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1 Background of the research and justification of the topic

The ultimate value of an organization is Man, as several authors state. (Bakacsi, Bokor, Császár, Gelei, Kováts, & Takács, 2004; Bassi & McMurrer, 2007; Nicholson, 2009) The background of the statement is that in a lot of cases the sustainable development and long-term success of business organizations lie in the competencies and the performance of the recruited and retained employees. More and more empirical evidence show that organizational commitment is an important antecedent of the employee’s performance and their intention to keep their organizational membership. It can be argued that for those companies that handle human resources as a key to their success, high organizational commitment leads to favorable outcomes. So we might rephrase out opening statement as: the ultimate value of an organization is the committed Man.

Organizational commitment has been in the focus of intense research for several decades (Becker, 1960; Hrebinak & Alutto, 1972; Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1979; O'Reilly & Chatman, 1986; Meyer & Allen, 1991; Somers, 1995; Wasti, 2005), with the contents of, antecedents to, and outcomes from the concept much investigated (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch, & Topolnytsky, 2002).

Similarly, life domains such as work and family have been investigated for long, with multiple studies analyzing interaction between these life domains, and exploring a mine of antecedents and outcomes (Marks, 1977; Crouter, 1984; Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985; Frone, Russell, & Cooper, 1992; Carlson & Perrewé, 1999; Michel, Mitchelson, Kotrba, LeBreton, & Baltes, 2009).

Relations between organizational commitment and the work-family interface have, however, been set in the focus of much less research. While a few studies with remarkable results have indeed been produced (Super, 1990; Perrone, Ægisdóttir, Webb, & Blalock, 2006; Shaffer, Harrison, Gilley, & Luk, 2001; Ali & Baloch, 2009; Bragger, Rodriguez-Srednicki, Kutzer, Indovino, & Rosner, 2005; Thompson, Beauvais, & Lyness, 1999; Grover & Crooker, 1995), and workaholism, this ‘pathological outgrowth’ from commitment, which, for all its significance, is thus beyond the scope of this study, has been examined by several authors (Piotrowski & Vodanovich, 2006), not a single piece of research has, as far as the author of this study is aware, relied upon the commitment profiles theory (Meyer & Herscovitsch, 2001; Wasti, 2005; Somers M. J., 2009) to any extent. As pointed out in this study, the commitment profiles theory has opened up new prospects in scientific thinking about organizational commitment, with an increasing number of authors having looked into the antecedents to and outcomes from commitment profiles (Wasti, 2005; Somers, 2009). Consequently, it seems to be timely and reasonable that, going beyond the above-mentioned studies aimed at cognition of relations between organizational commitment and the work-family interface, one carries out investigations into the relationship of organizational commitment profiles with the work-family interface – in an organizational context specifically to which both are relevant.
The goal of the present dissertation is to provide scientific advancement about the relationship between organizational commitment and work-family balance looking at the issue in a well-defined and relevant context: i.e. as it exists at customer support organizations. The research was based on an online questionnaire that tapped organizational commitment, work-family conflict and work and life domain antecedent and consequence variables. We used mathematical-statistical analytic methods to examine the relationship between the variables.

Operating as important divisions at multiple companies, personal customer support centers and call centers are of considerable and ever-increasing significance (Gans, Koole, & Mandelbaum, 2003). The industry has demonstrated the most dynamic development of all industries in Europe, the United States of America, and Australia over the decade past (URCOT, 2000). At the same time, the sector is characterized by a ‘contradictory position in which staff are placed, being tasked as they are, with providing a high quality customer service while management limit their ability through work intensification to provide such a service. (...) It is ironical, however, that concern with customers does not seem to be matched with an equal concern with employees, but perhaps the greater irony is that the two are seen as distinct’ (Knights & McCabe, 1998, old.: 182;188). Typical phenomena include high levels of job dissatisfaction and employee turnover, considerable exposure of employees to stress, uncertainty of sectorial career paths, and much complaint about wages and working conditions (URCOT, 2000).

An increasing number of scientists have been concentrating on issues connected with such working conditions as organization of work and working hours and consequences arising therefrom. Overtime work, unusual working regimes, and inflexible assignment and leave arrangements are features typical of personal customer support centers and call centers (Hannif, 2006). With respect to the customer assessment of a call center (and hence that of the whole parent organization), the levels of helpfulness and friendliness its employees exhibit are crucial. To this end, employees should have a high level of organizational commitment, while practical management and organization solutions seem to undermine that requirement (Kinnie, Hutchinson, & Purcell, 2000). Evidently, it is essential that there be ‘greater alignment between the HR practices and control systems adopted, the high quality interactions expected with the customer and the needs of employees. The ability to manage these potentially conflicting pressures in this fast-changing environment is seen to be one of the key factors in exploiting the potential benefits to be gained from this new way of working’ (Kinnie, Hutchinson, & Purcell, 2000, old.: 971).

With the advancement of information technology, more scientific attention has been devoted to the ICT customer support centers (especially call centers). Rose and Wright (2005) emphasize that
running a call center makes its management face multiple challenges, with some of them being old, while others new and complex, including issues of control, commitment, and the work-family balance. [People] ‘need a positive work-life balance, but many call centers still fail to recognize this. Failure to take these factors into account can create real difficulties for call center employers and employees alike, resulting in recruitment and retention costs, high sickness absence and stress levels, loss of trained and experienced staff, and lower productivity and morale’ (Paul & Huws, 2002, old.: 21)

Within call centers, the employees’ organizational commitment and its relation with the work-family interface are thus questions one shall not evade. [Call centers] ‘provide, therefore, an appropriate context for examining contemporary pressures in working life’ (Hyman, Baldry, Scholarios, & Bunzel, 2003, old.: 216).

Having several similarities to international tendencies, the problem is of great importance in Hungary too. At Hungarian call centers, the turnover of employees is nearly as high as 10 %, the most common causes to quit being, firstly, insufficient wages, and secondly, high levels of physical and psychic pressure and great performance expectations (HEA, 2009). The two major individual strategies applied at call centers to cope with stress are the seeking of support and distraction (Szendrő, 2009), a fact suggesting considerable interaction between such life domains as work and family with the employees of Hungarian calls centers as well.

Commitment profiles (as well as their relations with various variables) derivable from organizational commitment components have already been subjected to research in a lot of countries, including Canada (McNally & Irving, 2010; Gellatly, Hunter, Currie, & Irving, 2009), the United States (Somers, 2009), Turkey (Wasti, 2005), India (Kwantes, 2003), Greece (Markovits, Davis, & van Dick, 2007), and Malaysia (Karim & Noor, 2006). They have not, however, been studied yet in a Hungarian cultural context or using a Hungarian sample, or at least no paper on the issue has been published so far.

Such findings as may be derived from this research are likely to help us to obtain a deeper understanding of relations between the organizational commitment and work-family balance associated with call center employees in Hungary. Organizations with call centers and call center staff may equally benefit from the knowledge to be gained and from a possible translation of such knowledge into HR management practices (organization of work, training development, performance management, etc.), which may, in view of the large number of call center employees, have an effect on society not to be dismissed lightly.
1.1 Theoretical background

1.1.1 Organizational commitment

The theoretical framework of the research was based on the Three Component Model of organizational commitment by Meyer and Allen (1991), and its modified version by Meyer and Herscovitch (Meyer & Herscovitsch, 2001); and the work-family conflict model of Michel et al (Michel, Mitchelson, Kotrba, LeBreton, & Baltes, 2009).

Meyer and Allen (1991) claimed that the model they had created might be of help to integrate and interpret any former scientific finding on organizational commitment, offering a fundamental model for future research commonly known as the Three-Component Model of Organizational Commitment (TCM). Since this theoretical framework has become most popular over the last two decades, it is discussed below in much detail.

Going beyond a mere distinction between attitudinal commitment and behavioral commitment, TCM integrates both into its theoretical framework. A key concept of the model is the psychological state, i.e. a totality of the individual’s emotions and beliefs about his relation with the organization. The tripartition of the model is predicated on three different psychological states which constitute the three pillars or components of the model, namely emotional attachment to the organization, perceived costs associated with leaving the organization, and a feeling of obligation to retain organizational membership. The reason why these three dimensions present themselves in the model is that, having taken a survey of literature, Mayer and Allen concluded that, typically, the diverse definitions of commitment are centered round these three topics.

As already mentioned before in this study, it is to Porter et alii that we owe one of the most popular definitions of emotional attachment to the organization. Their OCQ questionnaire is designed to assess the degrees to which the individual is willing to make efforts on behalf of the organization, accepts organizational values and goals, and desires to retain his organizational membership. It is this line of former research that one component of the commitment concept TCM has adopted is constituted by.

A second pillar was offered by findings from investigations into perceived costs associated with commitment. In this subject, Becker had acted as the authors’ forerunner, giving rise to much research as discussed above. As contrasted with Mowday et al. (1972), Meyer and Allen (1991) regarded Becker’s theory as one of the attitudinal approaches to commitment on the grounds that what Becker had attached key importance to: the individual’s recognition, or becoming aware of, his side bets. Being affected by various environmental factors (e.g. the side bets themselves), the resultant psychological state will have some behavioral outcome (such as retention of the organizational membership), which is equivalent to the very argumentation used in an attitudinal approach to commitment.
Commitment relying on obligation is a third pillar. The essential point of this approach, having originated again in previous publications, is the individual’s feeling of a moral obligation to remain a member of the organization.

The authors came to call the three respective pillars outlined above affective commitment, continuance commitment, and normative commitment. An important circumstance, however, they were considered by the authors to be components rather than different types of commitment, demonstrating the fact that they manifest themselves with individuals simultaneously, though to differing degrees.

A common characteristic of all the three components is treatment of commitment as a psychological state, describing the individual’s relation with the organization, and bringing about as a consequence the individual’s decision as to continuing or discontinuing his organizational membership.

On the other hand, as Mayer and Allen claimed, these psychological states have different natures. There are emotional attachment, identification with the organization, and involvement at the back of affective commitment. It means that the individual is a member of the organization because he wants to be one. Continuance commitment is linked with the individual’s recognition that quitting would involve costs. It means that the individual is a member of the organization because of a necessity. Normative commitment is predicated on a feeling of moral obligation to retain his organizational membership, which means that the individual remains out of moral obligation.

Later the commitment profiles theory has opened up new prospects in scientific thinking about organizational commitment, with an increasing number of authors having looked into the antecedents to and outcomes from the mutual effect of the three components of organizational commitment – the so-called commitment profiles (Wasti, 2005; Somers, 2009). Consequently, it seems to be timely and reasonable that, going beyond the above-mentioned studies aimed at cognition of relations between organizational commitment and the work-family interface, one carries out investigations into the relationship of organizational commitment profiles with the work-family interface – in an organizational context specifically to which both are relevant. The research proposed in this study has set the latter objective, and can, in this respect, be considered a novelty even when compared to international efforts.

The idea that different employees may exhibit the three components of commitment with differing intensities simultaneously has marked out a new direction of research. Turning their attention from investigations into the antecedents and outcomes of particular components, scientists came to examine how particular combinations of commitment components affected certain outcomes, and what typical conjunctions of commitment components were detectable at the same time. Out of a rather poor supply of studies available on the matter, three papers are worth mentioning:
• Meyer and Herscovitsch (2001) proposed eight commitment profiles: High Commitment (HC), Affective Dominant (AC), Continuance Dominant (CC), Normative Dominant (NC), AC-CC Dominant, AC-NC Dominant, CC-NC Dominant and Low Commitment (LC).

• Upon a data analysis, Somers (2009) detected five commitment profiles on a sample of 288 nurses, including high commitment (HC), affective-normative dominated commitment (AC-NC), continuance-normative dominated commitment (CC-NC), continuance dominated commitment (CC), and low commitment (LC). Having examined correlations of the profiles with certain phenomena at work (intention to quit, job-seeking, absence, tardiness, work stress, and cross-domain stress), he found the majority of favorable work domain outcomes such as low levels of intention to quit, work stress, and cross-domain stress, to be linked with the affective-normative profile. There was no detectable difference between the profiles in terms of tardiness and, surprisingly, the continuance-normative profile was associated with the lowest level of absence.

• Using cluster analysis, Wasti (2005) managed to detect five out of the eight profiles proposed by Meyer and Herscovitsch (2001), and added one more, calling her six profiles high commitment, low commitment, affective dominated, continuance dominated, affective-normative dominated, and neutral. Having examined the profiles for their correlations with three outcomes, namely intention to quit, work withdrawal, and work stress, she found that it was the low commitment profile that was likely to bring about the least favorable development of the three outcomes, while with profiles such as high commitment, affective-normative dominated and affective dominated, the three outcomes were the most favorable. Remarkably, a high level of continuance commitment did not involve favorable work domain outcomes. Furthermore, it is important to note that favorable outcomes are most likely to present themselves when affective commitment scores high, especially if it co-occurs with a low level of continuance commitment.

1.1.2 Work-Family Interface

According to one of the most often cited definitions ’work’ is an instrumental activity intended to provide goods and services to support life (Piotrowski, Rapoport, & Rapoport, 1987). During this the individual contributes to the realization of the mission of an organization while getting financial compensation. (Kabanoff, 1980) To sum up: ’A set of (prescribed) tasks that an individual performs for material rewards while occupying a position in an organization’ (Geurts & Demerouti, 2003, p. 280).

Based on everyday experiences, everyone is aware of the meaning of the word ’family’ – yet the exact content is not so evident. Therefore, I shall briefly present the possible interpretations of the same concept.
The central element of the concept is the nucleus of the family or the nuclear family. 'Family, sociologically speaking, is a small group living together, the members of which are bound together by marriage, common ancestry, in other words, those who live in blood- or, in exceptional cases, adoptive relation to one another.' (Andorka, 1997, p. 353) To sum up, the classic concept of the nuclear family covers a married couple and their children.

Family is to be distinguished from household which is 'formed by a group of people who live together, share living expenses, (have meals and use durable goods together) and are generally but not necessarily relatives' (Andorka, 1997, p. 353).

Before the presentation of these theories it is necessary to clarify the concept of 'role'. Fábián (2007) gives an excellent summary of its development and definitions that evolved along scientific and theoretical paradigms. To have an understanding of role-related research it is not necessary to elaborate in detail on the subject. It will suffice to use Fábián’s synthetising definition as a starting point: 'on the one hand ’role’ means a set of behaviour-regulatory expectations linked to a given position in society. These expectations are mediated to the individual by social sub-systems. On the other hand it integrates a wide range of individual behaviour patterns given in response to the above expectations’ (Fábián, 2007, p. 31).

Individuals may fulfill several roles at the same time. Research focusing on the consequences of this phenomenon has come up with two variants: the theories of scarcity and the theory of enhancement.

The theory of scarce resources

The fundamental thesis here is that people have limited time, energy and attention resources. Consequently, multiple roles require the sharing of these limited resources, thus, scheduling and allocation will have a key importance. The more roles the individual undertakes the more probable it is that fulfilling one role will damage the other which leads to the exhaustion of resources and, ultimately, role-strain appears (Goode, 1960) In contrast to the theory of compensation, the reasons for resource sharing are not dealt with here. Instead, the theory of scarce resources focuses only on the individual’s inner, personal resources. (Haar & Bardoel, 2008).

1.1.3 Work-family conflict

This concept applies the theory of scarce resources to the work – family interface. The two life domains are in competition for the same resources (time, attention, energy), although the individual has only a limited supply of them. Consequently, the individual has to share his resources between the two domains since satisfying one role-expectation makes it difficult or even impossible to satisfy the other. In other words, the individual is faced with a role-conflict when he tries to fulfill work and family roles. (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985).
Work-family conflict is a fundamental source of strain and has a strong influence on the individual’s well-being. (Frone, Barnes, & Farrell, 1994)

According to Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) work-family conflict may be related to three main principles: time, strain and behaviour.

- Time-based means that time dedicated to fulfill the expectations of one domain is used up by fulfilling expectations of the other domain.

- Strain-based, in essence, means that strain (dissatisfaction, anxiety, exhaustion e.t.c.) caused by one domain makes it difficult to meet the challenges of the other domain.

- Behaviour-based refers to the phenomenon when behaviour-forms that work well in one domain are not efficient in the other – yet, the individual is unable to change them.

In all the three types of conflict a distinction may be made between the influence of work on family (WIF) and the influence of family on work (FIW). In the former case the domain of work has a negative influence on family life, in the latter case - it is vice versa. (Gutek, Searle, & Klepa, 1991).

The above conflict types are shown in the table below (Carlson et. Al 2000):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of work-family conflict</th>
<th>Direction of work-family conflict</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work interference with family</td>
<td>Family interference with work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Based WIF</td>
<td>Time Based FIW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strain Based WIF</td>
<td>Strain Based FIW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour Based WIF</td>
<td>Behaviour Based FIW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Michel et al. (2009) ventured to create a homogenous framework from the previous work-family conflict models, thus setting up an integrated theoretical framework of work-family relationship. The model applies the basic concepts used to describe relationship between the domains of work and family i.e. segmentation, conflict, spillover e.t.c. It also distinguishes direct and indirect influences between the domains. A further distinction is made between the domains of family and work, relating antecedents and consequences to both domains. Work-family conflict is regarded as multi-dimensional, WIF and FIW are distinguished. Consequence variables of work and family domains are
considered together as antecedent to life satisfaction. Direct and indirect relationships are identified among the above variables as indicated by numbered arrows.

In our research we intended to integrate Meyer and Allen’s commitment model and Michel et al’s work-family conflict model. Our research model is outlined in the next chapter.
1.2 The main research question

What is the relationship between organizational commitment and work-family conflict in customer support centers?

The research model is detailed below.

The following research questions emerge from our main research question:

- Can the three components of organizational commitment (affective, continuance, normative) be identified?
  - Are there differences among the commitment components based on some demographic variables (age, tenure, gender)?

- What is the relationship between the commitment components and the variables of the work and family domain?
  - Do the commitment components have moderating effect on the relationship between work antecedents and intention to quit? (Question 1)
o How do the three organizational commitment components influence each other and how does this interaction influence the intention to quit and the work-family interference? (Question 2 and 3)

o Do the three components of commitment combine to create commitment profiles?

  - Are there significant differences among the commitment profiles regarding work antecedents (Question 4), like work social support, work role conflicts, work role ambiguity, work time demand, job satisfaction, and regarding work consequences (Question 5)

  - Are there significant differences among the commitment profiles regarding family (Question 6): family social support, family role conflict, family time demand, family role ambiguity, and regarding family consequences (Question 7)

  - Are there significant differences among the commitment profiles regarding the variables measuring work-family conflict (work-family interference, family-work interference, work-family balance) (Question 8)

o What is the relationship between work-family interference, family-work interference and the commitment profiles? (Question 9)

1.3 Significance of the study

Our study offers several contributions to the theory and the practice of the field.

Theoretical contributions

  - **Topic:** our study applies the commitment profiles theory regarding the analysis of work-family conflict.

  - **Method:** In our study such mathematical and statistical methods are used, which had been not used by others to examine the relationship between organizational commitment and work-family conflict. Thus, our study examines uniquely many aspects of the subject.

  - **Results:** Empirical evidence is shown that the commitment profiles are significantly different regarding such work antecedents and consequences, that are related to the work-family conflict. We are not aware of any previous investigation to do so in a such comprehensive manner.
• **Organizational context:** our research gives support to the commitment profile theory in the context of customer service organizations, which allows more general lessons to be based on the results. The examined research questions had not been tested in the context of customer service organizations prior to our study.

• **Cultural context:** our research examines the commitment profile theory on a Hungarian sample - in this cultural context the theory has not yet been tested.

**Contributions to the practice**

• If the results support that the commitment profiles have different work antecedents and consequences, this has important implications for the managers and HR experts. Almost all of these work antecedents are within the sphere of influence of the top or middle managers and HR professionals, so their organization design and organization development efforts may induce predicted changes regarding the commitment profiles, and positive changes can occur regarding the consequence variables of the commitment profiles.

• Through a deeper understanding of the relationship between organizational commitment and work-family conflict, development of organizational solutions and practices can be possible, which help to reduce work-family conflict and at the same time to increase organizational commitment of employees. Thus contributing to the goal congruence of the employees and the organization.

• A large number of employees are working in customer service jobs in Hungary and worldwide. Based on the results of this research, steps can be taken by the organizations to improve the quality of work life and family life of the customer service employees, and progress can be made in reconciliation of these two life domains.
2 Research methodology

2.1 Data collection

2.1.1 Procedures of the data collection
In accordance with the commonly used methodology of the field, our data collection is going to be based on a large sample, using self-report questionnaire. As Babbie points out, ‘the questionnaire is the best method for those who want to collect original data in order to describe a population which is too big to be observed directly. (…) Questionnaires are a great way to measure attitudes or orientation of a huge population’ (Babbie, 2001, p. 274).

2.1.2 Questionnaire
Based on the above considerations, a questionnaire survey was carried out. The anonymity of the participants was guaranteed, the survey input process was Internet based.

2.1.3 Sample
The population consists of the employees of Hungarian customer support centers. Which is approximately 200 thousand people (Fillus, 2010). Neuman (2006) underlines that a sampling ratio of between 0.025 and 1% for a population of this size is required. This means a sample of 50-2000 people.

The target population means the members of a population the researcher can include in a study. This is the maximal sample size, as if everybody answers the questionnaire, the sample will be of this size. (Creswell, 2005). In our case the target population was 1200 employees of 41 organizational entities. The entities were defines based on the idea of Mastenbroek (1991), who argued that an organization is a network of interrelated groups (entities), which are connected through four layers. One of these layers are the socio-emotional layers. As Bakacsi (2010, old.: 189) summarizes, "People in organizations are linked through emotional ties: sympathy or antipathy manifested in personal relationships, a sense of belonging, sense of identity. The joint activities develop group affiliation and commitment – this is the „nest model” of organizations. The social-emotional relationships may include competitive and cooperative elements: the former is the identity of the individual (or group identity), the latter is the sense of belonging, identification with the organizational collective values) ”

This approach to the organizational reality reveals that when examining commitment and its related variables it is important to focus on these entities. When defining the entities, the main factor was not legal peronality, but the factors that form the basis of group identity in an organizational setting (different city, different supervisor, different task etc). Therefore we could tap the perceived organizational commitment the way it is formed by these important factors.
The number of returned questionnaires was 727, this means that the response rate is adequate and the sample size is appropriate for our study.

The questionnaire was completed by people working for Hungarian companies various industries. The respondents are of different sex, education, marital status, tenure etc.

2.1.4 Research variables
The questionnaires were found during the literature review, these surveys are appropriate for the measurement of the variables, and the validation – of their English version - has been made by their authors. It was therefore not necessary to use self-developed questionnaires.

The research variables may only tap a certain amount of the diversity of everyday life. Neither the domain of work, nor the domain of family life can be fully explained with these variables. When defining the scope of the study (and choosing the included variables) our principle was to use less variables with good reliability and validity, instead of using a lot of variables that are unreliable and of a dubious validity.

All of the scales described below were responded to on a 5-point Likert type scale. The anchor are strongly agree (5) and strongly disagree (1).

2.1.4.1 Work Social Support
We use the questionnaire of Etzion (1984) to measure the Work Social Support. This consists of 8 questions which reflect whether certain phenomena that are in connection with the social support are present in the individual’s life (for example: appreciation), and 3 questions that refer to the relationship between the individual and some other people or groups (f. e: superordinates)

2.1.4.2 Job Satisfaction
We decided to apply the commonly used questionnaire of Babin-Boles (1998). This has six questions (e.g, ‘I find real enjoyment in my work.’)

2.1.4.3 Work Role Conflict
We measure Work Role Conflict with eight questions (e.g., ’I have to do things that should be done differently.’). The questionnaire was developed by Rizzo, House and Litzman (1970).

2.1.4.4 Work Role Ambiguity
The six items relating Work Role Ambiguity was created by Rizzo, House and Litzman (1970) as well. An example: ‘I know exactly what is expected of me’ (reversely coded question).

2.1.4.5 Work Time Demand
Based on the idea of Carlson-Perrewé (1999) we collect data regarding an individual’s level of perceived role overload in order to measure Work Time Demand. The items were adapted from the
questionnaire of Beehr, Walsh, & Taber (1976), which has three items (e.g., 'It often seems like I have too much work for one person to do.').

2.1.4.6 Family Social Support
To tap Family Social Support, we use the scale of Etzion (1984), which is similar to the Work Social Support scale. The main differences are in the last three questions, which in this questionnaire refer to the relationship of the individual with families, friends and spouses (e.g., 'Please indicate the quality of the relationship you have with the following person or groups of persons: Spouse.').

2.1.4.7 Family Satisfaction
The items are based on the scale of Staines-Pleck (1983), which was used by several authors (Rice, Frone, & McFarlin, 1992). The scale consists of three items., e.g., 'I am happy with my family life.'

2.1.4.8 Family Role Conflict
Family-related role conflict items were adapted from the work role conflict scale by Rizzo, House and Litzman (1970). Carlson and Perrewé (1999) used the same approach, which makes it possible ‘to measure equivalent role conflict aspects of the family domain ((1999)p. 522). All questions for the family domain matched the questions for the work domain as closely as possible, e.g., 'I receive incompatible requests from two or more people.'

2.1.4.9 Family Time Demand
We measure Family Time Demand by tapping the respondent’s level of perceived role overload. This is measured with the adapted version of the work role overload scale developed by Beehr, Walsh, and Taber (1976) – as it was done by Carlson-Perrewé (1999): each item used for the family domain paralleled the questions for the work domain as closely as possible. This scale has three items, e.g., 'It often seems like I have too much work at home for one person to do.'

2.1.4.10 Family Role Ambiguity
The questionnaire for the measurement of Family Role Ambiguity uses an adapted version of the Work Role Ambiguity items developed by Rizzo, House and Litzman (1970). Each item paralleled the questions for the work domain as closely as possible. An example: 'I know that I have divided my time properly at home’ (reversely coded question).

2.1.4.11 Affective Commitment
We use the eight items of Meyer és Allen (1991) to measure affective commitment, e.g., 'I do not feel like 'part of the family' at my organization’ (reversely coded question).

2.1.4.12 Continuance Commitment
To tap continuance commitment we adapted the Powell-Meyer (2004) version of the Meyer-Allen (1991) items. This scale consists of nine questions, and has two subscales, measuring the high-
sacrifice (HiSac) and the low alternatives (LoAlt) dimension of continuance commitment, e.g., 'For me personally, the costs of leaving this organization would be far greater than the benefits.'

2.1.4.13 Normative Commitment
We rely on the eight items of Meyer and Allen (1991) to measure normative commitment, e.g., 'I think that people these days move from company to company too often.'

2.1.4.14 FIW and WIF
The measurement of FIW and WIF is conducted based on the scale of Carlson et. al. (2000). This scale has 18 items, 9 for FIW, 9 for WIF, and has three subscales for each (time based, strain based, behavior based). An example for an item regarding time based FIW: 'I have to miss family activities due to the amount of time I must spend on work responsibilities.'

2.1.4.15 WFB
To tap Work-Family Balance (WFB) we adapted the items of Carlson, Grzywacz and Zivnuska (2009). This scale consists of six items, e.g., 'It is clear to me, based on feedback from co-workers and family members, that I am accomplishing both my work and family responsibilities.'

2.1.4.16 Intention to Quit
We use the scale of Colarelli (1984) to measure the intention.

2.2 Data analysis
The main methods used for the analysis are described below.

2.2.1 Principal Component Analysis and Factor Analysis
We used Principal Component Analysis to aggregate the items of the questionnaire into their respective variables. To analyse the latent structure of the multidimensional variables and to analyse divergent validity we use Factor Analysis.

2.2.2 K-means Clustering
To create commitment profiles we use K-means Clustering. Based on the hypothesis of Meyer-Herscovitsch (2001) first we intended to find eight clusters. When interpreting the clusters we used the method of Wasti (2005, p. 298). [91]

2.2.3 Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)
In order to determine whether the commitment profiles differ significantly regarding the outcome variables, we conduct ANOVA.

2.2.4 Hierarchical regression analysis
To analyse the casual relationship between variables, we use hierarchical regression analysis.
3 Main empirical results
The main research question of the dissertation was how organizational commitment and work-family conflict are related in customer service positions. To answer the question, commitment was operationalized by the Three Component Model of Meyer and Allen (1991), and work-family conflict was operationalized by the integrative model of Michel et al (2009). Our research model was based on these two theoretical frameworks. The progress and focus of the empirical analysis was built upon our research model. This means that the research questions stemmed from our research model, which gave focus to the statistical analysis. These research questions and the results of relevant empirical investigations are summarized in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research questions</th>
<th>Results of the empirical investigations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How do the three components of organizational commitment influence the effect of the work antecedent variables on the work consequence variable (intention to quit)?</td>
<td><strong>INTENTION TO QUIT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(AC) (CC) (NC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFB</td>
<td>YES \ NO \ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRA</td>
<td>YES \ NO \ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTD</td>
<td>NO \ NO \ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRC</td>
<td>YES \ NO \ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSAT</td>
<td>YES \ YES \ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSUPP</td>
<td>YES \ NO \ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do the three organizational commitment components influence each other and how does this interaction influence the intention to quit?</td>
<td><strong>INTENTION TO QUIT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interaction effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(AC) (CC) (NC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>NO \ YES \ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>\ NO \ NO \ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>\ NO \ NO \ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do the three organizational commitment components influence each other and how does this interaction influence the work interference with family?</td>
<td><strong>WIF</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interaction effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(AC) (CC) (NC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>YES \ NO \ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>\ NO \ NO \ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>\ NO \ NO \ NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Are there different commitment profiles to be found based on the dominance of the commitment components?

We managed to find eight clusters regarding organizational commitment. We named these clusters as Low Commitment (LC), High Commitment (HC), Affective-Normative Dominant (AC-NC), Affective-Continuance Dominant (AC-CC), Continuance-Normative Dominant (CC-NC), Continuance Dominant (CC), Affective Dominant (AC) and Neutral (N) profiles.

What are the differences between the commitment profiles regarding the work and family antecedent and consequence variables?

Most of the commitment profiles did significantly differ regarding the work domain consequence variables: work role conflict, work role ambiguity, work time demand, work social support, job satisfaction.

Most of the commitment profiles did significantly differ regarding the work domain consequence variable: intention to quit.

Most of the commitment profiles did not significantly differ regarding the family domain antecedent variables: family role ambiguity, family time demand, family role conflict, family social support.

Most of the commitment profiles did not significantly differ regarding the family domain consequence variable: family satisfaction.

Most of the commitment profiles did significantly differ regarding the work-family conflict variables: work-family balance, work-family interference, family-work interference.

How do the commitment components correlate with WIF and FIW?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CORRELATION</th>
<th>AC</th>
<th>CC</th>
<th>NC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WIF</td>
<td>NEGATIVE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NEGATIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIW</td>
<td>NEGATIVE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NEGATIVE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What is the relationship between the commitment profiles and the work-family conflict variables?

Most of the commitment profiles did significantly differ regarding the components of work-family interference. We have found strain based WIF (SWIF) to be the highest, while time based WIF and behavior based WIF appeared to be lower.

Most of the commitment profiles did significantly differ regarding the components of family-work interference. Although the strain-based component was the highest concerning the WIF, it was found to be the lowest regarding FIW.

The above mentioned research results are detailed in the following chapter.
First we analysed the three components of commitment separately. We concentrated on their moderating effect on the relationship between the work domain antecedents and the work domain consequence variable (intention to quit). We have found that affective commitment and normative commitment have a moderating effect on the relationship of Work-Family Balance, Work Role Conflicts, Work Social Support and Job Satisfaction with Intention to Quit. We have also found empirical evidence that affective commitment has a moderating effect on the relationship of Work Role Ambiguity with Intention to Quit; and normative commitment has a moderating effect on the relation of Work Time Demands with Intention to Quit. Continuance commitment was rarely involved in moderating effects: according to our data, it only has a moderating effect on the relation of job satisfaction with intention to quit.

With the next research question, we made a step forward, and we focused on the combined effects of the commitment components. We concentrated on the most important consequence variable: Intention to Quit. Using the statistical method of hierarchical regression analysis, we were searching for empirical evidence regarding the joint effects of the commitment components on intention to quit. We have found that affective commitment and normative commitment has notable combined effect. The analysis regarding the first research question revealed that these two commitment components have notable effect on intention to quit separately, now we have some evidence that their combined effect is important as well: when the normative commitment is high, the relationship is weaker between affective commitment and intention to quit.

Then we examined the combined effects of the commitment profiles on Work Family Interference, using hierarchical regression analysis. The empirical evidence shows that the interaction of affective commitment and continuance commitment is significant. We didn’t find any significant interaction between affective and normative commitment; and there was no significant interaction between continuance and normative commitment as well. Examining the combined effects of affective and continuance commitment, we have found that the effect of affective commitment on work-family interference is dependent on the level of the continuance commitment. For those who have low continuance commitment, the relationship between the affective commitment and work-family interference is weaker, compared to those who have high continuance commitment. This means that high continuance commitment and high work-family interference occur together only when affective commitment is low.

Commitment profiles offer another way of examining the combined effects of the commitment components. First we intended to create the profiles using k-means cluster analysis. After the calculations, eight profiles emerged which we interpreted in accordance with the prior researches on the topic. We named each cluster comparing the cluster’s mean scores for each component to the relevant component’s mean.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AC-NC</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>AC-CC</td>
<td>HC</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>CC-NC</td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>QUIT</td>
<td>1,39</td>
<td>2,82</td>
<td>1,55</td>
<td>1,17</td>
<td>2,26</td>
<td>1,66</td>
<td>3,77</td>
<td>2,05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>WFB</td>
<td>4,31</td>
<td>3,66</td>
<td>4,2</td>
<td>4,32</td>
<td>3,9</td>
<td>4,08</td>
<td>3,55</td>
<td>3,99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>WRC</td>
<td>1,83</td>
<td>2,83</td>
<td>2,07</td>
<td>1,98</td>
<td>2,41</td>
<td>2,35</td>
<td>3,13</td>
<td>2,12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>FRC</td>
<td>1,46</td>
<td>1,76</td>
<td>1,54</td>
<td>1,48</td>
<td>1,67</td>
<td>1,67</td>
<td>1,54</td>
<td>1,53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>WTD</td>
<td>2,67</td>
<td>3,39</td>
<td>3,07</td>
<td>2,92</td>
<td>3,13</td>
<td>3,11</td>
<td>3,88</td>
<td>2,88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>FTD</td>
<td>2,01</td>
<td>2,29</td>
<td>1,99</td>
<td>2,16</td>
<td>2,3</td>
<td>2,09</td>
<td>2,09</td>
<td>2,09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>FRA</td>
<td>4,17</td>
<td>4,05</td>
<td>4,12</td>
<td>4,4</td>
<td>4,24</td>
<td>3,95</td>
<td>4,18</td>
<td>3,04**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>WRA</td>
<td>4,34</td>
<td>3,65</td>
<td>4,22</td>
<td>4,37</td>
<td>3,83</td>
<td>4,08</td>
<td>3,42</td>
<td>4,25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>JSAT</td>
<td>4,15</td>
<td>2,78</td>
<td>3,81</td>
<td>4,16</td>
<td>3,32</td>
<td>3,55</td>
<td>2,12</td>
<td>3,74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>FSAT</td>
<td>4,31</td>
<td>3,97</td>
<td>4,35</td>
<td>4,55</td>
<td>4,12</td>
<td>4,18</td>
<td>4,23</td>
<td>4,38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>FSUPP</td>
<td>4,38</td>
<td>4,05</td>
<td>4,29</td>
<td>4,36</td>
<td>4,09</td>
<td>4,24</td>
<td>4,03</td>
<td>4,23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>WSUPP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3,15</td>
<td>3,8</td>
<td>3,96</td>
<td>3,49</td>
<td>3,67</td>
<td>2,88</td>
<td>3,73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>WIF</td>
<td>2,29</td>
<td>3,16</td>
<td>2,54</td>
<td>2,45</td>
<td>2,79</td>
<td>2,71</td>
<td>3,24</td>
<td>2,47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>FIW</td>
<td>1,71</td>
<td>2,25</td>
<td>1,85</td>
<td>1,71</td>
<td>2,06</td>
<td>2,12</td>
<td>2,09</td>
<td>1,8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Table - Means of commitment profiles regarding the research variables
After creating the profiles, we intended to examine whether these profiles differed in terms of the work antecedent variables. The analysis of variance (ANOVA) method was used, and the according to the results all variables significantly differed across the profile groups. The results indicated that the more favourable levels of the antecedent variables were observed in the profiles with dominant affective commitment. This has lead us to the conclusion that the variables of work domain that are influenced by the management and HR decisions, play a significant role in the underpinning of affective commitment.

The next step was to examine the differences among the profiles regarding the family domain antecedents. We didn’t expect any significant differences, and our hypothesis was supported. The means of the commitment profiles didn’t differ significantly. This means that commitment is mainly a work domain concept.

As expected the variables tapping the conflict and balance of work and life domains (work-family balance, work-family interference, family-work interference) differed by the commitment profiles. It is noteworthy that even among the group with the lowest work-family interference the work-family interference was higher than the family-work interference of the group with the highest family-work interference. This required the deeper analysis of work-family interference and family-work interference. So we examined their components and their relation with the commitment profiles.

The correlations show that the work-family interference and affective commitment are negatively correlated, while the continuance commitment has no significant correlation with work-family interference. The normative commitment is negatively correlated to work-family interference.

Next we focused on the components of work-family interference and family-work interference, and their relationship with the commitment profiles. The ANOVA results indicated that there is significant difference among the profiles regarding the three components of WIF and FIW. The group with low commitment (LC) has the highest mean of strain based WIF, time based WIF and behaviour based WIF. This mean is significantly higher than the means of the other profiles, except for the continuance commitment dominant profile (CC) and the neutral commitment profile (N). On the other side the affective-normative dominant profile has the lowest WIF regarding the three components.

The continuance dominant profile (CC) has the highest FIW in each of the three components. This profile has significantly higher FIW than the affective-normative dominant (AC-NC) profile, the highly committed profile (HC) and the affective dominant profile (AC). The lowest means were found among the affective-normative dominant profile (AC-NC), the highly committed profile (HC).
The most important findings of the study are the following:

1. Three components of organizational commitment can be identified: affective, continuance, normative. These components differ in terms of antecedent and outcome variables.

2. The affective and normative component of the organizational commitment have a moderating effect on the relationship between several work domain antecedents and intention to quit. This means that the level of these commitment components have an influence on the strength of the relationship between the antecedent variables and intention to quit. Continuance commitment didn’t have a moderating effect on most of the variables.

3. The three components of organizational commitment show different effect on intention to quit and work-family interference when considered simultaneously not separately. Regarding intention to quit there is a significant interaction between the affective and normative component. The same can be observed between the affective and continuance component regarding work-family interference.

4. Based on the three components of organizational commitment organizational commitment profiles can be identified. These groups of employees differ in terms of several work related antecendent and consequence variables, but do not significantly differ concerning family domain antecedents and consequences.

5. The components of organizational commitment have different correlation with work-family interference and family-work interference. The affective and normative component correlates negatively to work-family interference and family-work interference, while continuance commitment does not show any significant correlation with these variables.

6. The commitment profiles differ significantly in terms of the components of work-family interference and family-work interference. The highest work-family interference was observed in the low commitment group and in the continuance commitment dominant group. The highest family-work interference was measured in the profiles with high level of continuance commitment and low level of affective commitment. In all of the profiles the stress based component work-family interference was the highest among the three components, and the behaviour based component of family-work interference.

Based on the results future directions of the research can be outlined. Without additional data collection it is possible to examine the mediating effects of variables, and after that the moderated mediation effects can be analysed. Conducting path analysis could give a deeper understanding of the relationship between the variables. Additional qualitative data would allow the better examination of causal effects, helping the interpretation of the results of the present study.
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