

Exploring the effects of role ambiguity and conflict on employee commitment in the Banking Industry

Martin Serreqi¹, Jonida Lama²

¹Department of Management, University of Tirana, Faculty of Economy, Albania

² University of Tirana, Faculty of Economy, Albania

*(martin.serreqi@unitir.edu.al, jonida.lama@unitir.edu.al)

(Received: 03 September 2025, Accepted: 07 September 2025)

(7th International Conference on Innovative Academic Studies ICIAS 2025, September 02-03, 2025)

ATIF/REFERENCE: Serreqi, M. & Lama, J. (2025). Exploring the effects of role ambiguity and conflict on employee commitment in the Banking Industry, *International Journal of Advanced Natural Sciences and Engineering Researches*, 9(9), 54-59.

Abstract – Researchers in the fields of human resources and organizational behavior have been studying organizational commitment for decades. This is due to the fact that employee commitment is believed to be a fundamental driver of organizational performance and productivity (Fiorito, Bozeman, Young, & Meurs, 2007) (Meyer, Allen, & Smith, 1993). One reason for this is because it is believed that organizational commitment is the driving force behind effectiveness and performance. The goal of this research is to investigate the connection between role ambiguity and conflict and the level of employee commitment in a business. For the purpose of this research, a representative sample of 181 banking industry employees was used. The objective is to determine the factors of role ambiguity and conflict that have an effect on organizational commitment, with the intention of providing employers with actionable insights that can be used to increase employee performance and commitment. According to the results, both role ambiguity and conflict have an effect on the level of organizational commitment across all of the responding individuals.

Keywords – Role Ambiguity, Role Conflict, Organizational Commitment, Performance.

I. INTRODUCTION

Nowadays, the employees are required to handle uncertainty while simultaneously answering the ever-changing and competing needs of a wide variety of consumer groups. According to Kim, Murrmann, and Lee (2009) as well as CahayaSanthi and Piartrini (2020), one of the main factors that contributes to stress in the workplace is the ambiguity that exists about the performance of certain duties. In addition, it appears that role conflict and role ambiguity are among the most significant factors that contribute to stress in the workplace (Grobela, 2015) (Arshad, Najwani, Mahmoud, Siam, & Alshuaibi, 2020). Role ambiguity and role conflict are more likely to be encountered by employees who have direct contact with consumers while responding to a variety of requests from customers, supervisors, and other departments (O'Neill & Davis, 2011) (Kim, Ro, Hutchinson, & Kwun, 2014).

To achieve their goals and objectives efficiently and successfully, firms want employees who are deeply committed to their job. When employees experience a psychological state that enhances their loyalty to their role and organization, this exemplifies organizational commitment. In their study, Jackson and Schuler and Jackson (1985) did a meta-analysis on nearly 200 research and discovered that role ambiguity and role conflict are the root causes of low work satisfaction, stress, low commitment, intention to quit, absenteeism, and poor job performance. Due to the perception that employee commitment is generally regarded as one of the key determinants of organizational effectiveness and productivity (Fiorito, Bozeman, Young, & Meurs, 2007) (Meyer, Allen, & Smith, 1993), organizational commitment has been a popular research topic among organizational and behavioral researchers for decades. This is because of the perception that organizational commitment is a key determinant of organizational effectiveness and productivity.

The mental state that is regarded to be organizational commitment is one that represents the requirement (affective commitment), the desire (continuance commitment), and/or the responsibility (normative commitment) to continue working for the company (Meyer & Allen, 1997). The authors Rizzo, House, and Lirtzman (1970) argued that role ambiguity occurs when individuals are not prepared with a strong awareness of their tasks and have a small knowledge of what is expected of them in relation to their performance on the job. The research conducted by Bhuiyan, Menguc, and Borsboom (2005) found that workers have a tendency to perform worse than expected when they are confronted with a lack of position clarity or when they have role ambiguity. On the other hand, as June and Mahmood (2011) point out, employees have a tendency to perform better when they have a clear grasp of what is expected of them and what is needed of them in their work.

According to the findings of a number of academics, the term "job stress" mostly relates to the uneasy sensations that people have as a result of changes in their typical way of life (Summers, DeCotiis, & DeNisi, 1995). Also, there are experts who believe that job stress is a term that refers to the responses of some persons to the work environment that may pose a harm to themselves, and that these reactions will induce physiological and psychological divisions (Jamal, 1990).

II. MATERIALS AND METHOD

Instrument. Organizational commitment among banking sector employees is the primary focus of this investigation. A questionnaire was distributed to the banking sector as part of our study, which employed a quantitative approach. The questionnaire encompassed inquiries regarding conflict, role ambiguity, and organizational commitment. All items are evaluated on a five-point Likert scale, with one representing "completely disagree" and five representing "strongly agree."

Participants. The majority of the employees were female (72.9%) and 27.1 % were male. A total of 181 employees completed survey. The age group of the majority of respondents was 31–45 years old (57.5%), with the age groups of 18–30 (33.1%) and 46–60 (9.4%) following in that order. The sample was highly educated, with 85.1% of the participants holding master's degrees and 12.7% holding bachelor's degrees. The percentage of individuals with a PhD was 1.7%, while only 0.6 percent had completed secondary school.

Table 1. Demographic data

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Gender				
	Female	132	72.9	72.9	72.9
	Male	49	27.1	27.1	100.0
	Age				
	18 – 30 years old	60	33.1	33.1	33.1
	31 – 45 years old	104	57.5	57.5	90.6
	46 – 60 years old	17	9.4	9.4	100.0
	Education				
	High school	1	.6	.6	.6
	Bachelor degree	23	12.7	12.7	13.3
	Master degree	154	85.1	85.1	100.0
	PhD	3	1.7	1.7	14.9
	Total	181	100.0	100.0	

III. RESULTS

Initially, descriptive statistics and reliability analyses were implemented to analyze the data. The reliability of the variables is indicated by Cronbach's alpha, which is the internal consistency. As shown in Table 2, organizational commitment, role ambiguity, and conflict measures are dependable and suitable for statistical study as indicated by their internal consistencies being comparatively high.

Table 2. Cronbach's alpha

Variable	Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
Organizational Commitment	.708	17
Role ambiguity	.736	3
Role conflict	.703	4

The Pearson correlation coefficient (r) of .308** suggests a positive but subtle correlation between Role ambiguity and Role conflict (Table 3). The statistical significance of this connection is indicated by the significance level (Sig. 2-tailed) of .000, which confirms the existence of a real link between role ambiguity and role conflict.

Table 3. Correlations

		Role ambiguity	Role conflict
Role ambiguity	Pearson Correlation	1	.308**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	181	181
Role conflict	Pearson Correlation	.308**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	181	181

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

We evaluated the model's validity subsequent to the scale analysis and reduction considerations. For this model, an adjusted R-squared of 46.8 % and an R-squared of 49.3 % were determined. This implies that 46.8% of the model is accounted for by the variation between role ambiguity and role conflict, while 53.2% is accounted for by other factors.

Table 4. Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.536 ^a	.493	.468	.586

Table 5 presents the regression results for role conflict and ambiguity on organizational commitment. When both variables are absent, the constant ($B = 45.391$, $p < .001$) indicates a rather high baseline commitment. Role conflict may have a modest beneficial influence on employee engagement ($B = 0.205$, $\beta = 0.126$, $p = .007$). Although statistically significant, role ambiguity offers a little advantage ($B = 0.047$, $\beta = 0.024$, $p = .004$) with limited practical implications. The results indicate that role conflict and role ambiguity influence organizational commitment, but their explanatory power is limited, indicating that other variables may be more essential in determining employee commitment.

Table 5. Coefficients

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	45.391	1.457		31.153	.000
	Role conflict	.205	.127	.126	1.618	.007
	Role ambiguity	.047	.151	.024	.314	.004

IV. DISCUSSION

When the results of the present research were compared to the findings of earlier studies, the analysis of the data indicated that there were some parallels between the findings of the current study and those of the other studies. When doing an analysis of the primary aim, which is to determine the link between role ambiguity and conflict on organization commitment, Pearson's correlation is used. An analysis of the data reveals that there is a statistically significant and somewhat positive connection between the three variables under investigation. Furthermore, employees are deemed to be dedicated to their organizations if they demonstrate a desire to continue being affiliated with their company and if they devote a significant amount of effort to the accomplishment of organizational goals (Laschinger & Finegan, 2005) (Lok, Westwood, & Crawford, 2005).

There is a broad range of commitment levels among managers to their respective organizations. Stress is becoming more widespread in companies as a result of the rising complexity of jobs and the weight of economic demand. Organizational commitment is significantly impacted by role ambiguity and conflict, which has a substantial influence. The dedication of workers to the company may suffer as a result. One of the most significant contributors to stress in the workplace is the job role or duties that are allocated to each individual worker. They have the potential to cause stress since they are in direct opposition to the workers' own capabilities, values, or requirements.

V. CONCLUSION

The purpose of this research was to investigate the impact that role ambiguity and conflict have on the level of organizational commitment. It was determined from the data that there was a considerable effect of role ambiguity and conflict on the level of commitment to the organization. This link was investigated by conducting an analysis of the replies of 181 workers working in the banking industry during the first phase.

For decades, researchers in the domains of organization and behavior have been looking at organizational commitment. This is because employee dedication is seen to be a key factor in how well an organization does and how productive it is (Fiorito, Bozeman, Young, & Meurs, 2007) (Meyer & Allen, 1997). One explanation for this is that people think that organizational dedication is what makes things work well and get done. In line with the results of this study, it was also discovered that role conflict and role ambiguity were connected to employee attitudes such as work satisfaction, organizational commitment, and desire to leave the company (Bettencourt & Brown, 2003) (Harris, Artis, Walters, & Licata, 2003).

There are certain barriers to this study. To begin, there is a small sample size of workers and the industry as a whole. During this analysis, just the banking sector was considered.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors would like to thank the ICIAS.

REFERENCES

- [1] Arshad, M., Najwani, A., Mahmoud, I., Siam, I., & Alshuaibi, A. (2020). Effect of Role Conflict and Work Overload on Job Stress: A Case of Banking Sector Employees. *Talent Development and Excellence*, 12(3), 2686-2696.
- [2] Bettencourt, A., & Brown, W. (2003). Role Stressors and Customer-Oriented Boundary-Spanning Behaviors in Service Organizations. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 31(4), 394–408. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1177/0092070303255636>
- [3] Bhuian, N., Menguc, B., & Borsboom, R. (2005). Stressors and job outcomes in sales: A triphasic model versus a linear-quadratic-interactive model. *Journal of Business Research*, 58(2), 141–150. doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0148-2963\(03\)00132-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0148-2963(03)00132-2)
- [4] CahayaSanthi, M., & Piartirini, S. (2020). The effect of role ambiguity on work related stress and employees' work satisfaction. *American Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences Research*, 4(6), 99-107.
- [5] Fiorito, J., Bozeman, D., Young, A., & Meurs, J. (2007). Organizational commitment, human resource practices, and organizational characteristics. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 19(2), 186-207.
- [6] Grobelna, A. (2015). Intercultural Challenges Facing the Hospitality Industry. Implications for Education and Hospitality Management. *Journal of Intercultural Management*. doi:10.1515/joim-2015-0023
- [7] Harris, G., Artis, B., Walters, H., & Licata, W. (2003). Role stressors, service worker job resourcefulness, and job outcomes: An empirical analysis. *Journal of Business Research*, 59(4), 407–415. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2005.06.003>
- [8] Jackson, E., & Schuler, S. (1985). A meta-analysis and conceptual critique of research on role ambiguity and role conflict in work settings. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 36(1), 16–78. doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978\(85\)90020-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(85)90020-2)
- [9] Jamal, M. (1990). Relationship of job stress and type-A behavior to employees' job satisfaction, organizational commitment, psychosomatic health problems, and turnover motivation. *Human Relations*, 43, 727-738. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/001872679004300802>
- [10] June, S., & Mahmood, R. (2011). The Relationship between Person-job Fit and Job Performance: A Study among the Employees of the Service Sector SMEs in Malaysia. *International Journal of Business, Humanities and Technology*, 95-105.
- [11] Kim, G., Ro, H., Hutchinson, J., & Kwun, D. (2014). The Effect of Jay-customer Behaviors on Employee Job Stress and Job Satisfaction. *International Journal of Hospitality & Tourism*, 15(4), 394-416. doi:10.1080/15256480.2014.961797

- [12] Kim, P., Murrmann, S., & Lee, G. (2009). Moderating effects of gender and organizational level between role stress and job satisfaction among hotel employees. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 28(4), 612-619. doi:10.1016/j.ijhm.2009.04.001
- [13] Laschinger, H., & Finegan, J. (2005). Empowering nurses for work engagement and health in hospital settings. *J Nurs Adm.*, 35(10), 439-449. doi:10.1097/00005110-200510000-00005
- [14] Lok, P., Westwood, R., & Crawford, J. (2005). Perceptions of Organisational Subculture and their Significance for Organisational Commitment. *Applied Psychology*, 54(4). doi:https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1464-0597.2005.00222.x
- [15] Meyer, J., Allen, N., & Smith, C. (1993). Commitment to Organizations and Occupations: Extension and Test of a Three-Component Conceptualization. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78(4), 538-551. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.78.4.538
- [16] Meyer, P., & Allen, J. (1997). *Commitment in the workplace: Theory, research, and application*. Sage Publications, Inc.
- [17] O'Neill, J., & Davis, K. (2011). Work stress and well-being in the hotel industry. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 30(2), 385-390. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2010.07.007
- [18] Rizzo, R., House, J., & Lirtzman, I. (1970). Role conflict and ambiguity in complex organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 15(2), 150–163. doi:https://doi.org/10.2307/2391486
- [19] Summers, P., DeCotiis, A., & DeNisi, S. (1995). A field study of some antecedents and consequences of felt job stress. In R. Crandall, & P. Perrewé, *Occupational stress: A handbook* (pp. 113–128). Taylor & Francis.