2006

Well-being as a function of deployment, terrorism, commitment, and patriotism

Elisa Aguayo Rolle
San Jose State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_theses

Recommended Citation

Rolle, Elisa Aguayo, "Well-being as a function of deployment, terrorism, commitment, and patriotism" (2006). *Master's Theses*. 3024.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31979/etd.jz5x-hdck>
https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_theses/3024

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Master's Theses and Graduate Research at SJSU ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of SJSU ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@sjsu.edu.

WELL-BEING AS A FUNCTION OF DEPLOYMENT, TERRORISM,
COMMITMENT, AND PATRIOTISM

A Thesis

Presented to

The Faculty of the Department of Psychology

San José State University

In Partial Fulfillment

Of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Science

By

Elisa Aguayo Rolle

December 2006

UMI Number: 1441118

Copyright 2006 by
Rolle, Elisa Aguayo

All rights reserved.

INFORMATION TO USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleed-through, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

UMI[®]

UMI Microform 1441118

Copyright 2007 by ProQuest Information and Learning Company.

All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

ProQuest Information and Learning Company
300 North Zeeb Road
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

© 2006

Elisa Aguayo Rolle

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

APPROVED FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

Dr. Sharon Glazer

Dr. Howard Tokunaga

Major Melba Stetz, Ph.D.
Walter Reed Army Institute of Research

APPROVED FOR THE UNIVERSITY

ABSTRACT

WELL-BEING AS A FUNCTION OF DEPLOYMENT, TERRORISM, COMMITMENT, AND PATRIOTISM

by Elisa Aguayo Rolle

This study examines the relationship between stressors (deployment and terrorism uncertainty) and strains (morale, well-being, and turnover intention from the military) among 385 U.S. Soldiers deployed after September 11, 2001. Further, blind patriotism, constructive patriotism, and affective commitment were hypothesized to moderate stressor-strain relationships. Blind patriotism buffered the relationships between terrorism uncertainty and psychological well-being, as well as the relationship between deployment uncertainty and intention to leave the military. Constructive patriotism moderated the relationships between deployment uncertainty and both psychological and cognitive well-being. Affective commitment moderated the relationships between deployment uncertainty and both morale and psychological well-being. In general, patriotism and affective commitment buffer stressor-strain relationships. Limitations and implications are discussed.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I dedicate this to my parents who have given me so much. Without them none of my dreams would have been possible. Papi, gracias por tú amor y apoyo, los cuales has demostrado no siempre con palabras sino con el sudor de tú trabajo y con los muchos sacrificios por tú familia. Me has enseñado que la inteligencia y sabiduria son cosas que no solo se aprenden en la escuela, la educación y los grandes valores nos llegan a la vida en muchas formas. Mom, gracias a ti, yo creo en que las posibilidades son infinitas. Mi perseverancia, determinacion, y tenacidad son dones que heredé de ti. Mi sueño es enseñar a otros como tu me has enseñado a mi. Gracias por tener fe en mi, y creer que yo podria perseverar aun cuando yo misma no creia en mi.

To my husband, thanks for being my sounding board, my refuge, and above all my best friend. Through this research I sought a better understanding of the commitment and loyalty Soldiers, like you, exhibit every day in the face of great peril and arduous conditions. As an American, I thank you and all our armed forces for your bravery in defending the U.S. and fighting overseas. As your wife, I count my blessings every day to have you home from Iraq. I am proud and honored to share my life with someone who gives of himself unconditionally every day. I continue to learn humility, sensitivity, and light-heartedness from you. I love you. To my sisters Esther and Vanessa, both of you have inspired me through your many achievements and accolades. You've become great examples for me not just in academia, but in life as strong and benevolent women.

Thank you to Howard, Sharon, and Megumi for being such great teachers and mentors. Melba and LTC Bliese, thank you for giving me the opportunity to work with

these data and for your patience as I worked on this thesis. Sharon, I couldn't have done this without your guidance every step of the way. Thank you for your relentless tenacity in pushing me to reach this goal. Thank you for the time and energy that went into being a thesis chair. You are all greatly appreciated.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION	PAGE
INTRODUCTION.....	1
<i>Significance of Research</i>	3
LITERATURE REVIEW.....	6
<i>Stressors</i>	7
<i>Terrorism</i>	7
<i>Deployment Uncertainty</i>	8
<i>Strains</i>	9
<i>Morale</i>	10
<i>Well-Being</i>	10
<i>Turnover Intention</i>	12
<i>Moderators</i>	12
<i>Organizational Commitment</i>	12
<i>Patriotism</i>	14
<i>Summary</i>	16
<i>Hypotheses</i>	18
<i>Research Question</i>	20
METHODS.....	21
<i>Participants</i>	21
<i>Measures</i>	22
<i>Stressors/Predictors</i>	22

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

<i>Terrorism Uncertainty</i>	22
<i>Deployment/Activation Uncertainty</i>	23
<i>Moderators</i>	24
<i>Blind Patriotism</i>	24
<i>Constructive Patriotism</i>	24
<i>Affective Organizational Commitment</i>	24
<i>Strains</i>	25
<i>Morale</i>	25
<i>Well-Being</i>	25
<i>Turnover Intention</i>	27
<i>Procedures</i>	27
<i>Data Analyses</i>	28
RESULTS.....	29
DISCUSSION.....	44
<i>Summary of Findings</i>	44
<i>Correlations between Stressors and Strains</i>	45
<i>Patriotism and Commitment as Moderators</i>	46
<i>Limitations</i>	51
<i>Future Research</i>	52
<i>Conclusion</i>	53
REFERENCES.....	54

APPENDIX A: Survey Items Organized by Scale	62
APPENDIX B: Human Subjects Institutional Review Board Approval Letter.....	65

LIST OF TABLES

TABLES	PAGE
1 Principal Components Factor Analysis with Varimax Rotation for the Measures of Morale and Well-Being	26
2 Descriptive Statistics and Partial Correlations, Controlling for Sex, Age, Years in Military, Months in Unit, and Active or Reserve.....	30
3 Outcome Variables Regressed on Control Variables, Deployment Uncertainty, Blind Patriotism, and the Interaction between Deployment Uncertainty and Blind Patriotism.....	32
4 Outcome Variables Regressed on Control Variables, Terrorism Uncertainty, Blind Patriotism, and the Interaction between Terrorism Uncertainty and Blind Patriotism.....	34
5 Outcome Variables Regressed on Control Variables, Deployment Uncertainty, Constructive Patriotism, and the Interaction between Deployment Uncertainty and Constructive Patriotism.....	36
6 Outcome Variables Regressed on Control Variables, Terrorism Uncertainty, Constructive Patriotism, and the Interaction between Terrorism Uncertainty and Constructive Patriotism.....	39
7 Outcome Variables Regressed on Control Variables, Deployment Uncertainty, Affective Commitment, and the Interaction between Deployment Uncertainty and Affective Commitment.....	40

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

TABLES		PAGE
8	Outcome Variables Regressed on Control Variables, Terrorism Uncertainty, Affective Commitment, and the Interaction between Terrorism Uncertainty and Affective Commitment.....	43

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURES	PAGE
1 Study model	5
2 Interaction of deployment uncertainty and blind patriotism on turnover intention.....	33
3 Interaction of terrorism uncertainty and blind patriotism on psychological well- being.....	35
4 Interaction of deployment uncertainty and constructive patriotism on psychological well-being.....	37
5 Interaction of deployment uncertainty and constructive patriotism on cognitive well-being.....	38
6 Interaction of deployment uncertainty and affective commitment on morale.....	41
7 Interaction of deployment uncertainty and affective commitment on psychological well-being.....	42

INTRODUCTION

Today's world is extremely different from what it was just a few years ago. This is especially true in the United States. The tragedies of September 11, 2001, impacted people's lives like no other. What was once normal has changed, especially when it came to ensuring people's security. No longer can one arrive at an airport fifteen minutes prior to a flight, or go to a baseball game without being searched. For the first two years after September 11, 2001, people in the U.S. would watch the news to find out what color the threat level was for the day (U.S. Department of Homeland Security, 2002). Since September 11, 2001, the threat level has not dropped below elevated or "yellow", which is the the third of five threat levels (U.S. Department of Homeland Security, 2003). Immediately after the attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, the President of the U.S. activated reserve components and deployed both reserve and active components to strategic points around the world (Bush, G. W., 2001, para. 2 & 11). For example, military personnel (approximately 7,200) were placed at 430 U.S. airports (Haskell, 2001).

Since deployments of U.S. military troops are unpredictable (e.g., the length of deployment and if terrorists will strike again or not), it is vital to continue research on military stress. Furthermore, since the U.S. wants to keep its Soldiers happy, healthy, and wanting to stay in the force, it is crucial to know about their attitudes toward terrorism and deployment. The results of this type of research will undoubtedly help the military improve related training (e.g., deployment phases and terrorism preparation). By becoming more knowledgeable about our Soldiers' thought processes, and frames of

mind, we can hope to give them tools to buffer stressors incurred during deployments (Britt & Bliese, 2003) and increase commitment to their jobs and the military.

Military research has begun to look at issues of military deployment, especially activation of reservists and part-time military personnel, primarily as it pertains to deployment abroad (e.g., Angrist & Johnson, 2000; Britt & Bliese, 2003; Halverson & Bliese, 1996; Stuart & Bliese, 1998). The literature available focuses on common stressors, including rapid mobilization to unfamiliar climates, crowded and unsanitary living conditions, lack of sleep, and threat of conventional and/or chemical attack that Soldiers (both Active duty and Reservists) incur while being deployed, (Britt & Bliese; Segal & Tiggle, 1997; Stuart & Bliese). Along with stressors, special attention has been given to psychological well-being and overall morale among Soldiers returning from deployment and activation (Halverson & Bliese; Rush, 1999).

The common progression of most of these studies has been to first look at the stressors and strains referred to above and then to ask, "How will these factors affect the Soldier, his or her family, and the military?" One important topic of research studied heavily in both the military and civilian literature is that of commitment. Previous studies (e.g., Allen & Meyer, 1990; Bourg & Segal, 1999) show that individuals with high affective commitment (i.e., emotional attachment, involvement and identification with an organization) have less turnover intentions than those with low affective commitment. Organizational commitment is an important topic of study. That is, without commitment, some individuals might behave in ways that would negatively impact their organization, such as a break in organizational structure and/or poor delivery of products and services,

and replacement costs. Commitment can also be a moderator of the relationship between job stressors and withdrawal intentions (Bourg & Segal). Namely, as commitment increases, withdrawal intentions decrease. If commitment decreases, turnover intention tends to increase too (Bourg & Segal; Leong, Furnham, & Cooper, 1996; Tucker, Sinclair, & Thomas, 2005).

The present study should give more insight on topics, such as terrorism uncertainty, patriotism, and deployment uncertainty, that had not previously been the focus, in previous military research studies. It is likely that these areas of research have not been examined much because they, particularly terrorism, were not salient to U.S. culture and daily life prior to the terrorist attacks on the Pentagon and World Trade Center (DiCamillo & Field, 2002). In particular, terrorism and deployment/activation uncertainty are topics that need to be explored and further understood, in light of the current political climate.

Significance of Research

The present study will provide new information about the relationship of the interaction between stressors (i.e., deployment uncertainty, and terrorism uncertainty) and moderating variables (i.e., organizational affective commitment and blind and constructive patriotism) on morale, well-being and retention intention (see Figure 1). Previous research (Britt & Bliese, 2003; Halverson & Bliese, 1996), did not address the impact of not having an estimated return date home on morale and well-being. That is, generally, deployments were specific and usually short missions as in the case of Somalia and Haiti (Halverson & Bliese). However, this is not the case with today's deployments.

Today's deployments are uncertain in length of time, duties, or mission clarity. Often times, these factors continue changing while in theatre (i.e., mission zone or area of operation). This is especially pertinent for those currently deployed in the Persian Gulf and Afghanistan who may have to stay for an inordinate amount of time due to lack of U.S. military resources (Jacobs, 2004). In this study, reservists were deployed to U.S. military installations and combat areas abroad. The extent of uncertainty regarding length of deployment, duties, mission clarity, however, is still quite similar.

The present study will provide further information on deployment uncertainty and how it affects the outcome variables (i.e., morale, well-being, and turnover intention). In addition, it will explore the moderating effects of affective commitment and patriotism (both blind and constructive), and give insights as to whether a buffering effect is present. This information would aid theory development by understanding the role of attachment and affiliation in the stress process. Practically, this information could help the U.S. military develop training and other activities that would increase a sense of affiliation, if affiliation (i.e., affective commitment and patriotism) indeed thwarts negative effects of terrorism and deployment uncertainty on morale, well-being, and turnover intentions.

Figure 1. Study model.

The following literature review will focus on defining each of the main study variables and providing support for the relationships among the study variables as posed in the theoretical framework (see Figure 1). First, definitions, and literature on stressors (i.e., terrorism, and deployment uncertainty) will be reviewed, followed by literature on strains (i.e., morale, well-being, turnover intention), ending with some literature on the moderator variables (i.e., organizational commitment and blind and constructive patriotism) in this model.

LITERATURE REVIEW

One area of research that has not been widely explored in the U.S. is that of terrorism. This might be because prior to September 11, 2001, U.S. society and U.S. researchers probably thought that the likelihood of a mass terrorist attack on U.S. soil was unlikely, even though there had been previous acts of terror against the U.S. and in the U.S. in recent years (CNN/USA Today/Gallup Poll, 2002). For example, both the Oklahoma City bombing in 1995 and the World Trade Center attack in 1993 were considered terrorist attacks; the former by U.S. militia terrorists and the latter carried out by Arab terrorists coming from outside the U.S. Even though now the theme of terrorism is something U.S. citizens are living with on a daily basis, there is little empirical research on this topic (exceptions include, Cohen, 2000; Greenberg, Simon, Pyszczyński, & Solomon, 1986; Medd, 1997).

Terrorism or terrorism uncertainty is likely a much more widely studied topic in Israel, for example, where the threat of an impending attack is something embedded into everyday life and dealt with at a basic level (Israel Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2004). Terrorism in Great Britain was also prevalent for a long time. Terrorist groups, such as the Irish Republican Army (IRA), had often organized and sometimes carried out attacks against civilian British (BBC News, 1993). For at least 30 years, the British had been cognizant of the threat, and aware of impending terror attacks by IRA members. The threat of terrorism there had been historically much greater than in the United States. Although there are many lessons that can be learned from research in these two countries, the greatest threat for terrorism against U.S. Americans now comes from Al-Qaeda

members (U.S. State Department, 2004; Hayes, 2005), who are not U.S. neighbors (as in the case of terrorist activities in Israel and Britain). Terrorism and deployment uncertainties are new realities U.S. Soldiers are experiencing. For this reason, research on these concepts in relation to stress is vital.

Stressors

Terrorism. The definition of terror is violence committed by an individual and/or group to attain a political goal (Boyer, Ellis, Harris, & Soukhanov, 1983). Terrorism, thus, is the act of creating fear of the unknown and intimidation through the exertion of abusive power for the purpose of gaining political clout. Consequences and results of terrorism are losses of innocent human life. Terrorism often strikes when we do not expect it, and if we do expect it, we often do not know where or how it will come and who will be affected by its wrath. This uncertainty is terrorism uncertainty.

Potential of a terrorist strike forces people to reflect upon their own mortality. Terror Management Theory (Greenberg, Simon Pyszczynski, & Solomon, 1986) states that “people’s abilities to think causally (anticipating events that have yet to occur), and to focus on oneself as a potential target or witness of an action, gives rise to an awareness of the inevitability of death and the ever-present potential for pain and aversive experience” (p. 212). Public opinion polls after the attacks on the World Trade Center and Pentagon (DiCamillo & Field, 2002) showed that as much as 83% of Americans felt less secure and believed they could be a victim of a terrorist attack. In 2004, many people (43%) were still worried about terrorist attacks, but to a lesser extent (CNN/USA Today/Gallup Poll, 2004).

Not knowing when the next attack could occur (stressor) increases the level of strain (i.e., negative reaction, shock, despair, and flashbacks) experienced (Frank, 2001). Therefore, members of the U.S. armed forces who indicate a high level of terrorism uncertainty are likely to report greater strain than those who report less feelings of terrorism uncertainty. A terrorist attack is an impending threat since September 11, 2001 (DiCamillo & Field, 2002).

Deployment Uncertainty. Deployment is a military term used to define the spreading out of forces systematically over an area (Boyer et al., 1983). Many active and reserve component Soldiers were called to duty within hours of the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001. Some were immediately deployed to airports and bases across the country whereas others (reserves) awaited the call to duty (or on their home post for a mission). The questions on many Soldiers' minds prior to deployment or activation were: "Where am I going? What will I be doing, and how long will I be there? When am I coming back?" Soldiers are keenly aware that these questions may not all be answered prior to leaving, and they may not even be answered while deployed.

By 2005, more than one million U.S. troops had been deployed to Iraq and Afghanistan, and among them were 210,000 members of the National Guard's 330,000 Soldiers (Bennis, Leaver, & the IPS Iraq Task Force, 2005). When reservists are called up for activation, they are apt to face situations that may impact their lives at a personal and professional level (e.g., time away from civilian job). Common stressors related to deployment or impending deployment/activation, include uncertainty, lack of sleep, long work hours, difficult weather conditions, and separation from spouse and family (Britt &

Bliese, 2003). These stressors yield strains, such as low morale, low well-being, and greater turnover intention the organization (Britt & Bliese, 2003; Tucker et al., 2005).

Even changes from war to peace are strain producing. After September 11, 2001, most U.S. service men and women were ready to act and defend their country. Although previous research (Crumbo, 2003; Stuart & Bliese, 1998) has shown that differing degrees of deployment uncertainty can be extremely strenuous, most U.S. Soldiers were anxious to help in any way possible. Many Soldiers interviewed by local and national press (e.g., Bray, 2003; LaSonde, 2001) commented that it was their patriotic duty to serve. One member of the Washington National Guard stated, “I am proud and incredibly honored to serve my nation and my community in this way. I will do it for as long as they need me” (LaSonde, 2001, para. 3). Nonetheless, military missions can change at any time, as demonstrated by an immediate change from combat operation to peacekeeping operation in Haiti in 1994 (Halverson & Bliese, 1996). Change from a combat operation to a peacekeeping mission, although positive, adds to the level of uncertainty experienced by Soldiers. Rapid mobilization to a strange place is also a stressor (Stuart & Bliese, 1998). Thus, change creates uncertainty which causes strains to develop (Beehr, Jex, Stacy & Murray, 2000; Kaufmann & Beehr, 1989).

Strains

Morale and well-being can be affected by many of the variables previously discussed, for example, deployment uncertainty, terrorism, and organizational commitment (Bourg & Segal, 1999; Evans & Rosen, 1997). Specific to military research, well-being and morale have been studied while Soldiers were deployed (e.g.,

Britt & Bliese, 2003), and often times upon their return home to civilian life (in case of Reserves) (e.g., Halverson & Bliese, 1996).

Morale. Morale is defined in The American Heritage Dictionary (Boyer et al., 1983) as “a moral condition; conduct, behavior; especially with regard to confidence, hope, zeal, submission to discipline” (p. 444). In recent archival studies of the German Army during World War II, it was noted that toward the end of the war, morale among the German Soldiers was so low that some Soldiers no longer trusted the leadership, and after many transfers they could no longer name the unit to which they belonged (Rush, 1999). German officers and the enlisted openly spoke of ways and means of deserting the army. When morale was low, intentions to withdraw were high. Halverson and Bliese (1996) found that U.S. Soldiers with high morale show more support for the operation than those with low morale. Likewise, high morale relate to lower intentions to withdraw from the mission.

Research based on organizational studies outside of the military show that morale is negatively affected by work stressors, job/task uncertainty, and linked to turnover intentions (Evans, Huxley, Gately, Webber, Mears, Pajack, et al., 2006). High morale is linked to higher job satisfaction and commitment to the organization (Linz, Good, & Huddleston, 2006).

Well-Being. Well-being refers to “how good one feels,” psychologically and physiologically. One construct of well-being often examined is depression. A number of studies examine depression in relation to deployment (e.g., Britt & Bliese, 2003; Evans & Rosen, 1997; Stuart & Bliese, 1998). In Stuart and Bliese’s study, Army Reserves

showed elevated depression as a result of their service in the Persian Gulf. Results suggest that combat deployed reserve unit Soldiers experienced greater Post-Traumatic Stress (PTS) symptoms in comparison to reserve Soldiers who were not activated for Operation Desert Storm or who served in other locations of deployment outside the Gulf region.

Deployment uncertainty might be related to well-being. Stuart and Bliese (1998) determined that after long deployments or deployments into combat situations, Soldiers report high psychological strain, such as low levels of well-being. They found that factors, including sudden separation from civilian employment, children, and loved ones, and immediate need to adjust to a combat environment, are each contributors of ill-being. Stressful work environments relate to poor well-being among group members as a whole, despite differences in how individuals perceived and responded to their work environments (Bliese & Halverson, 1998). Physical illness and problems at home also had a negative impact on well-being. Bliese and Halverson found other physical or environmental contributors to poor well-being are poor living conditions in foreign countries (unsanitary facilities, portable housing) and being in social isolation (Krugman, 2003). Another factor studied, that is likely a stressor is Soldiers' concerns with their current assignment and/or military occupational specialty (MOS). Well-being is affected if Soldiers are concerned that their MOS would be on long deployments and activated/deployed several times, such as the case of many Military Police units both Active and Reserve (Crumbo, 2003). Factors studied above in relation to well-being reflect family and work (civilian and military) issues. It is likely that military reservists

are aware of these factors' effects on well-being and therefore, possibly play a role in the negative effects of deployment/activation uncertainty on well-being.

Turnover Intention. Tett and Meyer (1993) define turnover as the termination of an individual's employment with a given company. Turnover intentions reflect conscious and deliberate willfulness to leave the organization, which has been found to be the strongest cognitive precursor of turnover (Lee & Mowday, 1987).

Over the last 20 years, considerable research has been devoted to developing predictive models of voluntary turnover, with job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and intent to quit among the most commonly proposed antecedents (Tett & Meyer, 1993). Satisfaction and commitment have consistently been negatively related to turnover and intent to leave (Bluedorn, 1982; Clegg 1983). Turnover is more likely to occur if one has low perceived job autonomy, low integration into the organization, low level of commitment, and low participation in organizational goals and activities (Marsh & Mannari, 1977). Mowday, Porter, and Steers (1982) established that influences on turnover could be found in the organization as a whole (e.g., work-unit size, supervisory style, co-worker relations), the job itself (i.e., the nature of the job requirements), and the individual (e.g., age, tenure). In the current study, deployment uncertainty and terrorism uncertainty may be factors partially explaining turnover.

Moderators

Organizational Commitment. Organizational commitment is a topic extensively researched both in military and civilian contexts (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Bourg & Segal, 1999; Meyer & Allen, 1991). Commitment to the organization is defined as a

psychological state that binds the individual to the organization, thereby making turnover less likely (Allen & Meyer). Three components of commitment widely studied today are affective, continuance, and normative commitment (Allen & Meyer; Meyer & Allen). Affective commitment refers to employees' emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in, the organization (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Meyer & Allen, 1991; Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch, & Topolnytsky, 2002). People with high affective commitment stay at an organization because they want to, not because they feel they need to or have to (Meyer & Allen; Meyer, Paunonen, Gellatly, Goffin, & Jackson, 1989). Continuance commitment refers to an attachment based on the costs that employees associate with leaving the organization (Allen & Meyer; Becker, 1960; Meyer, et al.). Normative commitment refers to employees' feelings of obligation to remain with the organization (Meyer, Allen & Smith, 1993; Wiener, 1982).

Only affective commitment is studied in the present study for three reasons. First, continuance commitment can be somewhat implied since, in the military, it is hard to leave the organization. That is, Soldiers are not required to give a "two weeks notice" to employers that they want to leave, as in the civilian world. Instead, their "way out" is either waiting until the end of their present tour (e.g., 2-3 years contract), retiring, resigning commission if officers, or (illegally) going absent without leave. Second, the archival data, which will be analyzed for this study, do not contain items referencing normative commitment. This is because normative commitment has been highly correlated with affective commitment (Allen & Meyer, 1990). Third, affective commitment has been found to moderate stressor-strain relationships (Clugston, 2000;

Donald & Siu, 2001; Hackett, Bycio, & Hausdorf, 1994; Irving & Coleman, 2003; Leong et al., 1996). Those with high affective commitment may experience less negative outcomes than those with low commitment when subjected to the same stressors (Donald & Siu, 2001; Mowday et al., 1982; Siu, 2002). Thus, it is expected that when faced with stressors, Soldiers who report high affective commitment will report lower turnover intentions, greater morale, and greater sense of well-being, than those with low affective commitment.

Patriotism. One issue that affects stress and Soldiers' readiness for deployment, that is only now being researched with greater attention is that of patriotism (e.g., Robinson, King, King, & Litz, 2005). Citizenry or patriotism to country might be a macro equivalent to citizenry or patriotism to one's employer. In fact, organizational citizenship behavior was once referred to as the "good Soldier effect" (Bateman & Organ, 1983). Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) is defined as individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly related to the formal organizational reward system, and, in the aggregate, promotes the effective functioning of the organization (Organ, 1988). It is composed of five components, including altruism, courtesy, sportsmanship, conscientiousness, and civic virtue (Organ, 1988; VanDyne, Graham, & Dienesch, 1994).

OCB has mediating effects between stressors and outcomes (Moorman, 1991). In an organizational study looking at work attitudes, OCB was shown to mediate the relationship between job stress, that is, employee burnout and positive work attitudes (Cropanzano, Rupp, & Byrne, 2003). It is possible that OCB should be further studied as

a buffer in the stressor-strain relationships too. In this study, OCB in the form of patriotism to country, will be examined as a moderator variable of stressor-strain relationships.

Patriotism to country, like OCB and commitment, might buffer the negative effects of stressors on strains (Stetz & Stetz, 2003). Patriotism is a sense of belonging, pride, and identification with one's country (Boyer, Ellis, Harris, & Soukhanov, 1983). A patriot is one who loves, defends, and supports his or her country (Boyer, et al.). The more one feels a sense of loyalty to his or her country the less likely work-related (e.g., deployment uncertainty) stressors would strongly impact strains. In other words, strong identification with one's country would likely buffer the effects of stressors on strains. In fact, Marsh and Mannari (1977) found that Japanese employees (in the 1970's) found it morally right to stay with their organization. This form of normative commitment (i.e., identification with organization as a result of obligatory feelings) might relate to studies of Soldiers, because the Japanese culture in the 1970's, like the military, promotes a sense of collectivity and working for the benefit of the group (Beehr & Glazer, 2001). Thus, this sense of obligation, or patriotism to country, might affect stressor-strain relationships.

Patriotism, from a research perspective, is conceptualized in two ways, blind patriotism and constructive patriotism (Schatz, Staub, & Lavine, 1999; Staub, 1991). Blind patriotism refers to an attachment to country by unquestioning positive evaluation, staunch allegiance, and intolerance of criticism. A blind patriot would likely support his or her country no matter what decisions are made or what stance is taken by the

government or citizens of said country (Stetz & Stetz, 2003). Constructive patriotism refers to an attachment to country by supporting through questioning and criticizing current group practices intended to result in positive change (Schatz et al.). For example, a constructive patriot may have protested against the Cold War or the war in Iraq.

Generally, there is a common belief that Soldiers are patriotic citizens (O'Briant, 2001). Patriotism and motivation for serving in the Armed Forces seem to go hand in hand (Stetz & Stetz, 2003). High levels of blind patriotism might buffer negative effects of stressors on Soldiers' well-being, morale, and turnover intention. Constructive patriotism might not have the same strong effects, as it introduces questioning and doubt of country. However, lack of constructive patriotism is not the opposite of blind patriotism. Therefore, it is also expected to moderate the stressor-strain relationship; with high constructive patriotism, effects of stressors on strains will not be as strong as with low constructive patriotism.

Little empirical research has been done on patriotism and it would be valuable to learn more about how patriotism might affect Soldiers' well-being, morale, and turnover intentions (see Figure 1). In addition to being highly applicable to the military literature, results of such a study would benefit civilians, as well, as the concept of patriotism relates to organizational citizenship behavior (Greenberg et al., 1990).

Summary

In this study, terrorism uncertainty and deployment uncertainty are examined as two stressors in relation to three strains, including well-being, low morale, and turnover intention from the military. Generally, during previous deployments, location, duration,

and specific missions were known by serving Soldiers serving (Britt & Bliese, 2003; Halverson & Bliese, 1996; Stuart & Bliese, 1998). However, since September 11, 2001, the landscape of military service has changed dramatically, and some (or all) of these factors are often not known or slowly disclosed to Soldiers in the process of deployment (China Daily News, 2003). Therefore, that deployment uncertainty and terrorism uncertainty yield individual strain, which inevitably affects the effectiveness of military activities, makes these variables important to study. Though little can be done to eliminate the threat of terrorism, there are things that the military can do to minimize deployment-related strain (e.g., uncertainty). Additionally organizational commitment and patriotism will be examined as potential moderators of some related stressor-strain relationships.

Historically patriotism has not been (or rarely) studied in the U.S. (Schatz et al., 1999; Staub, 1996). Previous research has focused on patriotism as a nationalistic view and not in relation to other variables. However, research on normative commitment (e.g., Allen & Meyer, 1990; Meyer et al., 2002) and organizational citizenship behavior (e.g., Moorman, 1991; Turnipseed & Murkison, 2000) suggests that citizenry and sense of obligation would reduce the impact of stressors on strains. This is particularly important as deployment and terrorism uncertainty are of great concern since September 11, 2001. Based on the above literature review, eight hypotheses are posed. These hypotheses are summarized by Figure 1.

Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1: The perceived threat of terrorism will negatively relate to morale and well-being, and positively relate to turnover intentions.

Hypothesis 2: Deployment uncertainty will negatively relate to morale and well-being and positively relate to turnover intentions.

Hypothesis 3: Blind patriotism will buffer the relationship between deployment uncertainty with each of the three outcome variables (morale, well-being, and turnover intention), such that at higher levels of blind patriotism, the relationship between deployment uncertainty and the three outcomes will not be as negative as for people with low blind patriotism.

Hypothesis 4: Blind patriotism will buffer the relationship between terrorism uncertainty with each of the three outcome variables (morale, well-being, and turnover intention), such that at higher levels of blind patriotism, the relationship between terrorism uncertainty and the three outcomes will not be as negative as for people with low blind patriotism.

Hypothesis 5: Constructive patriotism will buffer the relationship between deployment uncertainty with each of the three outcome variables (morale, well-being, and turnover intentions), such that at higher levels of constructive patriotism, the relationship between

deployment uncertainty and the three outcomes will not be as negative as for people with low constructive patriotism.

Hypothesis 6: Constructive patriotism will buffer the relationship between terrorism uncertainty with each of the three outcome variables (morale, well-being, and turnover intentions), such that at higher levels of constructive patriotism, the relationship between terrorism uncertainty and the three outcomes will not be as negative as for people with low constructive patriotism.

Hypothesis 7: Affective commitment will buffer the relationship between deployment uncertainty with each of the three outcome variables (morale, well-being, and turnover intentions), such that at higher levels of affective commitment, the relationship between deployment uncertainty and the three outcomes will not be as negative as for people with low affective commitment.

Hypothesis 8: Affective commitment will buffer the relationship between terrorism uncertainty with each of the three outcome variables (morale, well-being, and turnover intentions), such that at higher levels of affective commitment, the relationship between terrorism uncertainty and the three outcomes will not be as negative as for people with low affective commitment.

Active and reserve Soldiers have been studied before (e.g., Segal & Tiggle, 1997; Stuart & Bliese, 1998). In fact, it has been found that common stressors, including rapid

mobilization to unfamiliar climates, crowded and unsanitary living conditions, lack of sleep, and threat of conventional and/or chemical attack, concern both active duty and reserve components Soldiers while on deployment. Another stressor, however, is not knowing when one's unit will be deployed and it is conjectured that active and reserve Soldiers would differ on this variable, as well as the other study variables. Therefore, the following research question is generated.

Research Question: Are there marked differences between active and reserve Soldiers on the main study variables?

METHODS

Participants

A survey (scales in the Appendix section), was administered during the activation phase for operation Homeland Defense. Participation in the current study was offered to about 500 Soldiers deployed to the Pentagon area in Washington, D.C. and Fort Stewart in Georgia, right after the terrorists' attacks on the U.S. on September 11, 2001. Of those 500 Soldiers, 385 Soldiers (77%) completed the survey.

Analysis of this sample of military police Soldiers show that 171 (44%) were active component, and 214 (56%) reserve component (Army and National Guard). The reservists were from two companies activated for duty at the Pentagon ($n=104$), and one company activated for duty at Fort Stewart ($n=109$). The majority of participants were married (57%) and males (82%). Sixty-one percent of respondents were Caucasian, 26% African American, 5% Hispanic, and only two percent were Asian/Pacific Islander. The average age was 30 years ($SD = 9.00$) and average tenure in the military was 9.64 years ($SD = 8.11$). Of the total number of participants, 22% had been previously activated in other U.S. military operations either stateside or abroad. Participants were told that the purpose of the study was to assess whether unusual stressors were present from the (homeland defense) mission and if long-term activation affected readiness for deployment, turnover intention, morale and well-being for those Soldiers affected by Homeland Defense efforts.

Measures

The present study utilizes archival data obtained from a longitudinal Homeland Defense Study conducted by the Walter Reed Army Institute of Research (WRAIR) under protocol #931, entitled “Enhancing the Well-Being and Readiness of Soldiers and Families Defending the Homeland. Data were gathered on active and reserve component personnel activated post September 11, 2001 to serve at the Pentagon and Fort Stewart, GA. Surveys were administered prior, during, and after activation and deployment, however only data collected in Time 1 (the activation phase) are utilized in the present study. Variables provided in the Homeland Defense dataset, and that are investigated in the present study, include deployment uncertainty, terrorism uncertainty, constructive patriotism, blind patriotism, morale, well-being, turnover intention, and affective commitment (see Appendix A).

Predictor and moderator variables in the present study were assessed along a five-point Likert-type scale, ranging from 1 – “Strongly Disagree”, to 5 – “Strongly Agree.”

Stressors/Predictors. In order to examine the dimensionality of each scale, the two predictor variables (terrorism uncertainty, and deployment uncertainty) were subjected to a Principal Components Factor Analysis (PCFA) with Varimax rotation constraining to two factors.

Terrorism Uncertainty (see Appendix A, items 28-35). Researchers at WRAIR developed the Terrorism scale. It is referred to as terrorism uncertainty in the current study. Eight items were developed to assess perceptions of the likelihood of terrorist attacks. Example items are “Terrorists can attack anywhere and at any time,” “The U.S.

Government might be unable to warn us before the next attack,” and “Someone close to you could be a target of terrorism.” Cronbach alpha reliability for the scale items was .94. Item factor loadings for this scale ranged from .70 to .93

Deployment/Activation Uncertainty (see Appendix A, items 58-65). An 8-item scale developed by WRAIR was used to assess Soldiers’ worries, uncertainties and feelings around deployment. Participants were asked to what extent they agreed or disagreed with each of the items, for example, “It bothers me that I do not know when I will be deactivated” and “My employer supports my military affiliation.” Items in this measure were reverse coded, so that higher scores indicated greater agreement with items. Like terrorism uncertainty, deployment uncertainty items were subjected to a PCFA with Varimax rotation. Two items, 63 and 64, reflecting deployment uncertainty had factor loadings less than .30. The analyses, therefore, were run eliminating those two items.

Another PCFA was employed on the remaining items. Factor loadings for item 62 (“This deployment will have a positive impact on my civilian job”) and item 60 (“I am worried about whether my civilian job will actually be there when I am deactivated) were at least or more than .24 less than the next highest loading item (factor loading .34 .31 respectively); therefore these two items were also eliminated. The four items eliminated (60, and 62-64) reflect a civilian perspective, namely the job impact of deployment uncertainty not deployment uncertainty in and of itself.

In the third PCFA with Varimax rotation, deployment uncertainty item 65 (“The job that I have been doing is more rewarding than what I do in my civilian job”) had a

factor loading of .18 less than the next highest loading. Running alpha reliability indicated that alpha would improve greatly with its removal; therefore, item 65 was removed. It too included wording pertaining to the civilian job. The three retained items 58, 59, and 61 reflect uncertainty without regards to civilian job. The final confirmatory factor analysis indicated a factor labeled deployment uncertainty with factor loadings ranging from .78 to .92 and Cronbach alpha reliability for the scale items was .84.

Moderators. The moderators studied are blind patriotism, constructive patriotism, and affective commitment. Items for blind and constructive patriotism were developed by WRAIR (Stetz & Stetz, 2003). Responses to items on both variables ranged from 1-“Strongly Agree” to 5-“Strongly Disagree.” All patriotism items were entered into a principal component factor analysis (PCFA) and, as expected, two distinct components (blind patriotism and constructive patriotism) resulted from the analysis.

Blind Patriotism (see Appendix A, items 20-22) was measured using three items, for example, “I would support my country right or wrong.” PCFA with Varimax rotation yielded factor loadings ranging from .66 to .79. Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient was .68.

Constructive Patriotism (see Appendix A, items 23-27) was measured with a 5-item scale. An example item is, “If you love the U.S., you should notice its problems and work to correct them.” PCFA with Varimax rotation yielded factor loadings ranging from .60 to .83. Cronbach alpha reliability was .80

Affective Organizational Commitment (see Appendix A, items 53-56). A four-item version of Meyer and Allen’s (1991) Affective Organizational Commitment scale

was tailored for the military population samples. An example item of this measure is “The military has a great deal of personal meaning to me.” PCFA with Varimax rotation yielded factor loadings ranging from .84 to .91. Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient was .91.

Strains. Three strain variables were examined including morale, well-being, and turnover intention. Morale and well-being items were subjected to a PCFA with Varimax rotation.

Morale (see Appendix A, items 48-52) was measured using four items, with respondents answering on a 5-point scale ranging from 1-“Very Low” to 5-“Very High.” Respondents were asked to rate the extent to which their personal or unit level morale was high or low. PCFA with Varimax rotation yielded factor loadings ranging from .75 to .87. Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient was .91.

Well-Being (see Appendix A, items 36-47). A 12-item scale developed by Goldberg (1972) was used to measure psychological well-being. Participants were asked to respond to each item on a 4-point scale from 1-“Not at all” to 4-“A lot more than usual.” Respondents indicated if in the last two weeks they had, for example, “Been able to concentrate on whatever you’re doing,” or “Been feeling unhappy and depressed.” In a PCFA with well-being items, item 40 had the lowest loading (.42). Its wording, (“In the last two weeks have you felt constantly under strain?”) could be ambiguous in relation to the other items which specify the type of strain (e.g., loss of sleep). Therefore, it was eliminated from further analyses. Alpha reliability coefficient for well-being was low (alpha = .62), although the scale was reliable in past studies (e.g., Goldberg, 1972).

In another PCFA, extracting two distinct well-being factors yielded better results (see Table 1). One factor was labeled Psychological Well-Being. Item factor loadings for items 37, 41, 44-46 ranged from .62 to .87 and alpha reliability was .83. The aforementioned psychological well-being items were reverse coded. The second factor

Table 1

Principal Components Factor Analysis with Varimax Rotation for the Measures of Morale and Well-Being (n = 365)

Item	Factor 1 Morale	Factor 2 Psychological Well-Being	Factor 3 Cognitive Well-Being
49	.87		
48	.83		
51	.83		
52	.75		
50	.75		
45		.87	
46		.76	
41		.76	
44		.71	
37		.62	
43			.77
36			.71
42			.70
39			.68
47			.66
38			.55
Eigenvalue	5.81	2.36	1.65
% Variance accounted for	36.32	14.74	10.30
Cumulative % variance	36.32	51.06	61.36

Note. See Appendix A for item wording.

was labeled “Cognitive Well-Being”. Item factor loadings for items 36, 38, 39, 42, 43, and 47 ranged from .55 to .77 and alpha reliability was .90.

The correlation between these two well-being variables was .22, which was low enough to deem them distinct. Psychological well-being refers to one’s feelings and perceived self-worth (i.e., happiness, depression, worthiness, confidence), whereas cognitive well-being refers to one’s perceived role and ability to function (i.e., ability to concentrate, make decisions, cope with problems, and enjoy daily activities). Subsequent analyses of study hypotheses regarding well-being are examined with respect to two aspects of well-being, psychological and cognitive.

Turnover Intention. Turnover intention from the military was measured by asking Soldiers about their intentions related to continuing their careers with the military. The question, developed by WRAIR, was “Which best describes your career intentions?” Soldiers responded on a scale from 1-“Definitely stay in (military) until retirement eligible” to 6-“Definitely leave upon completion of my current obligation.”

Procedures

WRAIR’s survey was administered via paper and pencil, after September 11, 2001 activation/deployment of active and reserve component Soldiers. The purpose of the survey was to determine: 1) presence of unusual stressors from homeland defense, and 2) effects of long-term activation for readiness, retention, morale, and well-being of Soldiers impacted by Homeland Defense. All Soldiers in the aforementioned companies were eligible to enroll in the study and take the survey for Time 1. Surveys were not

anonymous but individual responses remained confidential except where dictated by law, for example, mandatory reporting of an injury, or alleged criminal activity. Identifying information, however, was not provided to the present investigator but kept by WRAIR. Soldiers were informed by WRAIR researchers that participation was completely voluntary. Researchers obtained a written consent form from all respondents which were kept locked in cabinets at the research institute.

Data Analyses

Means, standard deviations, reliabilities, factor analyses, and correlations were performed for all variables. *T*-tests were also run to compare active and reserve component Soldiers on the study variables. Variables for which there were significant differences between the two categories were held constant in subsequent regression analyses. Based on procedures written in Cohen and Cohen (1983), the moderating effects of organizational commitment, as well as patriotism (blind and constructive), on stressor-strain relationships were tested using hierarchical regression analyses. In addition, Soldier characteristics (i.e., sex, age, years in military, months in unit, and active or reserve) were controlled in the study.

Hypotheses 1 and 2 were tested using bivariate correlations. Based on Cohen and Cohen's (1983) work on the application of multiple regression analysis to behavioral science, and Ganster, Fusilier, and Maye's (1986) study of social support as a moderator for work stress, hierarchical multiple regression analyses was employed to test hypotheses 3-8, which purport a moderating effect of each of blind patriotism, constructive patriotism, and affective commitment on each stressor-strain relationship.

RESULTS

Prior to testing hypothesized relationships, the research question was addressed. Independent samples *t*-test was employed to determine if there were differences between active duty and reserve Soldiers on the main study variables. Turnover intention and cognitive well-being both reached the specified .01 and .05 significance level, respectively. Active military Soldiers had significantly greater mean scores ($\underline{M} = 4.19$, $SD = 1.86$) than reservists ($\underline{M} = 3.10$, $SD = 2.0$) on turnover intention ($F = 7.86$, $p < .01$, $df = 351$). Conversely, reservists ($\underline{M} = 2.17$, $SD = .55$) had significantly greater mean scores than active duty Soldiers ($\underline{M} = 2.01$, $SD = .46$, respectively, $p < .05$) on cognitive well-being ($F = 5.57$, $p < .05$, $df = 360$). Active military personnel and reservists did not differ significantly on terrorism uncertainty ($\underline{M} = 2.91$, $SD = 1.11$ vs. $\underline{M} = 3.15$, $SD = 1.09$, respectively, *ns*), deployment uncertainty ($\underline{M} = 3.94$, $SD = 1.27$ vs. $\underline{M} = 4.08$, $SD = 1.05$, respectively, *ns*), blind patriotism ($\underline{M} = 3.66$, $SD = .72$ vs. $\underline{M} = 3.67$, $SD = .84$, respectively, *ns*), constructive patriotism ($\underline{M} = 3.70$, $SD = .62$ vs. $\underline{M} = 3.77$, $SD = .65$, respectively, *ns*), affective commitment ($\underline{M} = 3.08$, $SD = .97$ vs. $\underline{M} = 3.45$, $SD = .95$, respectively, *ns*), psychological well-being ($\underline{M} = 3.07$, $SD = .71$ vs. $\underline{M} = 3.19$, $SD = .65$, respectively, *ns*), and morale ($\underline{M} = 2.95$, $SD = .90$ vs. $\underline{M} = 2.93$, $SD = .97$, respectively, *ns*). Because of the two significant results, whether a Soldier was active or reserve was held constant in subsequent analyses.

Means, standard deviations, correlations, and Cronbach alpha reliabilities among the study variables are presented in Table 2, controlling for active duty or reserve, sex, age, years in military, and months in unit. Hypothesis 1, that perceived threat of

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics and Partial Correlations, Controlling for Sex, Age, Years in Military, Months in Unit, and

Active or Reserve (N=385)

Variable	Mean	S.D.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1 Terrorism	3.12	1.10	.94							
2 Deployment Uncertainty	4.16	1.00	.04	.84						
3 Blind Patriotism	3.65	.88	.17*	-.18*	.68					
4 Constructive Patriotism	3.74	.66	-.04	-.02	.16*	.80				
5 Affective Commitment	3.32	1.01	.12	-.24**	.43**	.07	.91			
6 Psychological Well-Being	3.15	.69	-.12	-.36**	.16*	.09	.24**	.83		
7 Cognitive Well-Being	2.13	.53	.03	-.28**	.16*	.13	.26**	.34**	.90	
8 Morale	2.87	1.00	-.04	-.51**	.12	-.03	.38**	.52**	.53**	.91
9 Intentions to Leave	3.45	2.03	-.04	.25**	-.27**	-.08	-.52**	-.23**	-.35**	-.31**

Note. Reliability coefficients in bold, on diagonal.

Response options for terrorism uncertainty, morale, deployment uncertainty, patriotism and commitment range from 1 to 5; 5 means high levels of the variable.

Response options for well-being variables range from 1 to 4; 4 indicates a high score on the variable.

Intention to leave was rated on a 6-point scale from 1-definitely stay in until retirement to 6-definitely leave upon completion of my current obligation.

**p<.01, * p<.05.

terrorism will negatively relate to morale and well-being, and positively relate to turnover intentions was not supported. Correlations between perceived threat of terrorism and outcome variables were not significant. Hypothesis 2, that deployment uncertainty will negatively relate to morale and to well-being, and positively relate to turnover intentions, was fully supported. Correlations between deployment uncertainty and each of morale ($r = -.51, p < .01$), cognitive well being ($r = -.28, p < .01$), psychological well being ($r = -.36, p < .01$), and turnover intentions ($r = .25, p < .01$) were significant, and in the expected directions.

To test hypotheses 3-8, moderated regression analyses were employed. For hypothesis 3, morale, psychological well-being, cognitive well-being, and turnover intention were each regressed on deployment uncertainty and blind patriotism, as well as the interaction between deployment uncertainty and blind patriotism. The same was done for hypothesis 4, but instead of deployment uncertainty, the predictor variable was terrorism uncertainty. Hypotheses 5 and 6 were similar to and tested like hypotheses 3 and 4, respectively, except that blind patriotism was replaced by constructive patriotism. Finally, hypotheses 7 and 8 were also similar to hypotheses 3 and 4, respectively, but instead of blind patriotism, the moderator variable was affective commitment. Only significant findings are presented in this section, though all findings can be found in Tables 3-8.

Table 3 shows results of outcome variables regressed on control variables, deployment uncertainty, blind patriotism, and the interaction between deployment uncertainty and blind patriotism. Hypothesis 3 is partially supported.

Table 3

Outcome Variables Regressed on Control variables, Deployment Uncertainty, Blind Patriotism, and Interaction Between

Deployment Uncertainty and Blind Patriotism

Variables	Outcome Variables									
	Morale		Psychological Well-being		Cognitive Well-being		Turnover Intention			
	β	ΔR^2	β	ΔR^2	β	ΔR^2	β	ΔR^2	β	ΔR^2
Step 1										
Gender	-.02	.08**	-.16*	.05	.03	.04	-.03			.25**
Age	.10		-.05		.03		-.25*			
Years in Military	.09		.06		.05		-.11			
Months in Unit	-.07		.04		.01		-.12 [†]			
Active or Reserve	-.03		.07		.14		-.07			
Step 2										
Deployment Uncertainty (a)	-.12	.17**	-.36	.12**	.13	.06**	.71*			.04**
Step 3										
Blind Patriotism (b)	.36	.01	.11	.01 [†]	.45	.02 [†]	.27			.03**
Step 4										
a x b	-.37	.00	.01	.00	-.46	.01	-.65 [†]			.01 [†]

Note. The standardized regression coefficients are those derived at Step 4.

** $p \leq .01$, * $p \leq .05$, [†] $p \leq .10$.

The interaction between deployment uncertainty and blind patriotism added significant variance onto turnover intention (and not onto morale, cognitive well-being and psychological well-being). The interaction can be seen in Figure 2. As deployment uncertainty increased, turnover intention from the military increased with greater blind patriotism than low blind patriotism. Therefore, it seems blind patriotism buffered the deployment uncertainty-turnover intention relationship.

Figure 2. Interaction of deployment uncertainty and blind patriotism on turnover intention.

Table 4 shows the interaction between terrorism uncertainty and blind patriotism on outcome variables. The interaction between terrorism uncertainty and blind patriotism yielded a significant beta weight and variance in psychological well-being ($\beta = -.60, p < .05$).

Table 4

Outcome Variables Regressed on Control Variables, Terrorism Uncertainty, Blind Patriotism, and Interaction Between

Terrorism Uncertainty and Blind Patriotism

Variables	Outcome Variables							
	Morale		Psychological Well-being		Cognitive Well-being		Turnover Intention	
	β	ΔR^2	β	ΔR^2	β	ΔR^2	β	ΔR^2
Step 1								
Gender	.01	.08**	-.12*	.05**	.04	.04*	-.04	.25**
Age	.18 ⁺		.03		.07		-.33**	
Years in Military	.11		.07		.06		-.11	
Months in Unit	-.10 ⁺		.00		.00		-.06	
Active or Reserve	-.07		.06		.09		-.09 ⁺	
Step 2								
Terrorism Uncertainty (a)	-.38	.00	-.66**	.02**	-.05	.01*	-.04	.00
Step 3								
Blind Patriotism (b)	-.04	.02**	-.11	.03**	.04	.02*	-.26*	.04**
Step 4								
a x b	.41	.01	-.60*	.01*	.19	.00	.10	.00

Note. The standardized regression coefficients are those derived at Step 4.

** $p \leq .01$, * $p \leq .05$.

As seen in Figure 3, the negative relationship between terrorism uncertainty and psychological well-being was less negative for those with high blind patriotism. As terrorism uncertainty increases, psychological well-being decreases more strongly for those low on blind patriotism than high on blind patriotism. This finding is consistent with hypothesis 4 for psychological well-being.

Figure 3. Interaction of terrorism uncertainty and blind patriotism on psychological well-being.

Table 5 shows the interaction between deployment uncertainty and constructive patriotism for all outcome variables. Consistent with hypothesis 5, the interaction of deployment uncertainty and constructive patriotism yielded a significant beta weight ($\beta = 3.02, p \leq .001$), and added significant variance onto psychological well-being ($R^2 = .10, p \leq .01$), and a significant beta weight ($\beta = -1.66, p < .05$) and variance on ($R^2 = .03, p < .05$) cognitive well-being.

Table 5

Outcome Variables Regressed on Control Variables, Deployment Uncertainty, Constructive Patriotism, and Interaction

Between Deployment Uncertainty and Constructive Patriotism

Variables	Outcome Variables									
	Morale		Psychological Well-being		Cognitive Well-being		Turnover Intention			
	β	ΔR^2	β	ΔR^2	β	ΔR^2	β	ΔR^2	β	ΔR^2
Step 1										
Gender	-.05	.08**	-.05	.05	-.03	.04	-.02	.25**		
Age	.09		-.14		.03		-.28*			
Years in Military	.13		-.05		.14		-.12			
Months in Unit	-.07		.04		.01		-.06			
Active or Reserve	-.04		.02		.14 ⁺		-.10			
Step 2										
Deployment Uncertainty (a)	.04	.17**	-2.96**	.12**	1.19*	.06**	.21	.04**		
Step 3										
Constructive Patriotism (b)	.37	.00	-1.68**	.00	1.12**	.03**	-.05	.00		
Step 4										
a x b	-.54	.00	3.02**	.10**	-1.66**	.03*	-.01	.00		

Note. The standardized regression coefficients are those derived at Step 4.

** $p \leq .01$, * $p \leq .05$.

The interactions can be seen in Figures 4 and 5, respectively. As deployment uncertainty increased, psychological well-being decreased for those low on constructive patriotism, but not those high on constructive patriotism. However, as deployment uncertainty increased, cognitive well-being decreased for those high on constructive patriotism, but increased slightly for those low on constructive patriotism.

Figure 4. Interaction of deployment uncertainty and constructive patriotism on psychological well-being.

Figure 5. Interaction of deployment uncertainty and constructive patriotism on cognitive well-being.

At high levels of deployment uncertainty, cognitive well-being was equally low for people low and high on constructive patriotism, but at low levels of deployment uncertainty cognitive well-being was greater for those high on constructive patriotism than those low on constructive patriotism.

Hypothesis 6 was not supported. The interaction of terrorism uncertainty and constructive patriotism did not add significant variance onto any of the outcome variables (see Table 6).

Consistent with hypothesis 7, the interaction between affective commitment and deployment uncertainty yielded significant variance ($R^2 = .05, p < .001$) in morale and in

Table 6

Outcome Variables Regressed on Control Variables, Terrorism Uncertainty, Constructive Patriotism, and Interaction Between Terrorism Uncertainty and Constructive Patriotism.

Variables	Outcome Variables							
	Morale		Psychological Well-being		Cognitive Well-being		Turnover Intention	
	β	ΔR^2	β	ΔR^2	β	ΔR^2	β	ΔR^2
Step 1								
Gender	.01	.08**	-.13*	.05**	.05	.04*	-.03	.25**
Age	.17 ⁺		.04		.04		-.33**	
Years in Military	.13		.09		.08		-.13	
Months in Unit	-.12*		-.02		-.01		-.03	
Active or Reserve	-.06		.06		.09		-.09	
Step 2								
Terrorism Uncertainty (a)	-.52	.00	-.24	.02**	.11	.01*	-.05	.00
Step 3								
Constructive Patriotism (b)	-.15	.01	-.01	.00	.19	.03**	-.05	.00
Step 4								
a x b	.56 ⁺	.01	.10	.00	-.01	.00	-.04	.00

Note. The standardized regression coefficients are those derived at Step 4.

** $p \leq .01$, * $p \leq .05$.

Table 7

Outcome Variables Regressed on Control Variables, Deployment Uncertainty, Affective Commitment, and Interaction Between Deployment Uncertainty and Affective Commitment

Variables	Outcome Variables							
	Morale		Psychological Well-being		Cognitive Well-being		Turnover Intention	
	β	ΔR^2	β	ΔR^2	β	ΔR^2	β	ΔR^2
Step 1								
Gender	-.02	.08**	-.16*	.05	.04	.04	-.03	.25**
Age	-.02		-.12		-.04		-.22*	
Years in Military	.08		.05		.05		-.09	
Months in Unit	.03		.09		.03		-.06	
Active or Reserve	-.09		.04		.10		-.06	
Step 2								
Deployment Uncertainty (a)	-1.22**	.17**	-.92**	.12**	-.30	.06**	.00	.04**
Step 3								
Affective Commitment (b)	-.64**	.05**	-.45	.03*	.10	.04**	-.49*	.13**
Step 4								
a x b	1.04**	.05**	.73*	.02*	.14	.00	.11	.00

Note. The standardized regression coefficients are those derived at Step 4.

** $p \leq .01$, * $p \leq .05$.

psychological well-being ($R^2 = .02, p < .05$), see Table 7. Figures 6 and 7, respectively, show that when deployment uncertainty was low, both those with high and low affective commitment reported high morale and psychological well-being. However, affective commitment buffered the relationship between deployment uncertainty and these strains, as the negative slope for those high on affective commitment was not as strong as for those low on affective commitment. In other words, as deployment uncertainty increased, morale and psychological well-being decreases more strongly for those with low affective commitment than high affective commitment.

Figure 6. Interaction of deployment uncertainty and affective commitment on morale.

Figure 7. Interaction of deployment uncertainty and affective commitment on psychological well-being.

Hypothesis 8 was not supported. The interaction of terrorism uncertainty and affective commitment did not add significant variance onto any of the outcome variables (see Table 8).

Table 8

Outcome Variables Regressed on Control Variables, Terrorism Uncertainty, Affective Commitment, and Interaction Between

Terrorism Uncertainty and Affective Commitment

Variables	Outcome Variables							
	Morale		Psychological Well-being		Cognitive Well-being		Turnover Intention	
	β	ΔR^2	β	ΔR^2	β	ΔR^2	β	ΔR^2
Step 1								
Gender	.01	.08**	-.13*	.05**	.04	.04*	-.04	.25**
Age	.10		-.03		.01		-.23**	
Years in Military	.09		.06		.05		-.09	
Months in Unit	-.10 ⁺		-.01		.00		-.05	
Active or Reserve	-.10 ⁺		.03		.06		-.06	
Step 2								
Terrorism Uncertainty (a)	-.12	.00	-.32 ⁺	.02**	-.17	.01*	-.06	.00
Step 3								
Affective Commitment (b)	.32*	.12**	.17	.07**	.05	.06**	-.51**	.16**
Step 4								
a x b	.09	.00	.20	.02	.37	.01	.13	.00

Note. The standardized regression coefficients are those derived at Step 4.

** $p \leq .01$, * $p \leq .05$.

DISCUSSION

Summary of Findings

The purpose of this study was to examine if deployment and terrorism uncertainty relate with well-being, morale, and overall turnover intentions among members of the armed forces. Additionally, the interaction between predictors and moderating variables (blind patriotism, constructive patriotism, and affective commitment) were examined to determine whether these moderators buffer the predictor-outcome relationships.

Results suggest that the military should minimize uncertainty around deployments in order to ensure re-enlistment, well-being and high morale. Also, when facing threats of terrorism, those who have blind patriotism will fair better psychologically than those with low blind patriotism. In this section discussion and implications of results are presented.

Active vs. reserve component Soldiers significantly differed on two study variables. Active component Soldiers seem to have greater turnover intentions than reserve Soldiers. This might be because post September 11, 2001, active duty Soldiers face a great likelihood of many deployments, and thus they might want to terminate their military career sooner than reserve Soldiers (Bennis et al., 2005).

In addition, reservists seem to have higher cognitive well-being and lower turnover intention than active duty Soldiers. There may be numerous reasons for this finding. For example, cognitive well-being refers to one's perceived role and ability to function (i.e., ability to concentrate, make decisions, cope with problems, and enjoy daily activities). Reserves' deployments are more likely to have a defined period of time, and a specific purpose (Halverson & Bliese, 1996). Reservists might also feel they have an

especially important role to play in defending the U.S. after September 11, 2001. They might feel they are part of the solution to fix the problem, after all that is why most of them have been called to action (Bennis et al., 2005; Brownlee & Schoomaker, 2004). Finally, active duty Soldiers' cognitive well-being is perhaps lower because they see and live the military every day with all the good and imperfect decision-making that goes on (Rosen, Weber, & Martin, 2000). Although reservists provide the same defense, such work is part of active Soldiers' jobs. Note that the correlation between cognitive well-being and turnover intention is negative ($r = -.30, p < .01$). These results suggest that the military organization needs to take care of increasing the cognitive well-being of its most important resource, the Soldiers, if they want to retain a strong military force.

Correlations between Stressors and Strains

Results of the present study provide partial empirical support for Hypothesis 2, but not Hypothesis 1. Terrorism uncertainty positively correlated with cognitive well-being. Although contrary to hypothesis, this indicates that in situations where terrorism is perceived to be imminent, Soldiers feel confident and capable, thus they have greater concentration, purpose, enjoyment of work, and happiness. These results suggest that Soldiers feel mentally prepared to defend the country, as the threat of terrorism increases. It's as though these Soldiers have been motivated to demonstrate their strength and power to overcome terrorism uncertainty, which they lack control over.

In contrast, Soldiers faced with high levels of deployment uncertainty have lower psychological well-being. Deployment uncertainty can be a more controllable than terrorism. Therefore, what is controllable, but not controlled, yields greater strain.

Karasek (1979) and colleagues (Karasek, Gardell, & Lindell, 1987) write about control as a moderator of stressor-strain relationships and show that with greater control effects of stressors on strains declines, but little control yields greater strain. When deployment is an uncertainty, though otherwise could be controlled, it becomes strain-producing.

Soldiers who are unsure or experience uncertainty related to deployment are less likely to report high morale or high cognitive and psychological well-being, and more likely to indicate turnover intentions. When people do not know where they should be and when they should be at the unknown location, strain ensues. Ambiguity in the workplace has been linked to low satisfaction, low commitment, and withdrawal or intent to leave (Beehr & Glazer, 2005).

Patriotism and Commitment as Moderators

Blind patriotism, constructive patriotism, and affective commitment were expected to moderate the relationship between both deployment uncertainty and terrorism uncertainty and each of the four strains: morale, psychological and cognitive well-being, and turnover intentions. Results are supportive of several related hypotheses. Of the two stressors, mostly the relationship between deployment uncertainty (not terrorism uncertainty) and strains are moderated by affective commitment, constructive patriotism, or blind patriotism. One exception is between terrorism uncertainty and psychological well-being. Furthermore, some effects of stressors on psychological well-being are buffered by blind patriotism, constructive patriotism, and affective commitment. Thus, these cognitive/emotional states affect the extent to which stressors relate to strains. These results are elaborated below.

Blind patriotism acts as a buffer in the relationship between deployment uncertainty and turnover intentions. Because of this “blind” love of country, when deployment uncertainty increases, these Soldiers are far less likely to leave the military than their less blind patriotic counterparts. Blind patriots, therefore, stick with the military regardless of mission.

Blind patriotism is also a buffer in the relationship between terrorism uncertainty and psychological well-being. A Soldier who believes unconditionally in his or her government and shows strong support for the U.S. no matter what, reports higher psychological well-being than those with low blind patriotism. Perhaps highly blind patriots are fatalistic and accept the perils that may come with being a Soldier (Gemmler & Heisler, 1972).

Constructive patriotism moderates the relationship between deployment uncertainty and both psychological well-being and cognitive well-being (see Figures 4-5), albeit in different ways. High constructive patriotism buffers the deployment uncertainty - psychological well-being relationship. Specifically, regardless of their uncertainty related to deployment, psychological well-being remains the same for Soldiers with high constructive patriotism. However, for Soldiers with low constructive patriotism, psychological well-being decreases as deployment uncertainty increases. This is an important note for the military as the Department of Veterans Affairs deals with increased medical and psychological (e.g., post-traumatic stress disorder) claims from Soldiers returning from combat zones such as Iraq and Afghanistan (Hoge, Castro, Messer, McGurk, Cotting, & Koffman, 2004; Vedantam, 2005). Soldiers who feel they

cannot provide constructive criticism or voice disagreement with decisions the U.S. makes, have lower psychological well-being as deployment uncertainty increases. This suggests that voice, as studied in political context, is an important buffer of the effects of stressors on strains (Adnanes, 2004; Hirschman, 1993).

In contrast, as deployment uncertainty increases cognitive well-being drops sharply for Soldiers who have high constructive patriotism and slightly increases for Soldiers with low constructive patriotism. It seems that high constructive patriotism has a buffering effect on cognitive well-being. This type of buffering relationship is seen when one feels emotionally supported in the face of stressors, as in the case of police officers (Patterson, 2003). As an example, reverse buffering is sometimes seen with supervisor social support (Kickul, DePaul, & Posig, 2001). Both the authority figure and supervisor-subordinate relationships translate to the military setting being discussed. Soldiers who have low constructive patriotism have stable low scores on cognitive well-being, but as deployment uncertainty increases, highly constructive patriots' voices aren't heard, thus reducing a sense of cognitive well-being (which includes a sense of decision-making latitude and usefulness to the organization). This indicates that highly constructive patriots need clarity about their deployment. Knowledge and information availability are key factors to ensuring mental well-being (Hackman, 1980; Shaw & Gupta, 2004).

In this study, when deployment uncertainty is high, having or not having constructive patriotism, whereby one has a feeling of duty to speak up, makes no difference and cognitive well-being is low. But when faced with low deployment

uncertainty, cognitive well-being is higher for those with high constructive patriotism than for those with low constructive patriotism, which suggests that having a voice and speaking one's mind is a healthy strategy for maintaining cognitive well-being. Thus, organizations, including the military, must allow for people to voice their concerns about organizational functioning so that their well-being is preserved. This could have life or death consequences for the Soldier and retention or withdrawal consequences for employees of an organization.

Soldiers with low constructive patriotism aren't prone to criticize their government; they may perceive this as disrespectful or inappropriate. Because of this, when deployment uncertainty increases this group may have no other outlet but to reflect internally and feel sad, depressed, and lose confidence in themselves, which might be why there is a decrease in psychological well-being. The military cannot afford to have Soldiers who don't have confidence in themselves, especially as it relates to combat situations. With this same group, when one's deployment uncertainty increases so does one's cognitive well-being. For these Soldiers questioning government or authority doesn't take place, therefore there are fewer reservations about decisions being made and they may be more willing to perform day to day activities with enthusiasm vs. criticism. For military commanders it is imperative they strike a balance between these two groups so that they inspire trust in their troops and motivate Soldiers to do a good job and execute against military strategy abroad, especially in areas of combat.

That affective commitment buffers the relationship between deployment uncertainty and both morale and psychological well-being suggests, that an emotional

attachment to, and identification with the military helps to maintain positive affects even when faced with stressors. This is similar to findings by other researchers (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Leong et al., 1996; Meyer et al., 2002; Siu & Cooper, 1998). High affective commitment is important to maintain, as the opposite not only has dire effects on the individual but further negative consequences for the organization. In the case of the military, such consequences could mean the difference between success and failure of a mission. Also, once someone is in the armed forces, the military should nurture and encourage the feelings of belonging and identification. This can possibly be achieved through mentorship, community events, and public praise and recognition of all military personnel, regardless of active or reserve status or level.

Results of this study show that, in general, as terrorism uncertainty and deployment uncertainty increase, individual strains increase. Moreover, patriotism and affective commitment can sometimes minimize the strength of the stressor-strain relationships. Findings further suggest that the military should increase communication and share information related to deployment. Halverson and Bliese (1996) found that the interaction of morale and deployment uncertainty relates to turnover intentions such that Soldiers who self-report low morale and don't believe their units' morale is good will have higher turnover intention than those with high morale, and thus the military will likely not retain them.

In order to maintain high morale, and keep Soldiers engaged and feeling good about themselves and the Army, military officials must provide them with a worst case scenario timeline related to deployment.

Limitations

The present study has its limitations. First, the present archival data were taken from a survey administered shortly after September 11, 2001, when threats of terrorism were higher than years after (Davis & Silver, 2004). Furthermore, the survey was taken at a time of heightened awareness and fear of terrorism post September 11, 2001. The Soldiers taking the survey had just been activated for Homeland Defense. This fact, along with the media frenzy related to terrorism and potential wars could have played a factor in Soldier response to terrorism and patriotism questions, thus skewing results. Also, caution with interpretation of results is warranted because not all active duty Soldiers (35 out of 145) responded to the concept of deployment uncertainty. Also, the number of reserve Soldiers ($n = 208$) is greater than the number of active duty Soldiers ($n = 145$). The active duty population may be under-represented.

Common method variance, defined as the overlap in variance between two variables attributable to the type of measurement instrument used rather than due to a relationship between the underlying constructs (Avolio, Yammarino, & Bass, 1991; Kline & Sulsky, 2000), was taken into consideration due to the fact that the instrument used in this study was a self-report survey. Based on the supported hypotheses and significant interactions found, which are not typically found with common method variance, this was discounted as a limitation. Similarly, single source variance which refers to the degree to which the relationship between two variables deviates from the “true score correlation” because all responses are from a single source or person (Avolio et al.), was reviewed. The present study asked for self-reporting on one’s individual attitudes, not behaviors, so

the single-source responses were desired. To limit problems with single-source variance when behaviors are studied, it would be helpful to request self-reporting, and also observations and reporting from other sources, for example, supervisors, subordinates or peers.

Future Research

In the future, researchers should analyze data of the other survey administrations in order to capture a longitudinal picture of how the focal stressors affect strains. In particular, as worries over threats of terrorism begin to subside and better understanding of deployment decisions begin to occur, to what degree does well-being, morale, and turnover intention change? Later assessments could also include actual severance from military to determine the extent to which turnover intentions relate to actual withdrawal behaviors.

Further research on blind vs. constructive patriotism is warranted. Are Soldiers becoming more constructive and less blind over time? Are blind and constructive patriotism related to education level? Are there differences in blind and constructive patriotism along the organizational hierarchy? Findings to these questions might affect military recruitment efforts.

Given that patriotism was a salient moderating variable of stressor-strain relationships, and it reflects a sense of loyalty and duty, it would be interesting to determine if normative commitment relates to patriotism and moderates stressor-strain relationships in the same way as patriotism.

Conclusion

In conclusion, this study provides practical implications for military leadership. Primarily, information about deployments needs to be shared with Soldiers as it affects their morale, well-being and turnover intentions. In addition, affective commitment and patriotism moderate stressor-strain relationships. Affective commitment and constructive patriotism each buffered the relationship between deployment uncertainty and psychological well-being. Blind patriotism also buffered the relationship between perceived terrorist threat and psychological well-being. Constructive patriotism had a reverse buffering effect on the relationship between deployment uncertainty and cognitive well-being.

The take-home message from this study is that when stressors are not inevitable, like deployment uncertainty, communication about the stressor could be particularly beneficial for people who have a strong sense of affiliation with both the military organization and the country.

REFERENCES

- Adnanes, M. (2004). Exit and/or voice? Youth and post-communist citizenship in Bulgaria. *Political Psychology*, 25, 795-815.
- Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63, 1-18.
- Angrist, J. D., & Johnson, J. H. (2000). Effects of work-related absences on families: Evidence from the Gulf War. *Industrial & Labor Relations Review*, 54, 41-58.
- Bateman, T. S., & Organ, D. W. (1983). Job satisfaction and the good soldier: The relationship between affect and employee "citizenship." *Academy of Management Journal*, 26, 587-595.
- BBC News. (1993, April 24). IRA Bomb Devastates City of London. Retrieved on August 1, 2004, from http://newssearch.bbc.co.uk/onthisday/hi/dates/stories/april/24/newsid_2523000/2523345.stm
- Becker, H. S. (1960). Notes on the concept of commitment. *American Journal of Sociology*, 66, 32-42.
- Beehr, T. A., Jex, S. M., Stacy, B. A., & Murray, M. A. (2000). Work stressors and coworker support as predictors of individual strain and job performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21, 391-405.
- Beehr, T. A., & Glazer, S. (2001). A cultural perspective of social support in relation to occupational stress. In P. Perrewé, D. C. Ganster, & J. Moran (Eds.), *Research in Occupational Stress and Well-Being* (pp. 97-142). Greenwich, CO: JAI Press.
- Beehr, T. A., & Glazer, S. (2005). Organizational role stress. In J. Barling, K. Kelloway, & M. Frone (Eds.), *Handbook of Work Stress* (pp. 7-33). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Bennis, P., Leaver, E., and the IPS Iraq Task Force (2005, August 31). The Iraq quagmire: The mounting costs of war and the case for bringing home the troops. *Institute for Policy Studies and Foreign Policy in Focus*. Retrieved on November 2, 2006 from <http://www.ips-dc.org/iraq/quagmire/>
- Bliese, P. D., & Halverson, R. R. (1998). Group consensus and psychological well-being: A large field study. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 28, 563-580.

- Bluedorn, A.C. (1982). A unified model of turnover from organizations. *Human Relations*, 35, 135-153.
- Bourg, C., & Segal, M. W. (1999). The impact of family supportive policies and practices on organizational commitment to the Army. *Armed Forces & Society*, 25, 633-652.
- Boyer, M., Ellis, K., Harris, D. R., & Soukhanov, A. H. (Ed.). (1983). *The American heritage dictionary* (2nd college edition, revised., Vol. 1, pp. 192, 444, 503, 702). New York: Dell.
- Bray, B. (2003, April 2). Patriotism draws Warren Hills grad to fray. *The Express-Times*. Retrieved on November 3, 2006 from http://www.nj.com/war/expresstimes/index.ssf?/news/expresstimes/stories/etprofile_barcellona.html.
- Britt, T., & Bliese, P. D. (2003). Testing the stress-buffering effects of self engagement among Soldiers on a military operation. *Journal of Personality*, 71, 245-265.
- Brownlee, L. & Schoomaker, P. J. (2004, Summer). Saving a nation at war: A campaign quality army with joint and expeditionary capabilities. *The U.S. Army Professional Writing Collection*. Retrieved on November 3, 2006 from http://www.army.mil/professionalwriting/volumes/volume2/june_2004/6_04_1.html
- Bush, G. W. (Speaker). (2001). *Radio Address of the President to the Nation* (Live Broadcast September 29, 2001). Washington, DC: The White House.
- China Daily News (2003, August 13). U.S. soldier dies in bomb attack west of Baghdad. Retrieved on October 24, 2004 from http://www.chinadaily.com.cn/en/doc/2003-08/13/content_254407.htm.
- Clegg, C. W. (1983). Psychology of employee lateness, absence, and turnover: a methodological critique and an empirical study. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68, 88-101.
- Clugston, M. (2000). The mediating effects of multidimensional commitment on job satisfaction and intent to leave. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21, 477-486.
- Cohen, E. (2000). Defending America in the twenty-first century. *Foreign Affairs*, 79, 40-56.
- Cohen, J., & Cohen, P. (1983). *Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioural sciences*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

- Cropanzano, R., Rupp, D. E., & Byrne, Z. S. (2003). The relationship of emotional exhaustion to work attitudes, job performance, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, 160-169.
- Crumbo, C. (2003, November 20). MPs high on Army's most-wanted list. Retrieved November 14, 2004, from <http://www.thestate.com/mld/thestate/news/local/7305547.htm>
- Davis, D. W., & Silver, B. D. (2004). Civil liberties vs. security: Public opinion in the context of the terrorist attacks on America. *American Journal of Political Science*, 48, 28-46.
- DiCamillo, M., & Field, M. (2002, September 8). The Field Poll. Retrieved January 17, 2004, from <http://field.com/fieldpollonline/subscribers/RLS2054.pdf>
- Donald, I. & Siu, O. (2001). Moderating the stress impact of environmental conditions: The effect of organizational commitment in Hong Kong and China. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 21, 353-368.
- Evans, M. A., & Rosen, L. (1997). Pregnancy planning and the impact on work climate, psychological well-being, and work effort in the military. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 2, 353-361.
- Evans, S., Huxley, P., Gately, C., Webber, M., Mears, A., Pajak, S., Medina, J., Kendall, T., & Katona, C. (2006). Mental health, burnout and job satisfaction among mental health social workers in England and Wales. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 188, 75-80.
- Frank, I. (2001). September 11, 2001 - Insights into a day of terror from an emergency nursing perspective. *Journal of Emergency Nursing*, 27, 538-555.
- Ganster, D. C., Fusilier, M. R., & Mayes, B. T. (1986). Role of social support in the experience of stress at work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71, 102-110.
- Goldberg, D. P. (1972). *Detecting psychiatric illness by questionnaire*. Oxford University Press (Maudsley Monograph 21): London.
- Greenberg, J., Simon, L., Pyszczynski, T., & Solomon, S. (1986). The causes and consequences of the need for self-esteem: A terror management theory. In R. F. Baumeister (Ed.). *Public self and private self* (pp. 189-207). New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Greenberg, J., Simon, L., Pyszczynski, T., Solomon, S., Rosenblatt, A., Veeder, M., Kirkland, S., & Lyon, D. (1990). Evidence for terror management theory II: The

- effects of mortality salience on reactions to those who threaten or bolster the cultural worldview. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 58, 308-318.
- Hackett, R. D., Bycio, P., & Hausdorf, P. A. (1994). Further assessments of Meyer and Allen's (1991) three-component model of organizational commitment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79, 15-29.
- Hackman, J. R. (1980). Work redesign and motivation. *Professional Psychology*, 11, 445-455.
- Halverson, R. R., & Bliese, P. D. (1996). Determinants of soldier support for Operation Uphold Democracy. *Armed Forces & Society*, 23, 81-96.
- Haskell, B. (2001, October 8). National Guard steps in to help with airport security. *Armed Services Information Service News Articles*. Retrieved November 2, 2006 from http://www.defenselink.mil/news/Oct2001/n10082001_200110083.html
- Hayes, L. (2005, January). *Al-Qaeda, Osama bin Laden's Network of Terror*. Retrieved on June 14, 2006 from <http://www.infoplease.com/spot/terror-qaeda.html>
- Hirschman, A. O. (1993). Exit, voice and the fate of the German Democratic Republic: An essay in conceptual history. *World Politics*, 45, 173-202.
- Hoge, C. W., Castro, C. A., Messer, S. C., McGurk, D., Cotting, D. I., & Koffman, R. L. (2004). Combat duty in Iraq and Afghanistan, mental health problems, and barriers to care. *The New England Journal of Medicine*, 351, 13-22.
- Israel Ministry of Foreign Affairs, (2004, January 14). *2000-2004 Major Terror Attacks*. Retrieved on August 1, 2004, from <http://www.mfa.gov.il/MFA/Facts+About+Israel/Israel+in+Maps/2000-2004-+Major+Terror+Attacks.htm>
- Jacobs, A. (2004, April 16). Extended tours in Iraq dash hopes and raise fears among troops' families. *The New York Times*, p. A12.
- Jex, S. M., & Bliese, P. D. (1999). Efficacy beliefs as a moderator of the impact of work-related stressors: A multilevel study. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84, 349-361.
- Karasek, R. A. (1979). Job demands, job decision latitude, and mental strain: Implications for job redesign. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 24, 285-310.

- Karasek, R. A., Gardell, B., & Lindell, J. (1987). Work and non-work correlates of illness and behaviour in male and female Swedish white collar workers. *Journal of Occupational Behaviour*, 8, 187-207.
- Kaufmann, G. M., & Beehr, T. A. (1989). Occupational stressors, strains, and social supports among Police Officers. *Human Relations*, 42, 185-197.
- Kickul, J., DePaul, U., & Posig, M. (2001). Supervisory emotional support and burnout: An explanation of reverse buffering effects. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 13, 328-344.
- Krugman, P. (2003, August 15). Poor supplies hurt soldiers. Retrieved November 14, 2004, from <http://www.charlotte.com/mld/observer/news/6537277.htm?1c>
- LaSonde, M. (2001, October). *Washington National Guard: Task force freedom guard*. Retrieved November 2, 2006, from <http://www.washingtonguard.com/fo-Airport2.html>
- Lee, T. W., & Mowday, R. T. (1987). Voluntarily leaving an organization: An empirical investigation of Steer's and Mowday's model of turnover. *Academy of Management Journal*, 30, 721-743.
- Leong, C. S., Furnham, A., & Cooper, C. L. (1996). The moderating effect of organizational commitment on the occupational stress outcome relationship. *Human Relations*, 49, 1345-1363.
- Linz, S. J., Good, L. K., & Huddleston, P. (2006). Worker morale in Russia: An exploratory study. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21, 415-437.
- Marsh, R. M., & Mannari, H. (1977). Organizational commitment and turnover: A prediction study. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 22, 57-75.
- Medd, R. (1997). International terrorism on the eve of a new millennium. *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism*, 20, 281-316.
- Meyer, J. P., Paunonen, S. V., Gellatly, I. R., Goffin, R. D., & Jackson, D. N. (1989). Organizational commitment and job performance: It's the nature of the commitment that counts. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74, 152-156.
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1, 61-89.
- Meyer, J. P., Stanley, D. J., Herscovitch, L., & Topolnytsky, L. (2002). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: A meta-analysis of

- antecedents, correlates, and consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 61, 20-52.
- Moorman, R. H. (1991). Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors: Do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76, 845-855.
- Mowday, R. T., Porter, L. W., & Steers, R. M. (1982). Employee-Organization Linkages: The psychology of commitment, absenteeism, and turnover. In P. Warr (Ed.), *Determinants of employee turnover* (pp. 107-134). New York, NY: Academic Press.
- O'Briant, D. (2001, October 4). To enlist OR not to enlist I WANT YOU for the U.S. ARMY Amid patriotic fervor following Sept. 11 terrorist attacks, some rush to sign up, others weigh choices. *The Atlanta Journal-Constitution*, p. D1.
- Organ, D. (1988). *Organization citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Patterson, G. T. (2003). Examining the effects of coping and social support on work and life stress among police officers. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 31, 215-226.
- Robinson, B.C., King, L.A., King, D.W., & Litz, B.T. (2005). Impact of military stressors across the life course. Retrieved June 15, 2005 from <http://www.maveric.org/route/maveric/Resources/Mental%20Healthpf.asp>
- Rosen, L. N., Weber, J. P., & Martin, L. (2000). Gender-related personal attributes and psychological adjustment among U.S. Army Soldiers. *Military Medicine*, 165, 54-59.
- Rush, R. S. (1999). A different perspective: Cohesion, morale, and operational effectiveness in the German Army, fall 1944. *Armed Forces & Society*, 25, 477-508.
- Schatz, R. T., Staub, E., & Lavine, H. (1999). On the varieties of national attachment: Blind versus constructive patriotism. *Political Psychology*, 20, 151-174.
- Segal, D. R., & Tiggle, R. B. (1997). Attitudes of citizen-soldiers toward military missions in the Post-Cold War world. *Armed Forces & Society*, 23, 373-390.
- Shaw, J. D., & Gupta, N. (2004). Job complexity, performance, and well-being: When does supplies-values fit matter? *Personnel Psychology*, 57, 847-879.

- Siu, O. L., & Cooper, C. L. (1998). A study of occupational stress, job satisfaction and quitting intention in Hong Kong firms: The role of locus of control and organizational commitment. *Stress Medicine*, 14, 55-66.
- Siu, O. L. (2002). Occupational stressors and well-being among Chinese employees: The role of organizational commitment. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 51, 527-544.
- Staub, E. (1996). Cultural-Societal roots of violence: The examples of genocidal violence and of Contemporary youth violence in the United States. *American Psychologist*, 51, 117-132.
- Stetz, T. A., & Stetz, M. C. (2003, August). *The direct and moderating effects of blind and constructive patriotism on deployed Soldiers' commitment*. Poster presentation at the 2003 Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Toronto, Canada.
- Stuart, J. A., & Bliese, P. D. (1998). The long-term effects of Operation Desert Storm on the psychological distress of U.S. Army Reserve and National Guard veterans. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 28, 1-22.
- Tett, R. P., & Meyer, J. P. (1993). Job satisfaction, organizational commitment, turnover intention, and turnover: Path analyses based on meta-analytic findings. *Personnel Psychology*, 46, 259-293.
- Tucker, J. S., Sinclair, R. R., & Thomas, J. L. (2005). The multilevel effects of occupational stressors on soldiers' well-being, organizational attachment, and readiness. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 10, 276-299.
- Turnipseed, D. L., & Murkison, G. (2000). Good soldiers and their syndrome: Organizational citizenship behavior and the work environment. *North American Journal of Psychology*, 2, 281-304.
- U.S. Department of Homeland Security. (2002, March 12). *Understanding the Homeland Security Advisory System*. Retrieved on July 31, 2004, from <http://www.dhs.gov/dhspublic/display?content=3006>
- U.S. Department of Homeland Security. (2003, September 4). *Advisory to Security Personnel, No Change in Threat Level*. Retrieved on July 31, 2004, from <http://www.dhs.gov/dhspublic/display?content=1442>
- U.S. State Department. (2004, April). *Patterns of Global Terrorism 2003*. Retrieved on June 14, 2005, from <http://www.state.gov/s/ct/rls/pgtrpt/2003/>

- VanDyne, L., Graham, J., & Dienesch, R. (1994). Organizational citizenship behavior: Construct redefinition, measurement, and validation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37, 215-285.
- Vedantam, S. (2005, December 27). A political debate on stress disorder. As Claims Rise, VA takes stock. *The Washington Post*, p. A01.
- Wiener, Y. (1982). Commitment in organizations: A normative view. *Academy of Management Review*, 7, 418-428.

APPENDIX A

Survey Items Organized by Scale

Demographics

- 1 What is your primary component (e.g. Active Duty, Reserve, National Guard)?
- 2 What location were you deployed to?
- 3 Are you working in your primary MOS?
- 4 What is your gender?
- 5 What is your age?
- 6 Which ethnic group best describes you?
- 7 What is your highest level of education?
- 8 What is your grade (e.g. enlisted, officer, warrant officer) and rank?
- 9 Which of the following best describes your current leadership position?
NCO position
Officer position
- 12 Did you previously deploy to... (e.g. Grenada, Panama, Persian Gulf, etc.)?
- 13 How many years have you been in the military?
- 14 How many months have you been in your current unit?
- 15 What is your current marital status?
- 16 How many years have you been married to your current spouse?
- 17 How many children do you have?
- 18 Are you a single parent?
- 19 On average, how many hours have you slept each night in the past week?

Blind Patriotism

- 20 I would support my country right or wrong.
- 21 I believe that U.S. policies are almost always the morally correct ones.
- 22 It is un-patriotic to criticize this country.

Constructive Patriotism

- 23 If you love the U.S., you should notice its problems and work to correct them.
- 24 If I criticize the U.S., I do so out of love for my country.
- 25 I oppose some U.S. policies because I care about my country and want to improve it.
- 26 I express my love for the U.S. by supporting efforts at positive change.
- 27 My love of country demands that I speak out against popular but potentially destructive policies.

Terrorism

- 28 You do not know what the next terrorist target will be.
- 29 You do not know when the next terrorist attack will occur.
- 30 Terrorists can attack anywhere and at any time.
- 31 You might be unable to protect yourself from a terrorist attack.
- 32 You might be unable to protect those close to you from a terrorist attack.

- 33 The U.S. Government might be unable to warn us before the next attack.
- 34 Someone close to you could be a target of terrorism.
- 35 Americans have lost their sense of safety.

Well-being

In the last two weeks have you:

- 36 Been able to concentrate on whatever you're doing?
- 37 Lost much sleep over worry?
- 38 Felt that you are playing a useful part in things?
- 39 Felt capable of making decisions about things?
- 40 Felt constantly under strain?
- 41 Felt that you couldn't overcome your difficulties?
- 42 Been able to enjoy your normal day-to-day activities?
- 43 Been able to face up to your problems?
- 44 Been feeling unhappy and depressed?
- 45 Been losing confidence in yourself?
- 46 Been thinking of yourself as a worthless person?
- 47 Been feeling reasonably happy, all things considered?

Morale

Rate the following:

- 48 Your personal morale.
- 49 Your level of motivation.
- 50 Your level of energy.
- 51 Your level of drive.
- 52 Morale in your unit.

Affective Commitment

- 53 I feel like "Part of the Family" in the military.
- 54 The military has a great deal of personal meaning to me.
- 55 I feel a strong sense of belonging to the military.
- 56 I feel "emotionally attached" to the military.

Turnover Intentions

- 57 Which best describes your current career intentions?
 - Definitely stay in until retirement eligible (or longer)
 - Probably stay in until retirement
 - Definitely stay in beyond my present obligation, but not necessarily until retirement
 - Undecided about whether to stay after completion of my current obligation
 - Probably leave upon completion of my current obligation
 - Definitely leave upon completion of my current obligation

Deployment Uncertainty

- 58 It bothers me that I do not know when I will be deactivated.

- 59 It bothers me that I do not know if I will remain at this duty station.
- 60 I am worried about whether my civilian job will actually be there when I am
deactivated.
- 61 Rumors make this deployment much more difficult.
- 62 This deployment will have a positive impact on my civilian job.
- 63 My employer supports my military affiliation.
- 64 My absence will negatively affect my co-workers in my civilian job.
- 65 The job that I have been doing is more rewarding than what I do in my civilian job.

APPENDIX B

Human Subjects Institutional Review Board

Approval Letter

San José State
UNIVERSITY

**Office of the Academic
Vice President**

**Academic Vice President
Graduate Studies and Research**

One Washington Square
San José, CA 95192-0025
Voice: 408-283-7500
Fax: 408-924-2477
E-mail: gradstudies@sjsu.edu
<http://www.sjsu.edu>

To: Eisa Rolle
3356 Spring Street
Redwood City, CA 94063
From: Pam Stacks, *Pam Stacks*
Interim AVP, Graduate Studies & Research

Date: November 8, 2004

The Human Subjects-Institutional Review Board has approved your request for exemption from human subjects review under category "D" in the study entitled:

"The Moderating Effects of Commitment and Patriotism, in the Stressor-Outcome Relationship of Soldiers Activated for Homeland Defense."

This approval is contingent upon the subjects participating in your research project or the subject's data collected for the research project being appropriately protected from risk. This includes the protection of the anonymity of the subjects' identity when they participate in your research project and concerning all data that may be collected from the subjects. The Board's approval includes continued monitoring of your research to assure that the subjects are being adequately and properly protected from such risks. If at any time a subject becomes injured or complains of injury, you must immediately notify Pam Stacks, Ph.D. Injury includes but is not limited to bodily harm, psychological trauma, and release of potentially damaging personal information.

Please also be advised that all subjects need to be fully informed and aware that their participation in your research project is voluntary, and that he or she may withdraw from the project at any time. Further, a subject's participation, refusal to participate, or withdrawal will not affect any services that the subject is receiving or will receive at the institution in which the research is being conducted. This approval is granted for a one-year period and data collection beyond November 8, 2005 requires an extension request.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (408) 924-2480.

cc: Dr. Sharon Glazer

The California State University:
Chancellor's Office
Bakersfield, Channel Islands, Chico,
Dominguez Hills, Fresno, Fullerton,
Hayward, Humboldt, Long Beach,
Los Angeles, Maritime Academy,
Monterey Bay, Northridge, Pomona,
Sacramento, San Bernardino, San Diego,
San Francisco, San José, San Luis Obispo,
San Marcos, Sonoma, Stanislaus