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ABSTRACT

How are social networking sites, such as Facebook, affecting employees and their organizations? Social media provide a way of creating communities where employees can share their workplace experiences and insights. The literature suggests that the manner in which these communications occur is dependent on the organizational climate, specifically the organization’s values of knowledge sharing and social communications. Based on findings in the preliminary study, the main study of this thesis investigates how an employee’s level of organizational commitment and job involvement influence their use of social media. Correlational analyses showed that an employee’s level of organizational commitment and job involvement are positively related to whether they use Facebook to talk about work. The organizational climate of rule bending was positively related to work-related Facebook use. An employee’s perceptions of appropriateness of using Facebook to talk about work did not significantly moderate the expected relationships except for organizational commitment predicting work-related Facebook postings, in which the interaction is significant only at high levels of organizational commitment. Finally, the main hypothesis, that organizational commitment and job involvement would interact in their prediction of Facebook use was not supported but had significant simple slopes at low, medium, and high levels of job involvement.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION: PRELIMINARY STUDY

Social media in organizational settings seem to have a continually increasing presence in employees’ lives. These tools, such as social networking sites (e.g. Facebook, Twitter, LinkedIn), e-mail, and text messaging are being used by companies to enhance relations with clients and customers, build the company’s brand, recruit new employees, enhance employee morale, and much more. In order to understand social media within the workplace, we must consider how they influence relationships in industrial-organizational psychology. In this thesis, I propose that organizational climate, specifically trust and knowledge sharing, can be used to explain how social media use can depend on employee perceptions of organizational values. Additionally, I hypothesize that social media use may be moderated by certain aspects of how much a worker likes what they do (job involvement) versus how much they like where they do it (organizational commitment). I expect that employees will display differential social media use depending on their varying levels of organizational commitment and job involvement.

This thesis is based on theory and a self-report preliminary survey (see Appendix A) of employees’ Facebook use and interactions in a work-related context. The purpose of the preliminary study was to guide the main study and understand how employees are using Facebook to talk about their jobs or professions. I was mainly interested in the type of feedback and social support that employees receive through Facebook. The preliminary study directed my attention to I-O related constructs that may be affecting
social media use among employees. These I-O constructs, job involvement/job engagement and organizational commitment, were explored in the main study of this thesis by re-examining social media use in a new sample of employees.

**Organizational Climate: Trust and Knowledge Sharing**

Human behavior is, in part, a product of a person’s aptitude and personality, but the nature of his or her environment can be equally important (Patterson, Warr, & West, 2004). Organizational climate is the environment that must be considered when studying employee’s behavior within the workplace. This construct includes how employees perceive the social environment and policies of their company (Patterson et al., 2004) and is essential in understanding the interaction between employees and social media, such as Facebook. Organizational climate should not be confused with organizational culture, which refers to the composition and norms of an organization, while climate is an employee’s conscious perception of their organizational social surroundings (Denison, 1996).

Why is organizational climate so important when examining the influence of social media on employees? The answer lies in the link between measures of climate and organizational performance and behavior (Patterson et al., 2005). Patterson et al. (2005) defined climate as a representation of “employees’ perceptions of organizational policies, practices, and procedures, and subsequent patterns of interactions and behaviors that support creativity, innovation, safety, or service in the organization” (Patterson et al., 2005, p.381). Kopeleman, Brief, and Guzzo (1990) suggest that organizational climate affects company productivity through cognitive and affective states and salient
organizational behaviors. Features of organizational climate which are most relevant for this study include employees’ understanding of the company’s Facebook policy, an employees’ perception of their company’s values of knowledge sharing, social networking, and the separation of personal and professional lives, and finally, an employee’s perception of organizational trust among coworkers and supervisors.

**Knowledge Sharing**

Within the domain of organizational climate, I am specifically interested in employee attitudes on sharing knowledge, support, and thoughts with others, also referred to as ‘knowledge sharing’. One of the main uses of social networking sites (like Facebook and Twitter) is to engage with others, and offer personal thoughts, musings, and even life updates through photos and the “status” feature, also known as “micro-blogging”. An important determinant of a user’s intention to share knowledge is his/her attitude toward knowledge sharing; knowledge sharing is typically predicted by organizational climate. Communication climate – defensive vs. supportive (Harris, 2002) – is a key ingredient in organizational climate that should intuitively affect social media use. The preliminary study used in the current research included questions about how Facebook communications can be both defensive (negative) and supportive (positive).

Bock, Zmud, Kim, and Lee (2005) found that organizational climate conditions of fairness, affiliation, and innovativeness were positively associated with job-related knowledge sharing and intention to share knowledge, both implicitly and explicitly. Additional positive associations included a sense of self-worth and anticipated reciprocal relationships. That is, if an organization promotes fairness and affiliation, its employees
are more likely to have higher self-esteem and expect sharing and mutual friendships among their coworkers.

What motivates employees to share knowledge? The motivational factors seem to fall under two broad categories – employees’ personal belief structures and the organization’s institutional structures. Within personal beliefs, there are three motivational forces (Bock et al., 2005), including individual benefit (Wasko & Faraj, 2000), group benefit (reciprocated behaviors, mutual relationships; Wasko & Faraj, 2000), and organizational benefit (organizational gain and commitment; Kalman, 1999). The institutional structures are the organizational climate factors (Bock et al., 2005) described in the previous section.

In a model of positive deviance, researchers Pascale and Sternin (2005) describe how there must be a sense of safety for a community to share controversial thoughts and disagree. “Only when employees feel safe enough to discuss a taboo and when the community is sufficiently invested in finding solutions can the prospect of an alternative reality appear” (Pascale & Sternin, 2005, p. 6). In the current preliminary study, participants were asked if they have ever shared a complaint about their job or profession on Facebook. As we will see later, this topic of complaining may be considered “a taboo” that employees are less likely to participate in unless they feel that it is accepted or encouraged by their organization. Additionally, the nature of Facebook privacy settings and managing who can view individual postings may make the “taboo” of complaining to one’s social network more risky.
Trust

Recently, researchers have sought to understand whether having too many Facebook friends would disrupt sharing behavior among users (Brandtzaeg, Luders, & Skjetne, 2010). In other words, are users able to share freely, or do they feel inhibited and worry their Facebook postings will be read by the wrong friends? As Facebook has expanded to a wider audience, it has become more common to have Facebook “friends’ of varying social capital and social roles, ranging from friends and acquaintances to bosses and clients (Brandtzaeg & Luders, 2009; Facebook, 2010). There are age-based trends among Facebook users in how they use their privacy settings and their general knowledge and skill among similar Facebook features. Brandtzaeg, Luders, and Skjetne (2010) compared younger and older users and found that younger Facebook users were more skilled whereas older users had trouble navigating the site and understanding some of the important security and privacy issues. But, despite the effect of age, several users in the sample, both young and old, had completely open (not private) profiles without realizing it (Brandzaeg et al., 2010).

When considering the social purpose of social networking sites, a wider audience seems positive (Joinson, 2008). Alternatively, there is a concern with having a wider audience and the resulting mix of weak and strong ties users will begin to have (Ellison, Steinfield, & Lampe, 2007). Strong ties, such as family and close friends, are typically regarded with more trust than weaker ties, such as acquaintances. Facebook users may choose to engage in less knowledge sharing because of their concern for protecting their privacy from certain users, and not knowing how their privacy settings really work. This
issue of trust lies in social networking site itself, as well as trusting one’s online network. Little research has been done on how the proportion of coworker Facebook friends may affect employee use on the site. In this thesis, in both the preliminary study and the main study, the composition of Facebook friends within the same profession, as well as Facebook friends within the same workplace will be explored in relation to employee sharing behaviors.

Trust is one of the key elements that promote knowledge sharing. Collins and Smith (2006) created a model that showed the relationship between HR practices and firm performance, manifested through organizational climate and knowledge sharing. Their research suggests that employees who trust their coworkers will exchange information in more productive ways that coworkers with lower levels of trust. Additionally, trust in top management was assessed, under the assumption that leaders often set the climate for knowledge sharing. After adding each variable to their multiple regression, Collins and Smith (2006) found that trust accounted for approximately 10% of the variance between firm performance and HR practices. Knowledge sharing accounted for 20% of the variance.

The two main components that facilitate trust among virtual team members are credibility and benevolence (Zakaria, Amelinckx, & Wilemon, 2004). Credibility is established when both parties must believe that their referent can competently exchange resources and will meet the other’s outcome expectations. Additionally, both referents must believe their counterpart has benevolent (or positive) intentions to exchange information (rather than negative intentions – misinformation).
**Job Demands and Job Resources**

Beyond these factors of organizational climate, there are organizational influences, such as the nature of one’s jobs that influence their working conditions and are related to their interaction with social media. The Job-Demands-Resources Model (JDR; Bakker & Demerouti, 2006) can explain how social media might potentially affect employees and why we must study these tools from an organizational perspective. The JDR Model details how burnout and work engagement can be largely influenced by two sets of working conditions, job demands and job resources. Job demands are the work responsibilities and requirements (from the physical, social, or organizational job characteristics) that require effort and may be associated with certain psychological or physiological costs on the employee. Job resources, on the other hand, are certain aspects of the job (also physical, social, or organizational), that may reduce job demands, stimulate growth, and foster the achievement of work related goals (Bakker & Demerouti, 2006). Job demands are not negative in and of themselves, but the effort to fulfill those job demands without adequate resources may create job stress that can lead to negative work outcomes. Alternatively, if employees have the resources to successfully meet their job demands, they will maintain or even bolster their sense of self-efficacy (Bakker & Demerouti, 2006).

The job demands and resources relationship has been tied to many objective outcomes including burnout, turnover intentions, engagement, and even safety outcomes in the workplace. Job resources such as knowledge, autonomy and a supportive environment (i.e. social support) were positively related to job engagement and
negatively related to burnout (Nahrgang, Morgeson, & Hoffmann, 2010). Supportive social environments could potentially moderate the relationship between engagement and burnout.

An increase in job demands and decrease in job resources can predict burnout (Schaufeli, Bakker, & Van Rhenen, 2009). Additionally, resources such as social support and autonomy, predict work engagement. While burnout positively predicts sickness absenteeism, engagement negatively predicts sickness absenteeism (Schaufeli, et al., 2009, & Nahrgang, et al., 2010).

Social media may influence job resources via social support, from both internal networks (colleagues and supervisors) and external networks (family and friends outside the organization), job control and autonomy, and knowledge. Cuyper, Mauno, Kinnunen, and Makikangas (2011) hypothesized that when job resources, such as social support from one’s supervisor and colleagues, were low, there would be a stronger relationship between perceived employability and turnover intentions. Perceived employability is defined as an employee’s perception of how easily he/she will be able to find new employment. The notion that job resources play a crucial role in predicting turnover intentions was further supported (Cuyper, et al., 2011).

Social Support through Social Media

The main purpose of social media is to provide users with an entertaining and accessible outlet for social networking and engaging with other members of their community. The feature of social engagement is one of the key aspects that links social media to the organizational literature. As previously stated, social support is an essential
organizational resource considered in the Job Demands-Resources Model. In the 1990s when the Internet was rapidly gaining popularity, researchers began to question how this new form of communication would affect user’s social life, community engagement and face-to-face interactions. While some suggested that the surge of use would take away from community involvement, others showed that it could stimulate or even increase social support (Quan-Haase & Wellman, 2002). Quan-Haase and Wellman (2002) found that people use the Internet to maintain existing relationships by supplementing their face-to-face and telephone communications with this new medium. Furthermore, people pursue community and civic interests online, indicating that their Internet use supplements existing patterns of civic involvement and social contact (Quan-Haase & Wellman, 2002). Social support, or social capital, has large implications in social media and the workplace, including extending one’s social network and resources and improving job satisfaction and productivity.

**Social Capital: Definition and Types**

Social capital has been defined as the total resources that accrue to an individual or a group through the network of relationships of mutual acquaintance and recognition (Bourdieu & Waquant, 1992). Nahapiet and Ghoshal (1998) define social capital in terms of the resources it may provide: “social capital is networks of strong, crosscutting personal relationships developed over time that provide the basis for trust, cooperation and collective action” (p. 243). From an individual’s perspective, these resources come from their ability to draw information, advice, or emotional support from other members of the social network. Having a social network that extends one’s close relationships,
which is facilitated by social media (Ellison, Steinfield, & Lampe, 2007), may give an individual access to non-redundant resources, resulting in aids such as key networking figures that may benefit one’s job or lead to new employment opportunities (Granovetter, 1973).

It is important to understand the nature of relationships within an individual’s social capital in order to understand the resources it provides. These relationships have been categorized into two types – bridging and bonding social capital (Putnam, 2000). Bridging social capital includes the weaker relationships that are more likely to provide useful information between parties, rather than emotional support. Bonding social capital consists of emotionally close family and friends that have more expressive and supportive relationships. Research suggests that Facebook consumers are using social media more to connect with existing offline contacts than to meet new people. More specifically, they are using this social media device to keep in touch with old friends (bonding social capital) rather than to gain information (bridging social capital), or to learn more about people they met socially, people living nearby, or, in the case of students, people in their classes (Ellison et al., 2007).

Social support has also been identified as an important resource in the workplace that is associated with employee characteristics such as organizational commitment, job satisfaction, turnover, and burnout (AbuAlRub, 2010; Baruch-Feldman & Shwartz, 2002). Baruch-Feldman and Shwartz (2002) found that social support is positively related to job satisfaction and productivity and negatively related to burnout. The benefits of social support have been likened to social facilitation with its power to arouse team
members and team effectiveness (Harkins, 1987). Even outside of the workplace, social
capital is linked to a greater commitment to one’s community, and the ability to organize
activity that may benefit the community (Helliwell & Putnam, 2004). Social capital is
also related to components of psychological well-being, such as self-esteem and overall
life satisfaction (Helliwell & Putnam, 2004).

How does this ability to maintain offline connections, through sites such as
Facebook, affect one’s overall social network and social capital? Two Internet surveys,
Pew Social Ties Survey (2004) and Pew Major Moments Project (2005) indicated that
randomly sampled online users are more likely to have larger networks of close ties than
non-internet users (Boase, Horrigan, Wellman, & Rainie, 2006). Online communication
media such as e-mail have been shown to supplement rather than replace the
interactions people have with their close ties (Boase et al., 2006); this may explain why
internet users are able to develop and maintain a larger quantity of close friends.

One of the benefits of online social communication may be lower barriers that
encourage greater self-disclosure than in a face-to-face interaction. Earlier researchers
(Nie, 2001) argued that the surge in internet use would take time away from face-to-face
interactions that are essential for developing healthy relationships. On the other hand,
internet use studied on the community level has suggested that computer-mediated
communications have had positive effects on community social capital and involvement
(Hampton & Wellman, 2003).

Positive Features of Social Media Technologies
Determining what features will draw in social media users is a complicated task. Stafford, Stafford and Schkade (2004) had users rate how important certain Internet traits were that pertained to their potential uses and intrinsic motivation (through gratifications) for using the Internet. The three most important factors were process gratifications, content gratifications and social gratifications. Within social gratifications, chatting, friends, and interaction were rated most important.

**Facebook as of 2012**

As of November, 2012, there are currently one billion active Facebook users as reported on the company’s statistics page at Facebook.com. The average user has 130 Facebook friends. More than half of these billion users use their account on any given day, and over 350 million active users currently access Facebook through their mobile devices (www.facebook.com/press/info.php?statistics – Accessed Nov 4th, 2012).

It has been 8 years since the creation of Facebook in 2004, and earlier this year, on May 18th, 2012, Facebook held its initial public offering (IPO). Their IPO was the biggest in history among both technology and internet companies, and has had a peak market capitalization worth $104 billion (cnbc.com).

**Facebook features and functions in January 2012**

Facebook’s core site features and functions are continuously changing and expanding. Therefore, it is important to take note of the product’s characteristics and usability during the timeframe this thesis and before data collection. The two most fundamental features, a person’s home page and personal profile, have been part of the Facebook interface since its startup in 2004. The designs of both, however, have come a
long way with new features and layouts. As of 2012, the home page includes a news feed, a personalized stream of updates from friends. The home page typically features an array of newly uploaded photos, profile picture updates, status updates, links, and wall posts that friends have shared with others. Users are able to post things to their own profiles, such as links to news articles or status updates (also known as micro-blogging), or they can post to their friends profiles. In both cases, people have the option of tagging multiple friends to their wall posts or statuses so that those same posts appear on the tagged individuals’ profiles. Profile displays information about the individual he or she has the choice to share, including relationship status, contact information, education and work background, hobbies and interests. Facebook also includes core applications – Photos, Events, Videos, Groups, and Pages – that let people connect and share in engaging ways. The Facebook Timeline feature was first introduced in September 2011. The timeline allows you to organize your personal profile page in chronological order by highlighting life events (engagements, graduations, etc.), photos, or statuses that mean the most to you. Facebook users have the ability to control which friends see individual postings on their timeline (www.facebook.com/press/info.php?factsheet – Accessed Nov 4th, 2012).

**Facebook Sharing and Privacy**

People can communicate with one another through Chat (Facebook’s instant messaging application), personal inbox messages, Wall posts, Pokes, or Status Updates. Additionally, when someone communicates through status updates or wall posts, other users have the option of responding by commenting on that specific post or pressing the
“Like” button. The liking feature was added in the last few years and provides users with a quick way to show their approval and acknowledgement of what others have shared.

Facebook now allows users to control which of their friends and social networks can see individual postings and personal information. Users can decide who can see their wall, status updates, photo albums, photo and location tags, profiles pictures, and personal information listed on their profile. These privacy features were recently updated with the option to create lists of people to share with. There are two types of lists: smart lists, and the lists that individuals create and personalize. The smart lists automatically group users together based on the networks they belong to, such as their current city, or their academic or organization. Users also have the option of creating lists of people they wish to share with (or choose not to share with). For example, a user could create a list titled “People I work with”. Then, for every time they share something on Facebook, they have the option of choosing this list as the only group of people who can (or cannot) see their post.

Facebook has expanded dramatically since its initial start in 2004 when it was exclusive to Harvard students only. This social media site is now open to not only students and those who belong to registered networks, but to anyone around the world that has access to the Internet. The features and privacy settings I introduced above are just a snapshot of what Facebook looks like now – as of November 5th, 2012. These are the features that are relevant to the current study and considered in the analysis of how employees utilize and interact with Facebook.

**Complaining and Social Media**
Social Media sites like Facebook and Twitter are often used to share personal musings ranging from negative, to neutral to positive. These sites allow users to share anything they choose with their friends or followers including but not limited to, a news article, a positive thought, or a complaint about traffic or work. In the preliminary study, I was interested in general social support mediated through Facebook, but specifically how employees who complain on Facebook receive feedback and sympathy.

Typically, complaining is thought of as a negative social interaction because of the nature of how a complaint is defined – an expression of dissatisfaction. However, Kowalski points out that this does not always mean that the complainer is actually dissatisfied (Kowalski, 2003). She expanded the definition of complaining to include its multiple purposes: “an expression of dissatisfaction, whether subjectively experienced or not, for the purpose of venting emotions or achieving intrapsychic goals, interpersonal goals, or both” (Kowalski, 1996, p. 180).

Individuals often use complaining as a means for venting, but there are other common uses that we encounter on a daily basis. For instance, complaining can be a great way to engage people we are not familiar with – what Kowalski calls “lubricating social interactions” (Kowalski, 2003, p. 31). When talking to complete strangers, it is common to start a conversation with a complaint, almost as a way to break the ice. When waiting in line at a coffee shop or grocery store, strangers may begin conversation by talking about how long they are waiting or how they should have more checkers to speed things up. Complaints can also serve as a social lubricant between friends when conversation is lagging.
People also use complaining as a form of impression management (Kowalski, 2003). Complaining about a certain policy or political agenda, for instance, can be used to show others what you value and believe in. Additionally, we may complain to compare our actions and behaviors to others. By complaining about something to a friend, it encourages that friend to subsequently express their opinion on the topic. In this sense, complaining can be used as a way to see if our opinion is very different from that of our peers.

Finally, complaining can be used to seek explanation from others. This form of complaining can call others to explain a confusing or upsetting behavior (Kowalski, 2003). For instance, telling a roommate that they never clean up is a way of expressing dissatisfaction, but it may also entice the roommate to explain or defend their behavior.

After reviewing the multiple reasons people engage in complaining – it seems that complaints are often used as a way to facilitate social interactions. A person may complain about something work related on Facebook to see if their friends or coworkers feel the same way, or if someone can offer constructive feedback. As part of the preliminary study to this thesis, I hypothesized that complaints on Facebook would facilitate social support and interactions.

**Preliminary Study**

A preliminary survey was administered to acquire anecdotes about how current employees are receiving social support through Facebook. We hypothesize that an employee’s perception of organizational climate (specifically how the company values
knowledge sharing and social communications) will influence the likelihood that they will share work-related complaints on Facebook.

**Research Questions**

Question 1: Do employees who complain about work on Facebook receive social support?

Question 2: Do the employees who complain about work use Facebook more often or have more coworker or industry Facebook friends?

Question 3: How does an employee’s perception of organizational climate (specifically how the company values knowledge sharing, social communications and separation between workers’ personal and professional lives) influence the likelihood that they will share work-related complaints on Facebook?

Question 4: Does job satisfaction play a role in employees’ interaction with Facebook?

**CHAPTER TWO**

**METHOD**

**Participants**

Sixty individuals responded to an online survey, created by the researchers through SurveyMonkey. The researchers had separate links to the survey and posted a status on Facebook, asking their Facebook friends who were currently working to take the survey, and repost the research request on their own Facebook pages. This generated a snowball sample.

**Materials**
A 16 item survey was created through SurveyMonkey. The main questions of interest were the open-ended responses assessing employees’ use of Facebook to complain about their job or profession, and their knowledge of their company’s Facebook policy. Respondents were also asked to estimate how many Facebook friends and how many coworker Facebook friends they currently had, and how often they shared on their Facebook page. Three additional questions were asked about the nature of their jobs, including whether they worked in a field related to the research of human behavior, how long they had worked in their current job, and their level of job satisfaction.

**Procedure**

The purpose of the preliminary survey was to acquire information and anecdotes about how current employees are receiving work and non-work related social support through Facebook. Both of the researchers recruited participants separately through two separate links that were shared on their Facebook and LinkedIn accounts. In order to minimize the risk that the researchers would be able to identify the participants, two separate links were used so that the narratives would be stored in different files. Each of the two researchers reviewed the data pertaining to the other researcher’s Facebook friends (friends in their extended social network through the snowballing technique). Each researcher modified the responses to eliminate identifying information.

Upon completion of the survey, participants were given the chance to enter into a sweepstakes for a chance to win a $25 Amazon.com gift certificate.
CHAPTER THREE

RESULTS

In analyzing the survey responses, the first two questions of interest were, *Have you ever posted a complaint about your job or profession on Facebook and received feedback that is positive or helpful?* and *Have you ever posted a complaint about your job or profession on Facebook and received negative feedback?*, 10 people (appx. 17%) reported that they had posted a complaint and received positive feedback, while only 2 people (appx. 3%) reported that they had posted a complaint and received negative feedback. The other 83% of participants reported that they did not use Facebook at work and typically reported a one word answer, “no”, or elaborated on why they choose not to engage in this activity. For example, one individual reported, “No; there are too many people at my work that use Facebook and I can't afford to complain and risk my job.”

Participants were asked to *Think about the one person or a group of people that have offered you the most (work or profession related) support or positive feedback through Facebook. Do not list their name(s), but please describe your relationship to this person (or group of people).* The open-ended responses were coded and categorized into the following groups: *acquaintance, same field of profession, coworker, close friend(s) and family member*. Some people responded with more than one of the group categories. Four people listed “acquaintances”, 7 listed “same field of profession”, 12 listed “coworkers”, 17 listed “close friend(s)”, and 5 listed “family.” If the “coworkers” and “same field of profession” groups are combined, organizational-related support totals to 19, surpassing the total for each of the other categories.
A correlational analysis was run to see if any of the variables were significantly related to one another, and would be worth further investigation in the main study. The main question of interest, *Have you ever posted a complaint about your job or profession on Facebook and received feedback that is positive or helpful?*, was positively related (*r* = .28, *p* = .04) to the participants’ number of Facebook friends that were in the same profession (industry friends). Additionally, the percent of work-related Facebook posts was positively correlated (*r* = .29, *p* = .04) with posting a complaint and receiving positive feedback.

An individual’s percent of work related postings was positively related to both their number of coworker Facebook friends (*r* = .38, *p* = .01), and their number of industry friends (*r* = .33, *p* = .02). Job satisfaction was only significantly related to one social media variable, *How long have you been on Facebook?*. These two variables had a negative relationship (*r* = -.32, *p* = .02). One final relationship appeared between having mobile Facebook access (using a Facebook application from a mobile device) and receiving negative feedback from work related complaints. These two variables were positively related (*r* = .31, *p* = .02). The remaining variables were not significantly correlated. A full table of correlations and significance values can be seen in Table 1.

CHAPTER FOUR

DISCUSSION

The results suggest that few of the respondents are using Facebook as an outlet for complaining about their jobs. Many people reported feeling hesitant and consciously choosing to not to use Facebook for work-related thoughts. Some people seemed to think
that it was not acceptable to talk about work on Facebook, despite their knowledge of their company’s policy. One individual reported, “No, I do not think social networking is the proper arena for this.” but also reported not knowing the company’s Facebook policy because he or she worked from a “remote location”.

Why did 83% of participants report that they did not use Facebook to talk about their jobs? A possible explanation may be in the organizational climate of companies. Employees must perceive that sharing their work lives on Facebook is accepted or even encouraged by their organization. Additionally, employees must perceive knowledge sharing and trust within their organizational climate, and among the Facebook friends they choose to share with. In research on virtual teams, it has been suggested that the way the communication technology works and is used is “secondary” to the chemistry and interaction among the team members (Potter & Balthazard, 2002).

The primary question of interest in the preliminary study was whether individuals who complain about work on Facebook are receiving positive social support. Not many people reported that they complained about work on Facebook, but those who did also have a higher number of industry Facebook friends. This suggests that individuals may be more open to sharing complaints to an audience that can sympathize and understand their profession. This phenomenon may be why websites such as the complaintbook.com are so popular. This website encourages complaints about anything and then forwards the complaints to the party of relevance (an organization or individual), who then in turn may post their response back to the website (Kowalski, 2003).
Additionally, having more work-related posts was positively related to receiving positive feedback to Facebook complaints about work. Are the people who are passionate about their job and sharing job related posts on Facebook more likely to receive positive feedback when they complain? The number of work related posts an employee shares on Facebook is also positively related to their number of coworker and industry friends. The composition of an employee’s social network may dictate the types of things they share. Alternatively, someone who is more likely to talk about work on Facebook may be more likely to friend their colleagues and industry friends online. These preliminary relationships leads me to question how one’s percent of Facebook friends within their profession and percent within their organization may reflect the degree of importance they place on their profession or organization. Our participants that had more online connections with professional friends and coworkers were also the ones sharing more work related posts on Facebook. Could the composition of one’s online social network relate to larger I-O constructs such as job involvement and organizational commitment? In other words, does one’s level of job involvement and organizational commitment predict the likelihood that they will use Facebook as a work related social resource?

CHAPTER FIVE

INTRODUCTION: MAIN STUDY

Job engagement

The Job Demands-Resources model suggests that the presence of job demands (e.g., work load) and the absence of job resources (e.g., social support) predicts burnout,
whereas the presence of job resources leads to job engagement. As was mentioned earlier, job resources such as knowledge, autonomy and a supportive environment are positively related to job engagement. Job engagement was originally described as the degree to which an employee simultaneously invests cognitive, emotional and physical energies into their role performance (Kahn, 1990). Mashalch, Shauefli, and Leiter (2001) later defined this state of physical energy and dedication as a “persistent, positive, affective-motivational state of fulfillment”. As work engagement began to be conceptualized as a construct of positive psychology, researchers began to think of it as the opposite of burnout (Maslach, Jackson, & Leiter, 1996). As will be mentioned later, this “opposite” conceptualization introduced some issues in measurement.

In addition to a multidimensional investment in role performance, job engagement also describes an employee’s vigor (i.e., mental energy) and dedication (i.e., strong feelings of pride – similar to emotional investment; Bakker, Schaufeli, Leiter, & Taris, 2008). Kahn (1990) suggested that the three main precursors to job engagement are perceived organizational support, core self-evaluations, and value congruence. These three precursors may relate to the number of coworkers and industry friends (professional friends) within an individual’s Facebook friend network. The more Facebook friends an employee has within their organization and industry, the more they may perceive organizational support. Alternatively, the relationship could go in the other direction – the more an employee perceives organizational support, the more likely they may be to connect with organization friends on Facebook.

Utrecht Worker Engagement Scale
A widely used measurement of job engagement is the Utrecht Worker Engagement Scale (UWES; Schaufeli & Baker, 2003; 2006). The construction of this measurement was instigated by the problems that arise from using the negative correlations of Maslach’s Burnout Inventory (MBI; Maslach, Jackson & Leiter, 1983) as a way to measure job engagement. Burnout is defined by three dimensions – exhaustion, cynicism and professional ineffectiveness (Maslach & Leiter, 1997). Maslach and Leiter (1997) proposed that the opposite scoring pattern on the three aspects of burnout – as measured with the MBI implies work engagement. In other words, an employee low in exhaustion and cynicism would be high in professional efficacy – and this combination would indicate worker engagement.

Schaufeli and Baker (2003) point out a couple of flaws within this approach. While burnout and engagement seem to be opposite from one another – they cannot have a perfect negative correlation. Additionally, if a worker is not experiencing burnout, that does not mean that they are experiencing engagement (and vice versa). Another example of two “opposites” that are not necessarily so, is in mental health – just because a person is not suffering from depression, this does not mean that they are happy. Many “opposites” have a continuum of degrees between them and also lack this perfect negative relationship (e.g., Positive Affect and Negative Affect; Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988). The UWES was designed with this belief that burnout and engagement are two constructs that are not the exact opposite of one another and should therefore be measured independently (Schaufeli & Baker, 2003).
What about the criterion oriented validity of job engagement and the UWES?

When looking at the MBI and UWES, almost all correlations between burnout and engagement were both significant and negative. Only 8 out of a total of 120 correlations were non-significant. What was interesting and unexpected was the weak correlation between the vigor component of engagement and the exhaustion component of burnout. Engagement was most strongly correlated with burnouts components of professional inefficacy, followed by cynicism, and lastly by exhaustion. So, an engaged worker is likely to feel competent in his/her work and not cynical… but to a somewhat lesser degree… they do not feel very fatigued.

The possible outcomes of work engagement relate to positive attitudes towards work and towards the organization. These positive attitudes include job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and low turnover intention (Demerouti et al., 2001; Salanova et al., 2000). Engaged workers are also more likely to exhibit positive organizational behaviors, such as acting proactively and engaging in tasks beyond their prescribed job-roles (Salanova, Agut & Peiró, 2003).

Hallberg and Schaufeli (2006) investigated the discriminant validity of the UWES to determine whether work engagement could be empirically separated from work involvement and organizational commitment. The area of work commitment includes research on affect and attachment toward the organization, and the job (in both a general and specific sense). How is work engagement distinct from organizational commitment? In order to be considered a useful contribution, it must add predictive validity above and beyond similar constructs.
These three constructs, work engagement, job involvement, and organizational commitment, were expected to share some variance, but not overlap to the extent of redundancy. In other words, the constructs were projected to have weak to moderate correlations with one another (Hallberg & Schaufeli, 2006). Additionally, the constructs were anticipated to be empirically distinct and have different associations with job and personality characteristics, health complaints, and turnover intentions.

Latent intercorrelations indicated that the constructs shared between 12% and 21% of variance. These results confirm the first expectation, that the constructs overlap, but not to the point of redundancy. Next, confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) confirmed the expectation that the constructs would be empirically distinct. Finally, the constructs were correlated with the other variables: health complaints, turnover intentions and personality characteristics. Discriminant validity was further supported by the unique correlations between the constructs and these variables (Hallberg & Schaufeli, 2006). The association that separates the constructs of work engagement from job involvement and organizational commitment is the strong correlation between health complaints and work engagement; this distinguishes work engagement from the other constructs because of its stronger correlation with factors related to physical health (Hallberg & Schaufeli, 2006).

Job engagement was not measured in the current study because it lacked the component of job identity that is included in a similar construct, job involvement.

**Job Involvement**

Similar to engagement, job involvement refers to the degree to which employees believe that their jobs involve their lives in total. Unlike job engagement, job
involvement also includes how much an employee identifies with their job and thinks about it even outside of work (Kanungo, 1982). Job involvement can be influenced by individual differences among employees, organizational characteristics, and supervisory behaviors (Brown & Leigh, 1996).

Frone, Russel, and Cooper (1995) applied the identity theory to test whether the psychological salience of one’s role at work affected important relationships between work stressors and employee health. Identity theory is the idea that social roles (e.g., doctor, sister, mother, volunteer worker) form the source of one’s sense of self or personal identity (Burke, 1991). Each role is associated with a set of expectations of behavior; how well a person meets those expectations and fulfills their roles directly impacts their self-evaluation (Burke, 1991). Consequently, stressors that hinder one’s ability to fulfill their role may disturb their well-being (Burke, 1991). According to identity theory, everyone possess this self-identification through various roles, but there are individual differences in the salience of a given role identity (Frone et al., 1995).

Job involvement, similar to the identity theory, represents the psychological and cognitive association one has with their job (Kanugo, 1982). Job involvement has also been described as the “psychological identification” with one’s job (Kanungo, 1982). This sense of psychological identification suggests that job involvement is the degree to which one sees their job as part of their self-concept (Lawler & Hall, 1970). Therefore, someone with high job involvement would see their work as a way of defining their identity and self-evaluation.
Also like role identity, job involvement is predicted to be a moderator between one’s work experiences and their well-being and work-related outcomes (Locke, 1976). The effect of communication on employee work attitudes is one of the well-being outcomes relevant to the current study. The effectiveness of organizational communication is especially important because it is through this that employees learn what is expected of them and garner information and social support from their supervisors and coworkers (Likert, 1993). Because communication effectiveness is so important to the success of an organization (Likert, 1993), one would expect that it would be positively related to worker attitudes. Contrary to expectations, previous research has examined the effects of communication effectiveness on organizational attitudes and outcomes and found insignificant effects (Muchinsky, 1989; Pinchus, 1993).

Orpen (1997) suggested that this insignificant finding may be explained by a moderating variable that was not previously considered: job involvement. The communication behaviors were examined among a sample of 135 managers from several different firms. The Organizational Communication Effectiveness scale (Frone & Major, 1988) was used to measure the quality of communication behaviors among each manager. The job involvement-communication interaction significantly added and explained the variance in both satisfaction and motivation. In summary, managers with higher job involvement were more affected by the quality of the communication (Orpen, 1997).

In 1988, Frone and Major had tested a similar hypothesis among a sample of nurses. They predicted that their level of job involvement would impact the relationship
between communication quality and job dissatisfaction. As expected, they found that the quality of communication from supervisors, subordinates and colleagues among nurses with high job involvement was positively related to job satisfaction. Alternatively, the quality of these communication sources made no differences among nurses with low job involvement. (Frone & Major, 1988).

Job involvement has also been clearly linked to lower absenteeism, low turnover and lower intentions to leave (Baba & Jamal, 1991; Blau, 1986; Farrell & Stamm, 1988; Huselid & Day, 1991; Ingram, Lee, & Lucas, 1991; Scott & McClellan, 1990; Shore, Newton, & Thornton, 1990). Job satisfaction, as described above, is the most well-documented correlate of job involvement (Baba & Jamal, 1991; Elloy, Everett, & Flynn, 1991). The literature on job involvement describes the construct as a positive employee attribute, and something that is typically associated with positive work outcomes. In this thesis, I am considering the employees’ level of job involvement in relation to their social media use because of its links to the quality of organizational communication and social support, as well as its strong association to job satisfaction. Additionally, job involvement was chosen as a predictor variable over job engagement because of the important component of job identity. Job identity is the idea that an employee is so involved in their job that they think about it even outside of work. This is relevant for the current study because I want to see which employees are talking about their job on Facebook out of personal interest or concern. In other words, I am interested in the people who think about work even when they leave the office. I would like to see how an employee’s job duties involve their life in total and if this carries over in to how they
connect and share through social media. The construct of job involvement will help answer my question - are those who are more deeply invested in their jobs more likely to use Facebook to seek out work related social support?

**Organizational commitment**

Whereas job involvement is the degree to which employees believe their jobs involve their lives in total, organizational commitment is the degree that employees believe where they work (their organization) involves their lives in total. Organizational commitment is defined as an employee’s identification with the organization and its multiple constituencies, and a desire to maintain membership of the organization (Blau & Boal, 1987). Myer and Allen’s 1997 framework of organizational commitment includes three varying types: affective, normative and continuance. Affective commitment (AC) is the emotional attachment an employee has with their organization. Employees with a strong sense of AC identify with their company and believe their employer’s values are in line with their own.

The social-exchange framework is often used to explain the mechanism of AC. The process occurs when the employees exchange good treatment from their organization (trust, fair workload and compensation) for their affective attachments. Stronger AC will result in enhanced job performance (Shore & Wayne, 1993).

The construct of job involvement is somewhat similar to organizational commitment in that they are both concerned with an employee’s identification with the work experience. However the constructs differ in that job involvement is more closely associated with identification with one’s immediate work activities whereas
organizational commitment refers to one’s attachment to the organization (Brown, 1996). It is possible, for example, to be very involved in a specific job but not be committed to the organization or vice versa (Blau & Boal, 1987).

The preliminary study suggests that the people who reported having more industry and coworker friends also had stronger job satisfaction. In this case, social support from coworker and industry friends seems to be acting as a resource that is related to job satisfaction and possibly assessing the employees’ degree of job involvement and/or organizational commitment. For the main study of this thesis, I propose to further examine this relationship. Based on the preliminary survey findings, I hypothesize that an individual’s number of industry and coworker friends will be positively related to job involvement and organizational commitment (see Hypothesis 2 and Hypothesis 3 below).

**Core Self-Evaluations**

Finally, core self-evaluations will be considered in this study in relation to employee Facebook use. Core self-evaluations are employees’ basic evaluations of themselves and their success and control over their lives. An individual’s core self-evaluation may contribute to an employees’ likelihood to connect with organizational and professional friends on Facebook. The direction of the relationship is unclear and is most likely bi-directional. In other words, those with higher self-esteem are more likely to seek out social support, and those that receive social support are more likely to have an increased sense of self-esteem. Studies have shown that the manner in which an employee receives social support at work affects their levels of self-esteem and may also
encourage the return to work among employees with sickness absenteeism (Svensson, Mussener, & Alexanderson, 2009). In other words, the relationships one has with family, friends and coworkers have a strong correlation with an employee’s level of self-esteem, and this seems to encourage sick employees to return to work sooner.

Additionally, core self-evaluations may act as a mediator in the relationship between employee social support and job involvement (Karatepe, Keshavarz, & Nejati, 2010). An employee with higher core self-evaluations may be more likely to connect and share with coworkers and professional colleagues than someone with low self-esteem.

In the current study, it is hypothesized that the behavior of reaching out to coworkers and individuals in one’s professional network on Facebook will be positively correlated with an employee’s self-concept and core self-evaluation. In other words, participants who score higher on the core self-evaluation will also be the participants that report having a higher number of coworker and professional Facebook friends, as well as more likely to use Facebook to talk about their jobs.

Main Study

In this thesis, I will test whether Facebook social support is related to or predicted by employee job involvement and organizational commitment. Specifically, I would like to find out if job involvement and organizational commitment differentially predict social support and interaction on social networking sites.

Organizational commitment and job involvement are empirically distinct constructs, but few studies have looked at them together. Turnover intentions and job performance are the main criterions that have been considered in conjunction with both
job involvement and organizational commitment. Constructs relevant to the current study, such as job resources, social support, and the likelihood to connect with professional/organizational friends on Facebook have not been studied.

Previous studies have asked similar questions about the difference between employees having ties to the organization versus ties to their job task. With the exception of a few studies looking at turnover and job performance, most of this research did not develop far past the basic theory.

Job involvement and organizational commitment have been shown to interact in how they predict turnover intentions. Blau and Boal (1987) compared four employee profiles – employees with 1) high job involvement and high commitment, 2) high job involvement and low commitment, 3) low job involvement and high commitment, and 4) low job involvement and low commitment. Employees in the first category, called “institutionalized stars” had the lowest turnover intentions whereas those in the last category, “apathetic employees” had the highest turnover intentions. An interesting difference appeared in comparing the third category, employees with high job involvement and low commitment (the “lone wolves”) with the institutionalized stars. Lone wolves had higher turnover intentions than the institutionalized stars (with both high job involvement and high commitment). Although lone wolves value their work, they do not have a strong identification to the organization and would be more likely to leave if a job opened up elsewhere with more task-relevant opportunities (Blau & Boal 1987). It was expected that corporate citizens (those with high organizational commitment and low job involvement), would have significantly lower turnover than
lone wolves. This hypothesis was not supported, but corporate citizens did, as expected, have significantly lower turnover intentions than apathetic employees (Blau & Boal, 1987).

**Research Questions**

In the main study, we will further explore the effects of organizational climate and knowledge sharing. Organizational climate is an employee’s perception of their company’s social environment and policies (Patterson, Warr, & West, 2004), and is, therefore, essential in understanding an employee’s use of Facebook in a work related domain.

It is important to examine the organizational climate as a context for social media use because measures of climate have been linked to organizational performance and behavior (Patterson, et al., 2004). Organizational climate may affect company productivity through cognitive and affective states and salient organizational behaviors (Kopeleman, Brief, & Guzzo, 1990). Features of organizational climate that will be examined in this study include employees’ understanding of the company’s Facebook policy, and employees’ perception of their company’s values of knowledge sharing, social networking, and the separation of personal and professional lives.

**H1:** An employee’s perception of organizational climate (how the company values knowledge sharing, social communications and separation between workers’ personal and professional lives) will influence the likelihood that they will use Facebook as a work related source of social support.
**H1a:** An employee who believes their company values knowledge sharing will be more likely to use Facebook as a work related source of social support.

**H1b:** An employee who believes their company values social communications among colleagues and professional friends will be more likely to use Facebook as a work related source of social support.

**H1c:** The relationships stated in H1a-H1b will be moderated by the employee’s perceptions of the appropriateness of using Facebook to talk about work.

Next, I hypothesize that someone who has more job involvement will have more friends within the same profession. If an employee has high job involvement (i.e. likes what they do and is very invested in their work), we think that they would also want to connect (through Facebook) with people within their profession so that they can share knowledge and social support about the nature of their work.

**H2:** The number of Facebook friends an employee has within the same profession will be positively related to their level of job involvement.

**H2a:** Employees perceptions of the appropriateness of using Facebook at work will moderate the relationship stated in H2b.

In a similar way, we predict that an employee who is committed to their organization (likes where they work and is invested in their organization) will be likely to connect (through Facebook) with people who also work at their organization. This hypothesis can be separated from H2, in that those with high organizational commitment will be likely to connect with organizational friends, regardless of whether they work within the same profession.
$H3$: The number of Facebook friends an employee has within the same organization will be positively related to their level of organizational commitment.

$H4$: Employee’s use of Facebook in a work-related context will be significantly and positively related to their organizational commitment and job involvement. This relationship will be stronger in employees who report an organizational climate with high knowledge-sharing, as well as among those who believe it is appropriate to talk about work on Facebook.

$H5$: Employees levels of organizational commitment and job involvement will interact in their relation to social media use, such that people with high job involvement and low organizational commitment will be more likely to use Facebook for work (job-task) related purposes more than people with low job involvement and high organizational commitment.

$H5a$: People with high job involvement and high organizational commitment will be more likely to use Facebook for work (job-task) related purposes if their perceptions of their company’s organizational climate seem accepting of social media use (i.e. encourages knowledge sharing).

CHAPTER SIX

METHOD

Participants

Participants were recruited through Amazon Mechanical Turk (AMT), a paid participant pool. Anyone with internet access can sign up to use Amazon Mechanical Turk as either a ‘worker’ or a ‘requester’. People who sign up as ‘workers’ on AMT find
tasks posted by the ‘requesters’. If the requester accepts their task as complete, the worker is paid the amount listed for the task through Amazon Payments. For the current study, participants who were currently full-time employees, over 18, and had personal Facebook accounts were asked to take the survey. The prompt read, “Currently employed? Have Facebook? Researchers are interested in your opinion. If you complete this survey you will be awarded $9!” Participants were then instructed to follow the link to the survey (created through SurveyMonkey.com) if they met these requirements.

In order to determine the sample size (N) and power for the study, I forecasted the relationships among the three main independent variables, organizational commitment, job involvement, and organizational climate, and the dependent variable, social media use. According to Hallberg and Shaufeli (2006), organizational commitment and job involvement have an intercorrelation of $r = .43$. The intercorrelation between affective commitment and communication climate has been reported at $r = .26$ (van den Hooff & de Ridder, 2004). I could not find a reported intercorrelation between job involvement and organizational climate that was related to the proposed measures. For this value, I used Cohen’s (1988) guide explaining the appropriate correlation coefficients for predictors in multiple linear regressions. In his guide, he lists the recommended coefficients at small ($r = .10$), medium ($r = .30$), and large ($r = .50$). For job involvement and organizational climate, I included an intercorrelation midway between “small” and “medium” of $r = .20$. The intercorrelations among the IVs and the DV are not available so I also used a correlation value of $r = .20$ (Cohen, 1988).
According to these estimations, with 222 participants, we achieve a power of Lamda = .84 (Lambda = 7.85 = power of .80). The relationships between my independent variables and social media use had not been studied together before, so the analysis was simply an estimate.

**Measures**

A survey was created through survey monkey including questions drawn from the preliminary survey concerning Facebook use. The survey additionally included measures of organizational climate (for each employees’ organization), personal levels of job involvement organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and core self-evaluations.

**Demographic Questions.** A few background questions were included in the beginning of the survey concerning number of years employed at their current organization, education, and gender.

**Survey of Social Media use.** There were 11 questions concerning social media use. Some of these questions were drawn from the preliminary social media survey, but all questions are original and were created by the primary researcher. Several of the questions were open ended and asked participants to describe the nature of how they share on Facebook, or to estimate the number of Facebook friends they have in general and within their organization. The survey included items such as *If you have ever posted something about your job or profession on Facebook, what percent of your total postings (messages, statuses, wall-postings, pictures, etc.) are work related? Please estimate.* and *Have you ever posted something about your job or profession on Facebook and received positive feedback? Please describe any examples.*
Measure of Job Involvement. Job involvement was measured with Kanungo’s Job Involvement Questionnaire (JIQ, Kanungo, 1982). Kanungo’s scale was intended to advance the definitional concept of job involvement included in Lodahl and Kejner’s (1965) scale. The JIQ was based on Kanungo’s conceptualization of involvement as "a cognitive or belief state of psychological identification" (Kanugo, 1982, p. 342). The entire JIQ scale was included in the survey for the current study. There were 8 Likert type questions including items such as I am very much involved personally in my job and Most of my interests are centered around my job answered on a scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). According to a meta-analysis of job involvement, the JIQ has a weighted mean reliability of alpha=.85 (Brown, 1996).

Measure of Organizational Commitment. Organizational commitment was assessed with Meyer and Allen’s (1990) Affective Commitment Scale (ACS). This scale comes from the most widely used multidimensional characterization of organizational commitment, developed by Meyer and Allen (1990). The original model includes three dimensions of commitment: affective, normative and continuance commitment. There are three separate scales for each dimension. For the purpose of this thesis, I am only interested in using the component of affective commitment, which describes an employee’s desire to stay in an organization, rather than feeling like they have to (continuance commitment) or ought to (normative commitment). The Affective Commitment Scale has 8 items on a Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree) and includes items such as. This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me and I do not feel 'emotionally attached' to this organization.
The Likert Scale in this survey was originally on a seven point scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). For the current study, the scale only included five points ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) to remain consistent with other test items. The ACS has an acceptable reliability (coefficient alpha = .87) (Meyer & Allen, 1984).

**Measure of Organizational Climate and Knowledge Sharing.** Organizational Climate was measured with a multidimensional instrument, the Organizational Climate Measure (OCM; Patterson, West, Shackleton, Dawson, Lawthom, Maitlis, Robinson, & Wallace, 2005). This model was based on Quinn and Rohrbaugh’s (1983) Competing Value’s Model of Organizational Climate. When the OCM was originally tested, it included 19 individual scales falling under four quadrants, human relations, internal process, open systems, and rational goal. After testing the psychometrics, two of the scales were omitted to leave a total of 17 scales. Regression weights were calculated from a confirmatory factor analysis that assessed 50% of the data. All regression rates were highly statistically significant, with the exception of one item that was removed (Patterson et al., 2005). Each scale contained five items each and the internal consistency of scales had alpha levels ranging from .67 - .88 (Patterson, et al., 2005).

For the purpose of this study, scale items were used from four of the 17 OCM scales including the Autonomy, Formalization, Involvement and Integration scales. All items were presented on a Likert Scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Three of the original five items were drawn from each scale, and one newly formed item was added to the involvement scale. An example item drawn from the
Autonomy scale is *Management lets people make their own decisions much of the time.* The regression rates for the Autonomy scale items range from .51 to .59 (Patterson et al., 2005). The Integration scale contains items such as *People in different departments are prepared to share information.* These items have regression weights ranging from .70 to .77. The Formalization scale includes items such as *People can ignore formal procedures and rules if it helps get the job done.* These regression weights range from .58 to .68. Finally, the Involvement scale consists of items such as *Information is widely shared within our organization,* and the newly created item, *Our coworkers value the sharing of ideas and knowledge among each other.*

**Measure of Job Satisfaction.** Job Satisfaction was measured using the Job In General (JIG) Scale from the Job Descriptive Index (JDI; Bowling Green State University, 1982-2009). The scale is typically presented in accompaniment with five other scales including, People On Your Present Job, Work on Present Job, Pay, Opportunities for Promotion, and Supervision. For the purpose of this study, we will only be including the 18-item JIG scale.

The reader was presented with instructions to think of their job in general and what it is like most of the time. Next to each of the words, they were asked to indicate their agreement with a “Y” if the word described their job, a “N” if it did not describe their job, or a “?” if they were not sure. The JIG includes items such as *Pleasant, Bad, Great,* and *Waste of time.* The JIG scale has a reported alpha of .91 and above (Ironson, Smith, Brannick, Gibson, & Paul, 1989). The JIG has convergent validity with other measures of job satisfaction. The JIG had correlations ranging from .66 with a numerical
rating job satisfaction scale to .80 with the 1951 Brayfiled Roth Scale (Ironson, et al., 1989).

This measure was placed at the end of the survey so that the participants would not be primed to answer in a certain way for questions on organizational commitment and job involvement.

**Measure of Core Self Evaluations** The final part of the survey on core self-evaluations was measured using the Core Self-Evaluation Scale (CSES; Judge, Erez, Bono, & Thoresen, 2003). It has been demonstrated that the CSES is reliable and valid (Judge et al., 2003). The test-retest reliability was found to be .81, which is reasonably high, and evidence that the CSES is stable (Judge et al., 2003). In addition, because the CSES is composed of a only 12 items, it is easy to administer and score. Half of the items are negatively worded and were reverse coded.

**Procedure**

Participants were recruited through Amazon Mechanical Turk (AMT), a form of task crowdsourcing provided through Amazon. Online crowdsourcing are tasks outsourced to undefined groups of Internet users in the form of an open call (Howe, 2006). People who sign up as ‘workers’ on AMT find tasks posted by the ‘requesters’. If the requester accepts their task as complete, the worker is paid the amount listed for the task through Amazon Payments.

AMT workers read a prompt (created by the researcher/requester) intended to draw in people who are currently employed, over 18, and have personal Facebook accounts. The prompt read, “Currently employed? Have Facebook? Researchers are
interested in your opinion. If you complete this survey you will be awarded $9!”

Participants were then instructed to follow the link to the survey (created through SurveyMonkey.com) if they met these requirements. The participants’ survey responses were anonymous and confidential and only used for research purposes by the primary investigator. In order to ensure that participants were not identified, but could be given credit for completing the survey, a 4 digit code was provided on the last page of the survey. Participants were asked to type this code on AMT after completing the survey to receive credit for their work.

Data Analysis

In the first phase of analysis, I determined the descriptive statistics and correlations among all of the measurement items. This phase of analysis is equally as important because of the novelty of this research. It is important to determine where relationships and associations may be occurring, then to see if these relationships can be further explained. I specifically looked for relationships between the main independent variables: organizational climate, organizational commitment, and job involvement with the dependent variable, social media use. I was additionally interested to see how job satisfaction relates to the main IVs, as well as the DV.

In the next phase of analysis I used a series of multi-step linear regressions. All of the independent variable measures were mean centered before running the analysis. Additionally, four interaction terms will be created: 1. An interaction of job involvement and organizational commitment (Hypothesis 5), 2. An interaction of job involvement, organizational commitment and organizational climate. 3. An interaction of job
satisfaction and job involvement, and 4. An interaction of job satisfaction and organizational commitment.

For each linear regression, the DV will be one of the social media use variables. The first block will contain the IVs of Job Involvement, Organizational Commitment and Organizational Climate. The second block will contain the interaction terms.

CHAPTER SEVEN

RESULTS

All statistical analyses were conducted using SPSS 21.0. Rather than analyzing the data for outliers univariately, before testing my hypotheses, diagnostic tests were run after each hypothesis to check for possible outliers with z-scores above or below 3. Cooks distance, Mahalanobis distance, and leverage statistics were also inspected after conducting tests of the main hypotheses.

For the tests of hypotheses, a variety of tests were used including correlations, paired t-tests, and finally, multiple linear regressions to test interactional effects. Prior to the use of multiple regressions, all independent variables were mean-centered to reduce multicollinearity effects.

Descriptive Statistics and Correlational Analysis of Measured Variables

Means and standard deviations for each scale or the three main IVs and the main social media variables are presented in Table 2 and 3. In analyzing the survey responses, the first two questions of interest were, How often do you post something positive about your job or profession on Facebook? and How often do you post something negative about your job or profession on Facebook? Both of these questions were asked on a 5-
point Likert scale from 1 (never) to 5 (more than once a day). The mean response for posting something positive about one’s job or profession ($M = 2.06, SD = .97$) was higher than participants posting something negative about their job or profession ($M = 1.34, SD = .67, t(219) = 10.56, p < .001$). Additionally, these two responses had a positive and significant correlation ($r = .29, p < .001$). This indicates that the people who are creating positive posts more frequently are also creating negative posts more frequently, and those who aren’t engaging in positive posting are also avoiding the posting complaints about their jobs.

Next, the researchers analyzed the nature of the Facebook postings (both negative and positive) in relation to organizational commitment and job involvement. Negative work related Facebook postings were not significantly related to either job involvement ($r = -.10, p = .13$) or organizational commitment ($r = -.09, p = .18$). However, positive work-related Facebook posts were significantly related to both job involvement ($r = .32, p < .001$) and organizational commitment ($r = .28, p < .001$).

Participants’ job satisfaction, measured by the Job In General Scale (from the JDI; Bowling Green State University, 2009), was positively correlated to how often they posted something positive about their job on Facebook ($r = .19, p < .01$) and negatively correlated to how often they posted negatively about their job on Facebook ($r = -.20, p < .01$).

**Tests of Hypotheses**

The correlational analyses for all hypotheses can be seen in Tables 2 and 3. Hypothesis 1 (a-b) was that an employee’s perception of organizational climate would
influence the likelihood that they will use Facebook as a work related source of social support. To test this hypothesis, a correlational analysis were used. The correlational analysis revealed that only one of the four components of Organizational Climate was related to an individual’s likelihood to share work-related posts with their Facebook friends. This component was the participants’ conception that they did not need to follow a strict set of rules within their organization, which will be called “rule bending”. Those who scored high on this scale agreed with statements like, *People can ignore formal procedures and rules if it helps them get the job done.* Rule bending was positively correlated to work-related Facebook posts, $r = .14, p < .05$. The other components of Organizational Climate, conceptions of sharing information between departments, management and supervision, and communication among coworkers were not significantly related to work-related Facebook posts (see Table 2).

Hypothesis 1c was that the relationships in H1a and H1b would be moderated by the employee’s perceptions of the appropriateness of using Facebook to talk about work. This hypothesis was tested for the significant component of organizational climate, rule bending. After mean-centering, an interaction term was created between the predictor variables of appropriateness and rule bending. A multiple linear regression revealed there was not a significant interaction between perceptions of appropriateness and rule bending, $\beta = .06, t(221) = 1.55, p = .12$. Therefore, no additional variance was explained when the interaction was added to the model. Thus, Hypothesis 1c was not supported.

Next, correlational and regression analyses were used to address Hypotheses 2 and 3. Variables used in correlational analyses for Hypotheses 2 and 3 can be seen in
In Hypothesis 2 it was expected that an employee’s number of professional Facebook friends would be positively related to their job involvement. A correlational analysis was run to see if the main variables of interest were significantly related to one another, and would require further investigation (see Table 3). The results revealed that having a higher number of professional friends on Facebook was positively correlated with job involvement \((r = .23, p < .001)\).

Hypothesis 2a was that this relationship would be moderated by an employee’s perceptions of the appropriateness of using Facebook at work. A multiple linear regression was used for this analysis. The predictor variables, job involvement and Facebook appropriateness, were first mean centered then used to create an interaction term. The interaction between job involvement and opinions of Facebook appropriateness was not significant, \(\beta = -0.02, t (221) = -0.79, p = .43\), therefore Hypothesis 2a was not supported.

Hypothesis 3 stated that employee’s number of organization friends would be positively related to organizational commitment. The correlational analysis revealed that the level of organizational commitment was significantly related to percent of organizational friends \((r = .15, p < .05)\). Additionally, having more professional friends on Facebook was significantly correlated to the employee’s job involvement \((r = .23, p < .001)\) and organizational commitment \((r = .19, p < .01)\). An individual’s percent of work related postings was positively related to both their number of coworker Facebook friends \((r = .57, p < .001)\), and their number of industry friends \((r = .36, p < .001)\). The relationship between organizational commitment and an employee’s number of
organization friends was not significantly moderated by rule-bending, \( \beta = .11, t(220) = 1.96, p = .52 \). The simple slopes were significant only in high levels of rule bending, \( \beta = .3, t(220) = 3.51, p < .01 \). See Figure 1 for a visual of the interaction.

Hypothesis 4 stated that employee’s use of Facebook in a work-related context will be significantly and positively related to their organizational commitment and job involvement. A regression analysis was used with mean centered predictors, organizational commitment and job involvement, and percent work-related Facebook postings as the dependent variable. The analysis revealed that individuals level of job involvement significantly predicted the amount they post about their job or profession on Facebook, \( \beta = .28, t(220) = 3.01, p < .01 \). Job involvement scores also explained a significant portion of variance in work-related Facebook posts, \( R^2 = .03, F(1, 220) = 7.34, p < .001 \). Organizational commitment, however, did not significantly predicted the amount of work-related Facebook posts among participants, \( \beta = -.05, t(220) = -.42, p = .67 \).

The correlations between work-related Facebook use were positively related to both job involvement \( (r = .264, p < .001) \) and organizational commitment \( (r = .18, p < .01) \). Please see the scatterplots of these relationships in Figures 2 and 3.

Hypothesis 4a was this this relationship would be stronger in employees who reported an organizational climate with high knowledge sharing as well as those who believe it is appropriate to talk about work on Facebook. A multilinear regressions found no significant moderation of knowledge sharing on these relationships, \( \beta = -.08, t(221) = -1.56, p = .121 \) for organizational climate and \( \beta = -.05, t(221) = -.75, p = .45 \) for job
involvement. However, there was a significant interaction between organizational commitment and perceptions of Facebook appropriateness in predicting an employee’s percent of work-related Facebook posts, $\beta = .60$, $t (221) = 2.00$, $p < .05$, and explained a significant among of variance, $R^2 = .282$, $F (1, 221) = 28.58$, $p < .05$. The simple slopes were calculated using an excel worksheet calculator. The simples slopes revealed that the interaction is only significant when organizational commitment is high, $\beta = .20$, $t (219) = 2.14$, $p < .05$. When organizational commitment was high, employee’s with low perceptions of Facebook appropriateness at work were less likely to post about work, but more likely to post about work when they had high perception of Facebook appropriateness. The graph of the simple slopes can be seen in Figure 4.

A multiple linear regression examining the interaction between job involvement and perceptions of Facebook appropriateness was not significant, $\beta = .023$, $t (221) = .86$, $p = .39$.

In Hypothesis 5, an employee’s levels of organizational commitment and job involvement was expected to interact in their relation to social media use, such that people with high job involvement and low organizational commitment would be more likely to use Facebook for work (job-task) related purposes more than people with low job involvement and high organizational commitment. A multilinear regression did not find this interaction to be significant, $\beta = .06$, $t (221) = 1.71$, $p = .09$. Finally, the simple slopes were calculated and the significance test indicated that simple slopes for all levels of job involvement were significant (low: $t(219) = 1.97$, $p < .05$), medium: $t(219) = 3.30$, $p < .01$), and high: $t(219) = 2.95$, $p < .01$). A graph of the interaction can be seen in
Figure 5. The graph shows that the slopes begin to cross, but the interaction is only marginal \( (p = .09) \).

Hypothesis 5a was that people with high organizational commitment and high job involvement would be more likely to use Facebook for work (job-task) related purposes if their perceptions of their company’s organizational climate seem accepting of social media use (i.e. allows Facebook use at work). I ran an independent samples \( t \)-test with the grouping variable of whether participants reported their organization allowed Facebook at work, and organizational commitment and job involvement as the response variables. There were no significant mean differences between these two groups, job involvement: \( t(194) = .17, p = .87 \); organizational commitment: \( t(194) = 1.09, p = .28 \).

Additional Interactions

In addition to the hypotheses, I created interaction terms among the main measures of my thesis. The interaction of job involvement and organizational commitment was addressed in Hypothesis 5. Next, I added the mean centered variable of rule bending (organizational climate) to the interaction in predicting work-related Facebook use. In Model 1, the three coefficients were entered without the interaction variable and only job involvement was a significant predictor or work-related Facebook posts, \( \beta = .25, t(220) = 2.70, p < .01 \). Model 1 also explained a significant portion of variance in work-related Facebook posts, \( R^2 = .29, F(1,220) = 6.59, p < .001 \). The interaction in model 2 did not significantly predict the relationship beyond model 1.

The next two interaction variables created were job satisfaction * job involvement and job satisfaction * organizational commitment. The first linear regression, with job
involvement and job satisfaction, concluded that the interaction did not significantly add to the prediction of work-related Facebook posts beyond model 1. The second linear regression, with organizational commitment and job satisfaction, also indicated that the interaction did not significantly predict work-related Facebook posts beyond model 1.

The multiple linear regressions including the interaction between Core Self-Evaluations (CSEs) with Job Involvement and Organizational Commitment were conducted next. CSEs did not significantly moderate the relationship between an employee’s job involvement and percent of work-related Facebook postings, but the p-value was marginally significant, $\beta = .06, t(221) = 1.81, p = .07$. The simple slope significance test revealed that the slopes were significantly different at low ($p < .05$), medium ($p < .01$), and high ($p < .01$) levels of job involvement, with high levels having the steepest slope. Alternatively, CSEs significantly moderated the relationship between an employee’s organizational commitment and percent of work-related Facebook postings, $\beta = .10, t(221) =3.00, p < .01$). The interaction also explained a significant portion of variance, $R^2 = .08$, $F(1, 221) = 5.92, p < .01$. The simple slopes were significant at low ($p < .05$), medium ($p < .01$), and high ($p < .01$) levels of organizational commitment (See Figure 6).

A final multiple linear regression was conducted with all of the main predictor variables: Organizational Climate of Rule-Bending, Organizational Commitment, Job Involvement, Job Satisfaction, and CSEs. When considered in a model together, Job Involvement was the only significant predictor of work-related Facebook use among
employees, $\beta = .257$, $t(221) = 2.78$, $p < .01$. All other independent variables did not additionally predict this relationship beyond an employee’s level of job involvement.

CHAPTER 8

DISCUSSION

Summary of Findings

Hypothesis 1 was that an employee’s perception of organizational climate would influence the likelihood that they would use Facebook as a work related source of social support. A correlational analysis revealed that only one of the four components of Organizational Climate, rule-bending, was positively and significantly related to an individual’s likelihood to share work-related posts with their Facebook friends.

Hypothesis 2 was supported by a correlational analysis indicating that an employee’s number of professional Facebook friends is positively correlated to their job involvement. The regression analysis showed us the direction of this relationship with job involvement significantly predicting an employee’s number of Facebook friends within their profession.

Hypothesis 3, stating that employees with more coworker Facebook friends would have higher organizational commitment, was supported by a significant but small positive correlation. Additionally, the analysis revealed that having more professional Facebook friends was positively correlated to employee involvement, a relationship that was not proposed in the original hypotheses.

Recalling a model from the preliminary study, the Job-Demands-Resources Model (JDR) may help explain the positive correlation between job involvement and
having organizational Facebook friends. The JDR Model details how burnout and job involvement can be largely affected by two sets of working conditions, job demands and job resources. The model suggests that having a job resource, such as having social support and friends at work, may reduce job demands and foster job engagement (Bakker & Demerouti, 2006).

This prediction has been supported by numerous studies- including one that demonstrated the way social support at work can play a crucial role in predicting turnover intentions (Cuyper, et al., 2011). When job resources such as social support from one’s supervisor and colleagues are low, there is a stronger relationship between perceived employability, or an employee’s belief that they have a chance at gaining new employment, and turnover intentions. Other studies have also shown that having social support on the job will decrease the likelihood of turnover (Chiu, Chung, Wu, & Ho, 2009).

Hypothesis 4 was that an employee’s use of Facebook in a work-related context would be significantly related to their levels of organizational commitment and job involvement. This hypothesis was supported by a regression analysis that revealed that job involvement and organizational commitment positively and independently predicted employees’ work-related Facebook use. Part of Hypothesis 4a was supported: employees’ perceptions of Facebook appropriateness moderated the relationship between organizational commitment and work-related Facebook postings’s. Job involvement and work-related Facebook postings however, were not significantly moderated by perceptions of Facebook appropriateness.
In Hypothesis 5 it was expected that an employee’s level of organizational commitment and job involvement would interact in their relation to social media use, such that people with high job involvement and low organizational commitment would be more likely to sue Facebook for work related purposes than people with low job involvement and high organizational commitment. This hypothesis was not supported, but the multilinear regression was just missing significance. The simple slopes calculated showed that simple slopes for low, medium, and high levels of job involvement were significant.

Participants reported posting something positive about their job or profession more often than posting something negative. Why did more participants report that they used Facebook to talk about their jobs in a positive light than a negative one? This may be explained by the idea that people are generally more positive than negative and positive perceptions (whether realistic or illusory) are linked to subjective well-being (Brookings & Serratelli, 2006). These perceptions most likely carry over into the workplace when people are asked to rate their level of job satisfaction. In the current study, participants reported a rather high level of job satisfaction. The negative correlation between job satisfaction and negative work-related Facebook postings and positive correlation between job satisfaction and positive work-related Facebook posts can be explained by this tendency for people to evaluate their life more positively in general.

Another possible explanation for why people were less likely to report negative job-related postings may be in the organizational climate of companies. Although the
results suggest that not all of the components of organizational climate are significantly related to sharing work-related posts with one’s Facebook network. “Rule bending”, or an employee’s perception that their company doesn’t value a strict adherence to rules and procedures, was significantly related to the likelihood that employees used Facebook as a work related source of social support.

The number of work related posts an employee shares on Facebook is also positively related to their number of coworker and industry friends. The composition of an employee’s social network may dictate the types of things they share. Alternatively, someone who is more likely to talk about work on Facebook may be more likely to friend their colleagues and industry friends online.

A study on Facebook users by Sheldon (2008) suggests that those who are more involved in their face-to-face relationships are also more involved in their online relationships. While Facebook has been shown to have positive effects on individuals who are introverted (Forest & Wood, 2012), those effects are even more positive for those who are extroverted and have a large social network (Sheldon, 2008). This supports the “rich-get-richer” hypothesis – that is, those who are outgoing and have a lot of friends are more likely to communicate and benefit from socializing on Facebook. In the same study, those who had face-to-face social anxiety used Facebook to dissipate loneliness more than others, but they had fewer Facebook friends (Sheldon, 2008).

Finally, participants were less likely to report negative work-related Facebook postings. This may be related to the perception (and actuality) that their employers are monitoring their social media profiles. In general, people may be hesitant to talk
negatively about their job on the Internet because of the fear that this information will get back to their employer. Studies that have investigated how inappropriate Facebook posts affect hiring decisions have found that females suffer the most. Employers are more likely to choose a candidate who posted something inappropriate on Facebook if they are a male rather than a female (Karl & Peluchette, 2009). Little research has been done on how employers monitor and use work-related posts they see on their current employee’s Facebook profiles.

Limitations and Future Research

There were certain advantages and limitations related to the participant pool and recruiting method in the current study. Participants were recruited through Amazon Mechanical Turk (AMT), a form of task crowdsourcing provided through Amazon. Online crowdsourcing are tasks outsourced to undefined groups of Internet users in the form of an open call (Howe, 2006). AMT for research has shown to have advantages of a large subject pool access, subject pool diversity, low cost and a built-in payment mechanism (Amazon Payments). The main benefits of this form of recruitment are the accessibility to a large pool of participants and a short amount of time spent collecting data. In this study, data from 222 participants were collected in less than one day.

People who sign up as ‘workers’ on AMT find tasks posted by the ‘requesters’. If the requester accepts their task as complete, the worker is paid the amount listed for the task through Amazon Payments. The disadvantage of using this type of sample is the possible difference of AMT workers from the general population. These people sought reimbursement for online tasks and are willing to do research for relatively low pay.
On the other hand, AMT has allowed many studies, including the current study, to expand their participant pool beyond the undergraduate population. There is a wide range of variation in race, age, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, language, and country of origin (Mason & Suri, 2012). But as with many online samples, AMT is not representative of any particular segment of the population or even representative of the online population (Mason & Suri, 2012).

The study of social media devices such as Facebook and Twitter has recently become a popular area of interest in many areas of research, including Psychology. However, research on Facebook in Industrial-Organizational Psychology is limited and majority of the research is done on the general population, adolescents and college aged participants. The research proposed in the current study, relating job involvement and organizational commitment to social media use, has not been previously examined and requires further investigation.

Future research should examine the relationships of organizational commitment, job involvement, organizational climate, and social media in further detail. Primarily, the interaction of organizational commitment and job involvement in relation to work-related Facebook use must be looked at more carefully. In the current study, the simple slopes were significant, but the overall interaction was just shy of significance \( (p = .09) \).

Considering the limitations of online research and Amazon Mechanical Turk, a larger sample set or different recruiting mechanism should be used.

Additionally, the content of work-related Facebook posts should be studied. The current study did not include questions asking participants whether their “work-related”
Facebook posts were about their company, their jobs, their profession, or just people they work with. More detail about how employees are using Facebook to talk about work may help further explain some of these relationships.

A final idea for a future direction lies in the limitation of only asking participants to estimate their percent of work postings, organizational friends, and professional friends, but not the content of their postings. With the public nature of many social media profiles on networks such as Facebook and Twitter, future research could directly measure the content of these postings. One possible mechanism would be using a product by Salesforce.com called Radian 6. Radian 6 is a social media listening device in which you can gather, organize, and analyze what people are saying on public social media accounts such as blogs, forums, Facebook, MySpace, and Twitter. In a future study, I would like to investigate specifically how people talk about their jobs or professions on Facebook to garner social support and in what contexts they are complaining or talking positively.

**Conclusion**

In conclusion, an employee’s level of organizational commitment and job involvement are individually and positively related to whether they use Facebook to talk about work. The organizational climate of rule bending, or the perception that it is not important to follow rules at work, was positively related to work-related Facebook use. It was expected that an employee’s perceptions of appropriateness of using Facebook to talk about work would moderate several main hypotheses. These hypotheses of moderation were not supported except the interaction of Facebook appropriateness and
organization commitment in predicting work-related Facebook postings. The final hypothesis, that organizational commitment and job involvement would interact in their prediction of Facebook use was not supported, but the interaction had a $p$-value of .09 and significant simple slopes. The study encourages future research and provides support for the view that an employee’s dedication to their job and organization influence the way they use Facebook.
APPENDICES
Appendix A

Preliminary Survey

The following questions can apply to any Facebook feature including status updates, but also messages, notes, wall postings, photos, and any other Facebook feature.

1. Have you ever posted something about your job or profession on Facebook and received positive feedback? Please describe any examples.

2. Have you ever posted something about your job or profession on Facebook and received negative feedback? Please describe any examples.

3. Think about the one person that has offered you the most (work-related) support or positive feedback through Facebook. Do not list their name, but please describe your relationship to this person.

4. How often do you post on Facebook?
   a. Never
   b. Less than once a week
   c. Weekly
   d. Daily
   e. More than once a day

5. If you have ever posted something about your job or profession on Facebook, what percent of your total postings (messages, statuses, wall-postings, pictures, etc.) are work related? Please estimate.

6. Please estimate what percentage of your friends are coworkers.

7. Please estimate what percentage of your friends are in the same profession or have similar type jobs (i.e. they do not necessarily have to work at the same organization as you).

8. How long you’ve been on Facebook? Please estimate to the best of your ability.
   Years _____ Months _____

9. Please list (or estimate) your total number of Facebook friends.
10. Do you know if your workplace allows Facebook or has a Facebook policy? Please explain here.

11. Do you have a Facebook application on a smartphone or personal device (ex: iPod touch)?
   a. Yes
   b. No

12. What is the highest degree of education you have obtained?
   a. Some high school
   b. High school degree
   c. Some college
   d. College degree
   e. Post graduate degree
      i. List post grad degree here: ______

13. Gender:
   a. Female
   b. Male

14. How long have you worked at your current job?
   Years______ Months ______

15. Does your Job involve research on human behavior?
   a. Yes
   b. No

16. How satisfied are you with your job?
   1 – Completely dissatisfied
   2
   3- Neutral
   4
   5- Completely satisfied
Appendix B

Main Study Survey

1. Do you have a personal Facebook account?
   a. Yes
   b. No

2. Are you currently employed full-time?
   a. Yes
   b. No

3. If so, how long have you been employed full-time?
   Years_____ Months_____

4. How long have you worked at your current job?
   Years_____ Months ______

5. Please indicate which of the following categories your current job or profession falls under.
   a. Architecture and Engineering
   b. Arts, Design, Entertainment, Sports and Media
   c. Building and Grounds Clearing and Maintenance
   d. Business and Financial Operations
   e. Community and Social Service
   f. Computer and Mathematical
   g. Construction and Extraction
   h. Education, Training, and Library
   i. Farming, Fishing, and Forestry,
   j. Food preparation and Serving Related
   k. Healthcare practitioners and Technical
   l. Healthcare Support
   m. Installation, Maintenance, and Repair
   n. Legal
   o. Life, Physical, and Social Science

6. What is the highest degree of education you have obtained?
   a. Some high school
   b. High school degree
   c. Some college
   d. College degree
   e. Post graduate degree
      i. List post grad degree here:
7. What is your age?

8. Gender:
   a. Female
   b. Male

9. Does your job involve research on human behavior?
   a. Yes
   b. No

10. How often do you post something positive about your job or profession on Facebook?
    a. Never
    b. Less than once a week
    c. Weekly
    d. Daily
    e. More than once a day

11. How often do you receive positive feedback on this type of posting? Provide an example
    a. Never
    b. Less than once a week
    c. Weekly
    d. Daily
    e. More than once a day

12. How often do you receive negative feedback on this type of posting? Provide an example
    a. Never
    b. Less than once a week
    c. Weekly
    d. Daily
    e. More than once a day

13. How often do you receive helpful feedback on this type of posting? (e.g. someone gives you advice on something that will help you with your job or provides you with a work related resource or tip).
    a. Never
    b. Less than once a week
    c. Weekly
    d. Daily
    e. More than once a day
14. How often do you post something negative about your job or profession on Facebook?
   a. Never
   b. Less than once a week
   c. Weekly
   d. Daily
   e. More than once a day

15. How often do you receive positive feedback on this type of posting? Provide an example
   a. Never
   b. Less than once a week
   c. Weekly
   d. Daily
   e. More than once a day

16. How often do you receive negative feedback on this type of posting? Provide an example
   a. Never
   b. Less than once a week
   c. Weekly
   d. Daily
   e. More than once a day

17. How often do you receive helpful feedback on this type of posting? (e.g. someone gives you advice on something that will help you with your job or provides you with a work related resource or tip).
   a. Never
   b. Less than once a week
   c. Weekly
   d. Daily
   e. More than once a day

18. Think about the one person that has offered you the most support through Facebook. Do not list their name, but please describe your relationship to this person.

19. Please indicate your agreement with the following statements:

   19. I trust that Facebook will protect my information and only use it in ways that I am aware of and approve.

   Please indicate your agreement with the following statements:
20. I believe that it is appropriate to use Facebook to talk about my job or profession with others.

21. I understand Facebook privacy settings and how to set them.

22. How often do you post on Facebook?
   a. Never
   b. Less than once a week
   c. Weekly
   d. Daily
   e. More than once a day

23. If you have ever posted something about your job or profession on Facebook, what percent of your total postings (messages, statuses, wall-postings, pictures, etc.) are work related? Please estimate.
   a. 0%
   b. 0-10%
   c. 10-20%
   d. 20-40%
   e. 40-60%
   f. 60-80%
   g. 80-100%

24. Please estimate what percentage of your Facebook friends are coworkers (i.e. they work at the same organization as you).
   a. 0%
   b. 0-10%
   c. 10-20%
   d. 20-40%
   e. 40-60%
   f. 60-80%
   g. 80-100%
25. Please estimate what percentage of your Facebook friends are in the same profession or have similar type jobs (i.e. they do not necessarily have to work at the same organization as you).
   a. 0%
   b. 0-10%
   c. 10-20%
   d. 20-40%
   e. 40-60%
   f. 60-80%
   g. 80-100%

26. How long have you been on Facebook? Please estimate to the best of your ability.
   Years _____ or Months _____

27. Please estimate the total amount of time you have been on any social networking site (MySpace, Twitter, LinkedIn, Facebook, Zynga, etc.)
   Years _____ or Months _____

28. Please list (or estimate) your total number of Facebook friends. ______

29. Do you know if your workplace has a Facebook policy? Please explain here.
   a. Yes they do have a policy.
   b. No they do not have a policy.
   c. I don’t know if they have a policy.

30. Do you if your workplace allows employees to access Facebook while at work?
   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. I don’t know.

31. I access Facebook at work:
   a. On a device provided by my employer
   b. On my personal device
   c. On someone else’s personal device
   d. I do not access Facebook at all while at work
Instructions for the remainder of the survey: please indicate your agreement with the following statements about the organization in which you are currently employed.

32. Values: 'I share many values of my organization.'
   a. 1 = strongly disagree
   b. 2 = disagree
   c. 3 = neither agree nor disagree
   d. 4 = agree
   e. 5 – strongly agree

33. Loyalty: 'I feel loyal to my organization.'
   a. 1 = strongly disagree
   b. 2 = disagree
   c. 3 = neither agree nor disagree
   d. 4 = agree
   e. 5 – strongly agree

34. Pride: 'I am proud to tell people who I work for.'
   a. 1 = strongly disagree
   b. 2 = disagree
   c. 3 = neither agree nor disagree
   d. 4 = agree
   e. 5 – strongly agree

35. I do not feel a strong sense of belonging to my organization.
   a. 1 = strongly disagree
   b. 2 = disagree
   c. 3 = neither agree nor disagree
   d. 4 = agree
   e. 5 – strongly agree

36. I do not feel "emotionally attached" to this organization.
   a. 1 = strongly disagree
   b. 2 = disagree
   c. 3 = neither agree nor disagree
   d. 4 = agree
   e. 5 – strongly agree

37. This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me.
   a. 1 = strongly disagree
   b. 2 = disagree
   c. 3 = neither agree nor disagree
   d. 4 = agree
   e. 5 – strongly agree
38. I do not feel like "part of the family" at this organization.
   a. 1 = strongly disagree
   b. 2 = disagree
   c. 3 = neither agree nor disagree
   d. 4 = agree
   e. 5 – strongly agree

39. I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization.
   a. 1 = strongly disagree
   b. 2 = disagree
   c. 3 = neither agree nor disagree
   d. 4 = agree
   e. 5 – strongly agree

40. I enjoy discussing my organization with people outside it.
   a. 1 = strongly disagree
   b. 2 = disagree
   c. 3 = neither agree nor disagree
   d. 4 = agree
   e. 5 – strongly agree

41. I really feel as if this organization's problems are my own.
   a. 1 = strongly disagree
   b. 2 = disagree
   c. 3 = neither agree nor disagree
   d. 4 = agree
   e. 5 – strongly agree

42. I think I could easily become as attached to another organization as I am to this one.
   a. 1 = strongly disagree
   b. 2 = disagree
   c. 3 = neither agree nor disagree
   d. 4 = agree
   e. 5 – strongly agree

43. The most important things that happen to me involve my present job
   a. 1 = strongly disagree
   b. 2 = disagree
   c. 3 = neither agree nor disagree
   d. 4 = agree
   e. 5 – strongly agree
44. To me, my job is only a small part of who I am.
   a. 1 = strongly disagree
   b. 2 = disagree
   c. 3 = neither agree nor disagree
   d. 4 = agree
   e. 5 – strongly agree

45. I am very much involved personally in my job.
   a. 1 = strongly disagree
   b. 2 = disagree
   c. 3 = neither agree nor disagree
   d. 4 = agree
   e. 5 – strongly agree

46. I live, eat and breathe my job (figuratively speaking).
   a. 1 = strongly disagree
   b. 2 = disagree
   c. 3 = neither agree nor disagree
   d. 4 = agree
   e. 5 – strongly agree

47. Most of my interests are centered around my job.
   a. 1 = strongly disagree
   b. 2 = disagree
   c. 3 = neither agree nor disagree
   d. 4 = agree
   e. 5 – strongly agree

48. I have very strong ties with my present job which would be very difficult to break.
   a. 1 = strongly disagree
   b. 2 = disagree
   c. 3 = neither agree nor disagree
   d. 4 = agree
   e. 5 – strongly agree

49. Usually I feel detached from my job.
   a. 1 = strongly disagree
   b. 2 = disagree
   c. 3 = neither agree nor disagree
   d. 4 = agree
   e. 5 – strongly agree
50. Most of my personal life goals are job-oriented.
   a. 1 = strongly disagree
   b. 2 = disagree
   c. 3 = neither agree nor disagree
   d. 4 = agree
   e. 5 – strongly agree

51. I consider my job to be very central to my existence.
   a. 1 = strongly disagree
   b. 2 = disagree
   c. 3 = neither agree nor disagree
   d. 4 = agree
   e. 5 – strongly agree

52. I like to be absorbed in my job most of the time.
   a. 1 = strongly disagree
   b. 2 = disagree
   c. 3 = neither agree nor disagree
   d. 4 = agree
   e. 5 – strongly agree

53. Management let people make their own decisions much of the time
    a. 1 = strongly disagree
    b. 2 = disagree
    c. 3 = neither agree nor disagree
    d. 4 = agree
    e. 5 – strongly agree

54. Management keep too tight a reign on the way things are done around here
    a. 1 = strongly disagree
    b. 2 = disagree
    c. 3 = neither agree nor disagree
    d. 4 = agree
    e. 5 – strongly agree

55. It’s important to check things first with the boss before taking a decision
    a. 1 = strongly disagree
    b. 2 = disagree
    c. 3 = neither agree nor disagree
    d. 4 = agree
    e. 5 – strongly agree
56. There is very little conflict between departments here
   a. 1 = strongly disagree
   b. 2 = disagree
   c. 3 = neither agree nor disagree
   d. 4 = agree
   e. 5 – strongly agree

57. People in different departments are prepared to share information
   a. 1 = strongly disagree
   b. 2 = disagree
   c. 3 = neither agree nor disagree
   d. 4 = agree
   e. 5 – strongly agree

58. Collaboration between departments is very effective
   a. 1 = strongly disagree
   b. 2 = disagree
   c. 3 = neither agree nor disagree
   d. 4 = agree
   e. 5 – strongly agree

59. It is considered extremely important here to follow the rules
   a. 1 = strongly disagree
   b. 2 = disagree
   c. 3 = neither agree nor disagree
   d. 4 = agree
   e. 5 – strongly agree

60. People can ignore formal procedures and rules if it helps get the job done
   a. 1 = strongly disagree
   b. 2 = disagree
   c. 3 = neither agree nor disagree
   d. 4 = agree
   e. 5 – strongly agree

61. Its not necessary to follow procedures to the letter around here
   a. 1 = strongly disagree
   b. 2 = disagree
   c. 3 = neither agree nor disagree
   d. 4 = agree
   e. 5 – strongly agree
62. There are often breakdowns in communication here
   a. 1 = strongly disagree
   b. 2 = disagree
   c. 3 = neither agree nor disagree
   d. 4 = agree
   e. 5 – strongly agree

63. Information is widely shared within our organization
   a. 1 = strongly disagree
   b. 2 = disagree
   c. 3 = neither agree nor disagree
   d. 4 = agree
   e. 5 – strongly agree

64. Changes are made without talking to the people involved in them
   a. 1 = strongly disagree
   b. 2 = disagree
   c. 3 = neither agree nor disagree
   d. 4 = agree
   e. 5 – strongly agree

65. Our coworkers value the sharing of ideas and knowledge among each other. *NEW ITEM*
   a. 1 = strongly disagree
   b. 2 = disagree
   c. 3 = neither agree nor disagree
   d. 4 = agree
   e. 5 – strongly agree

Think of your job in general. All in all, what is it like most of the time? In the blank beside each word or phrase below, write:

Y for “Yes” if it describes your job
N for “No” if it does not describe it
? for “?” if you cannot decide

66. __ Pleasant
67. __ Bad
68. __ Great
69. __ Waste of time
70. __ Good
71. __ Undesirable
72. __ Worthwhile
73. __ Worse than most
74. __ Acceptable
75. __ Superior
76. __ Better than most
77. __ Disagreeable
78. __ Makes me content
79. __ Inadequate
80. __ Excellent
81. __ Rotten
82. __ Enjoyable
83. __ Poor

84. I am confident
   a. Strongly disagree
   b. Disagree
   c. Slightly disagree
   d. Neither agree nor disagree
   e. Slightly agree
   f. Agree
   g. Strongly agree

85. I get the success I deserve in life
   a. Strongly disagree
   b. Disagree
   c. Slightly disagree
   d. Neither agree nor disagree
   e. Slightly agree
   f. Agree
   g. Strongly agree

86. When I try, I generally succeed.
   a. Strongly disagree
   b. Disagree
   c. Slightly disagree
   d. Neither agree nor disagree
   e. Slightly agree
   f. Agree
   g. Strongly agree
87. I complete tasks successfully.
   a. Strongly disagree
   b. Disagree
   c. Slightly disagree
   d. Neither agree nor disagree
   e. Slightly agree
   f. Agree
   g. Strongly agree

88. Overall, I am satisfied with myself.
   a. Strongly disagree
   b. Disagree
   c. Slightly disagree
   d. Neither agree nor disagree
   e. Slightly agree
   f. Agree
   g. Strongly agree

89. I determine what will happen in my life.
   a. Strongly disagree
   b. Disagree
   c. Slightly disagree
   d. Neither agree nor disagree
   e. Slightly agree
   f. Agree
   g. Strongly agree

90. I am capable of coping with most of my problems.
   a. Strongly disagree
   b. Disagree
   c. Slightly disagree
   d. Neither agree nor disagree
   e. Slightly agree
   f. Agree
   g. Strongly agree
### Table 1

*Correlation Matrix of Preliminary Study Social Media Variables, Part 1*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complaint Pos Feedback</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>.28*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaint Neg Feedback</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posts on Facebook</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Work Facebook posts</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FB friends coworkers</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.63**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FB friends same prof</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** Correlation is significant at the .001 level (2-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed)
* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed)

### Table 1 Continued

*Correlation Matrix of Preliminary Study Variables, Part 2*

<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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How Long on FB</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-.32*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># FB friends</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FB Policy</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access FB on phone</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Involve Behavior</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** Correlation is significant at the .001 level (2-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed)
* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed)
### Table 2

**Correlation of Organizational Climate Variables in Hypothesis 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Work FB Posts</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org Clim. Management</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org Clim. Dept Sharing</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.60**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org Clim. Rule Bending</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org Clim. Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

### Table 3

**Correlations of Measured Variables in Hypotheses 2 and 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% FB Work Post</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.18**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FB Friends Coworkers</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.63**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FB Friends Same Prof.</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JobInvolement</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td>.75**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OrgCommitment</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
Figure 1

Depiction of non-significant interaction between Organizational Commitment and rule-bending
Figure 2

Simple scatterplot and regression line of relationship between Organizational Commitment and percent of work-related Facebook posts
Figure 3

Simple Scatterplot with regression line of relationship between Job Involvement and percent of work-related Facebook posts.
Figure 4

Depiction of how employee perceptions of Facebook appropriateness moderate the relationship between Organizational Commitment and work-related Facebook postings.
Figure 5

Non-significant interaction between job involvement and organizational commitment in the prediction of work-related Facebook posts.
Figure 6

Significant interaction between Core Self-Evaluations and Organizational Commitment in predicting percent of work-related Facebook posts.
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