Forces, 51, 448-454.
- Antonovsky, H. E, & Antonovsky, A. (1974). Commitment in an Israeli kibbutz. Human Relations, 27 (3), 303-319.
- Barge, J. K. & Schlueter, D. W. (1988). A critical evaluation of four popular measures of organizational commitment and Identification. Management Communication Quarterly, 2, 116-133.
- Becker, H. S. (1960). Notes on the concept of commitment. American Journal of Sociology, 66, 32-40.
- Buehanan, Bruce 11. (1974). Building organizational commitment: The socialization of work managers in work organizations. Administrative Science Quarterly, 19, 533-546.
- Chenev, G. (1983). On the various and changing meanings of organizational membership: A field study of organizational identification. Communication Monographs, 50 342-360.
- Cheney, G. & Tompkins, P. K. (1987). Coming to terms with organizational identification and commitment. Central States Speech Journal, 38 (1), 1-15.
- Clanipitt, P. (1988). Downs/Hazen Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire. In C. W. Downs, Communication Audits, pp. 112-132. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman, and Co.
- Clanpitt, Phillip, & Downs, Cal W. (1993). Communication and productivity. Journal of Business Communication.
- Clanpitt, P. & Girard, D. M. (June, 1988). Time for reflection: A factor analytic study of the Communication Satisfaction Instrument. Paper presented at the meeting of the International Communication Association, Dublin, Ireland.
- Cook, J., & Wall, T. (1980). New work attitude measures of trust, organizational commitment and personal need non-fulfillment. Journal of Occupational Psychology, 53, 39-52.
- Crino, M. D., & White, M. (1981). Satisfaction in communication: an examination of the Downs-Hazen measure. Psychological Reports, 49, 831-838.
- Downs, A. and Downs, C. W. (May, 1991) Relationship between communication satisfaction and organizational commitment in two Australian organizations. Paper presented at the meeting of the International Communication Association, Chicago, IL.
- Downs, A. (1991). Relationship between communication satisfaction and organizational commitment in two Australian organizations. Unpublished masters thesis, University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS.
- Downs, C. W. (1988). Communication Audits. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman, and Co.
- Downs, C. W. (1977). The relationship between communication and job satisfaction. In R. C. Huseman, C. M. Logue, & D. L. Freshly (Ed.), (?)

**Note: One page of citations is missing here.**

Gouldner, H. P. (1960). Dimensions of organizational commitment. Administrative Science Quarterly, 4, 468-487.

Grusky, Oscar. (1966). Career mobility and organizational commitment. Administrative Science Quarterly, 10 (4), 488-503.

Hall, D., Schneider, B., & Nygren, H. (1970). Personal factors in organizational identification. Administrative Science Quarterly, 15, 176-190.

Hecht, M. L. (1978). Measure of communication satisfaction. Human Communication Research, 4, 350-368.

Hrebiniak, L. G. & Alutto, J. A. (1972). Personal and role-related factors in the development of organizational commitment. Administrative Science Quarterly, 17 (4), 555-573.

Kanter, R.M (1968). Commitment and social organization: A study of commitment in Utopian communities. American Sociological Review, 33, 499-517.

Kiesler, C. A. (1971). The psychology of commitment: Experiments linking behavior to belief. New York: Academic Press.

Likert, R. (1967). The human organization. New York: McGraw-Hifi.

Lodahl, T., & Kejner, M. (1965). The definition and measurement of job involvement. Journal of Applied Psychology, 49, 117-28.

Mottaz, C. J. (1988). Determinants of organizational commitment. Human Relations, 41(6), 467-482.

Mowday, R. T., Porter, L. W. & Steers, R. M. (1982). Employee-organization linkages: The psychology of commitment, absenteeism and turnover. New York: Academic Press.

Nogradi, G. S., & Koch, S. A. (1981). The relationship between decisional participation and commitment to the organization, community, and profession among municipal recreation administrators. Leisure Sciences, 4 (2), 143-159.

Odagawa, Kazuko. (1991), Communication satisfaction and organizational commitment: U.S. and Japanese workers under Japanese-style management. Unpublished masters thesis, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY.

O'Reilly, C. A. III, & Caldwell, D. F. (1980). job choice: The impact of intrinsic and extrinsic factors on subsequent satisfaction and commitment. Journal of Applied Psychology 59(5), 559-565.

Pincus, J. David. (1984). The impact of communication satisfaction on satisfaction and job performance. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, College Park, MD.

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(5), 603-609.

Potvin, Tammie. (1991). Employee organizational commitment: An examination of its relationship to communication satisfaction and an evaluation of questionnaires designed to measure the construct. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS.

Putti, J. M., Aryee, S., & Liang, T. K. (1989). Work values and organizational commitment: A study in the Asian context. Human Relations, 42(3), 275-288.

- Putti, J. M., Aryee, S., & Phua, J. (1990). Communication relationship satisfaction and organizational commitment. Group & Organization Studies 15(1), 44-52.
- Randall, Donna. (1987). Commitment and the organization: The organization man revisited. Academy of Management Review, 12(3), 460-471.
- Rotondi, Thomas Jr. (1972). Personality aspects of organizational identification. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Colorado, Boulder, CO.
- 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.
- Salancik, G. R. , & Pfeffer, J. (1978). A social information processing approach to job attitudes and task design. Administrative Science Quarterly, 22, 46-55.
- Sheldon, Mary E. (1971). Investments and involvements as mechanisms producing commitment to the organization. Administrative Science Quarterly, 16(2), 143-150.
- Somers, Mark J. (1993). A test of the relationship between affective and continuance commitment using non-recursive models. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 66, 185-192.
- Steers, R. M. (1977). Antecedents and outcomes of organizational commitment. Administrative Science Quarterly, 22, 46-56.
- Ticehurst, G. W. (1992). Organizational commitment in Australia, Japan, and the United States. Paper presented at the meeting of the Conference of the Australian and New Zealand Academy of Management, Sydney, Australia.
- Tziner, A., & Latham, G. P. (1989). The effects of appraisal instrument, feedback and goal-setting on worker satisfaction and commitment. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 10, 145-153.
- Varona, F. (1988). A comparative study of communication satisfaction in two Guatemalan companies. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS.
- Varona, F., & Downs, C. (May, 1992). Relationship between communication satisfaction and organizational commitment in three Guatemalan organizations. Paper presented at the meeting of the International Communication Association, New Orleans, LA.
- Wiiio, Osmo. (1976). Organizational communication: Interfacing systems in different contingencies. Paper presented at the meeting of the International Communication Association.

**Table 1****FACTOR ANALYSES OF OCI**

Potvin, Varona-Downs, Gribas Theoretical

	All	Food	All	All	
Factor One: Loyalty					
	1		1		
	2	2	2	2	2
		3			
	4	4	4	4	
	7		7	7	7
	8	8	8		
Factor Two: Involvement					
		1			
		5			
	3		3	3	3
	6	6	6	6	6
		7			
	9	9	9	9	9

**Table 2**  
**CORRELATIONS OF COMSAT TO OCI**

COMSAT FACTOR	OCI COMPOSITE
<b>Org. Perspective</b>	
USA-1 all (N=490) .	.32***
Potvin/Downs	
Retail	.35*
Electronics	.29**
Hospital	.39**
Aus. all (N=194)	.25*
Downs/Downs	
Univ.	.25*
Manuf.	.22*
Guat. (N=177)	
Downs/Varona	.25**
USA-2(N=620)	.51***
Downs/Gribas	
Ad Agency	.40***
Airline	.42***
Civil Service	.51***
<b>Org. Integration</b>	
USA-1 all .43'	
Retail	.47**
Electronics	.39**
Hospital	.44**
Aus. all	.35**
Univ.	.431
Manuf.	.29**
Guat.	.27**
USA-2	.45*1
Ad Agency	.45*1
Airline	.46***
Military	.43*1
<b>Personal Feedback</b>	
USA-1 all	.45*1

	Retail	.47**
	Electronics	.43**
	Hospital	.43**
Aus. all		.38**
	Univ.	.39**
	Manuf.	.37**
Guat.		.22**
USA-2		.45***
	Ad Agency	.48***
	Airline	.40***
	Military	.51***

#### Rel. with Supervisor

USA-1 all		.48***
	Retail	.49*
	Electronics	.55**
	Hospital	.52**
Aus. all		.42**
	Univ.	.45*
	Manuf.	.40*
Guat.		.16
USA-2		.42***
	Ad Agency	.40***
	Airline	.37***
	Military	.49***

#### Rel. with Subordinate

USA-1 all		.43*1
	Retail	.06
	Electronics	.50**
	Hospital	.47**

#### Media Quality

USA-1 all		.50***
	Retail	.44*
	Electronics	.46**
	Hospital	.53**
Aus. All		.34**
	Univ.	.35**

	Manuf.	.32**
Guat.		.21*
USA-2		.52***
	Ad Agency	.46***
	Airline	.51***
	Military	.53***

**Top Mgt Comm.**

Guat.		.13
USA-2		.54***
	Ad Agency	-.5
	Airline	.56***
	Military	.54***

p <.05\*, p <.01\*\*, p <.001 \*\*\*

**Table 3**  
**REGRESSION ANALYSES BETWEEN THE**  
**COMSAT AND OCI COMPOSITE SCORES**

Org. Commit.		Predictors	Multiple R	F	Significance
<b>1. UNITED STATES -1</b> (Potvin and Downs)					
All	OCI	Personal Feedback Rel. with Supervisor Horizontal Comm.	.67	39	.00001
Retail		Horizontal Comm.	.59	6.5	.03
Electronics		Rel. with Supervisor Horizontal Comm.	.69	31	.00001
Hospital		Rel. with Supervisor	.59	16	.00001
<b>2. GUATEMALA</b> (Varona and Downs)					
Factory		Horizontal Comm. Org. Integration	.30	13	.0001
<b>3. AUSTRALIA</b> (Downs and Downs)					
All	OCI	Rel. with Supervisor	.47	21	.0000
Uni		Rel. with Supervisor	.45	5	.03
Manuf.		Rel. with supervisor	.40	5	.0336
<b>4. UNITED STATES-2</b> (Downs and Gribas)					
All	OCI	Comm. Climate Organizational Perspective Top Mgt. Communication Rel. with Supervisors	.62	92	.0000
I. Adv.		Top Mgt Comm. Horizontal Comm.	.60	27	.0000
2. Airline		Top Mgt Comm. Rel. with Supervisors	.59	49	.0000
3. Civil Service		Org. Perspective Top Mgt. Communication Communication climate Rel. with Supervisors	.62	50	.0000

Table 4

## COMSAT PREDICTORS OF OCI COMPOSITE

Comsat Factor	USA			Guatemala	Australia		USA			Total				
	All	1	2	3	factory	all	1	2	all		1	2	3	
Orq. Perspective									x		x		2	
Org. Integration					x								1	
Personal Feedback	x												1	
Rel. with Supervisor	x		x	x			x	x	x			x	7	
Rel. with Subordinate													0	
Horizontal Comm.	x		x	x	x					x			5	
Comm. Climate									x	x	x	3		
Media Quality*													0	
Top Mgt. Comm.*										x	x	x	x	4

\*Top Management as included only in the questionnaire for the Guatemalan sample and USA study by Downs and Gribas.

Table 5

## PREDICTORS OF COMMITMENT FACTORS

FACTOR	SAMPLE	COMSAT PREDICTOR	MULTIPLE R	F	SIGNIF.
LOYALTY (2,4,7)	Aus.	Personal Feedback	.47	21	.0000
	Guate.	Horizontal Comm.	.20	5	.05
	USA-2	Comm. Climate Org. Perspective Top Management	.44	49	.000
(1,2,4,7.8)	USA-1	Rel. with Supervisor Horizontal Comm. Personal Feedback	.66	39	.00001
IDENTIFICATION (1,5,8)	Aus. All	Media Quality	.40	14	.0003
	Guate.	Org. Integration	.30	12	.0001
USA-2 Comm. Climate		Top Mgt Comm	.66	120	.0000
INVOLVEMENT (3,6,9)	Aus. All	Rel. with Supervisor	.31	8.4	.0049
	Guate.	Org. Perspective	.27	10.5	.001
	USA-2	Comm. Climate Org. Perspective Top Mgt. Comm.	.42	43	.000
	USA-1	Horizontal Corn. Org. Perspective	.41	15.1	.00001
(3,6,7.9)	Aus. All	Rel. with Supervisor	.34	9.5	.0028