

THEORETICAL AND EMPIRICAL LINKAGES BETWEEN WORK-RELATED COMMITMENT FOCI

G ROODT

Department of Human Resource Management
Rand Afrikaans University

OPSOMMING

Geen studie is tot dusver in die verbondenheidliteratuur gerapporteer wat die verhouding tussen ses werkverwante foki op 'n vergelykbare teoretiese basis ophelder nie. So 'n vergelyking is moontlik gemaak deur die ontwikkeling van ses instrumente om betrokkenheid/verbondenheid tot werk, pos, beroep, loopbaan, vakbond en skool as kognitiewe predisposisies te operationaliseer. 'n Ewekansige, proporsioneel-gestratifiseerde steekproef van 510 onderwysers is by 184 skole en 'n populasie van 4166 onderwysers van 'n vorige provinsiale onderwysdepartement getrek. Slechs 279 van die 385 bruikbare vraelyste was volledig voltooi en is vir finale ontleding gebruik. 'n Tweedeorde-faktorontleding het vier faktore opgelewer wat ongeveer 66% van die totale variansie verklaar. Hierdie faktore is "werkbehepthed", "organisasie-verbante betrokkenheid/verbondenheid", "vakbondverbondenheid" en "werk-verbante vervreemding" genoem wat skynbaar relatief-onafhanklike faktore is. Geen steun vir die bestaan van ses afsonderlike foki kon gevind word nie.

ABSTRACT

No study has been reported thus far in the commitment literature which clarifies the relationship between six work-related foci on a comparable theoretical basis. Such a comparison was made possible by the development of six instruments to operationalise involvement/commitment towards work, job, occupation, career, union and school as cognitive predispositions. A random, proportionally stratified sample of 510 teachers was drawn from 184 schools and a population of 4166 teachers from a previous provincial department of education. Only 279 of the 385 usable questionnaires were fully completed and used for final analysis. A second-order factor analysis yielded four factors which explain about 66% of the total variance. These factors named "workaholism", "organisational-related involvement/commitment", "union commitment", and "work-related alienation" seem to be relative independent factors. No support for the existence of six separate foci could be found.

Work commitment as a field of study is characterised by a proliferation of concepts which did not develop in an evolutionary fashion with specific reference to meaning and relationships to other involvement concepts (Morrow, 1983, pp. 486, 487).

Several researchers coined their own definitions of work commitment in stead of leaning on existing approaches (Morrow, 1983, p. 486). In this regard Greenhaus (1971, pp. 209-210) defined **career salience** as the importance of work and of a career in the total life of a person. Lodahl and Kejner (1965, p. 24) defined **job involvement** as the extent to which a person psychologically identifies with his/her work and the importance of work for his/her total self-concept. Work as a **central life interest** is defined by Dubin (1956, p. 134) as the extent to which a worker chooses the work environment as the preferred locality for the performance of behaviour which can also be executed in a non-work setting. **Organisational commitment** is defined by Mowday, Steers and Porter (1979, p. 226) as the worker's desire to stay on in the organisation; his/her willingness to exert effort for the organisation; and his/her trust in and acceptance of the values and goals of the organisation. The **work-ethic concept** is described by Mirels and Garrett (1971) as the belief that hard work is intrinsically good and a goal by itself. Also the personal worth and the moral structure of a person will depend on his/her willingness to work hard. **Union commitment** is described by Gordon, Philpot, Burt, Thompson & Spiller (1980) as a union member's willingness to stay on as a member; to have trust in the goals of organised labour; and a willingness to present voluntary services to the union. These definitions clearly illustrate the differences in theorisation.

Morrow (1983) identified not less than 32 different instruments for measuring involvement in or commitment to five different foci (value, career, job, organisation and union). This list is not complete, because several instruments could be added to Morrow's list and at least two additional foci could be added. Instruments that could be added to the work value focus are those of Goldstein and Eichhorn (1961); Hammond and Williams (1976); Ho (1984); and Ray (1982). There are also six instruments from Kanungo (1982) which distinguish between a work and a job focus, while Sheldon (1971) and Reichers (1985) added an occupational focus. In a facet analysis and in an evaluation of the five most popular instruments Morrow (1983) suggested that some of these concepts were redundant and that the epistemic correlations of some of these instruments were under suspicion. This clearly illustrates the proliferation of concepts.

As is illustrated above there are different theoretical premises in the definition of the work-related commitment foci. Morrow (1983, p. 489) mentioned in this regard: "The theoretical and empirical linkages among the five forms of work commitment are not readily apparent, nor have they been the focus of much comparative study." Morrow (1983, p. 497) concluded: "At a minimum, an empirical study comparing all five forms of work commitment in a single sample is in order."

Morrow and McElroy (1986) as well as Randall and Cote (1991) conducted such studies in which significant relationships between some work-related commitment foci were reported. Several other studies also investigated and reported significant relationships between organisational commitment and a range of other commitment/involvement foci:

- job involvement (Barling, Wade & Fullagar, 1990, p. 54; Hall & Schneider, 1972, pp. 344-347; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990, p. 174; Shore, Thornton & Shore, 1990, p. 855; and Stevens, Beyer & Trice, 1978, pp. 388-389);
- occupational and professional commitment (Ferris & Aranya, 1983, pp. 94-95; and Mathieu & Zajac, 1990, p. 174);

* The author wishes to thank Prof JM Schepers for his valuable suggestions concerning the statistical calculations.

* Financial support received from the Centre for Science Development (HSRC, South Africa) for this research is hereby acknowledged. Opinions expressed and conclusions drawn are those of the author and should not necessarily be ascribed to the CSD. Requests for reprints should be addressed to G Roodt, Department of Human Resources, Rand Afrikaans University, P.O. Box 524, Auckland Park 2006.

- career commitment (Wiener & Vardi, 1980, p. 80; Shore, Thornton & Shore, 1990, p. 855);
- union commitment (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990, p. 174);
- central life interest (Dubin, Champoux & Porter, 1975, pp. 418-419);
- Protestant work-ethic (Kidron, 1978, p. 245; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990, p. 174; and Putti, Aryee & Liang, 1989, p. 289);
- organisational commitment tendency (Pierce & Dunham, 1987, pp. 169, 173); and
- community involvement (Allen & Meyer, 1990, p. 10).

Several points of critique could be raised against most of these studies:

Firstly, mostly bivariate analyses were conducted in these studies which excluded other important foci from the analysis.

Secondly, only a few studies tried to determine the discriminant validities of the different commitment scales. In this regard Brooke, Russel and Price (1988); Mathieu and Farr (1991); Shore, Thornton and Shore (1990); and Wiener and Vardi (1980) found proof for the discriminant validity between organisational commitment and job involvement. Elloy and Terpening (1992); and Kanungo (1982) also found that job and work involvement were two distinguishable concepts.

Thirdly, only Morrow and McElroy (1986) and Randall and Cote (1991) related more than three foci in a single sample setting.

Fourthly, none of the instruments used in these studies were operationalised on the same theoretical basis, which makes the theoretical comparisons of concepts virtually impossible. In order to address the last problem, six instruments were developed for this study which are based on a cognitive predisposition. A cognitive predisposition in this case reflects the extent to which a particular work related commitment focus can satisfy the salient needs of the worker (compare Kanungo, 1982). Some instruments do exist which can operationalise commitment on this basis (Kanungo, 1982; Lefkowitz, Somers & Weinberg, 1984; and Mannheim, 1975). Items reflect a cognitive salience of the work-role if they express the respondents interest; success; concern; preoccupation; time expenditure; and ego-identification relative to other activities. This premise is largely based on the work of Dubin (1956); Lawler and Hall (1970); Lodahl and Kejner (1965); Patchen (1970); and Vroom (1962).

In view of the possible limitations identified above, the goal of this study will be to determine the theoretical and empirical linkages between six work related commitment foci (i.e. work, job, occupation, career, union and school) operationalised on a comparable theoretical basis (i.e. a cognitive predisposition).

METHOD

The method followed in this study will be discussed under the headings subjects, procedure, measuring instruments, and statistical analysis.

Subjects

According to a year report of the Freestate Education Department (1991) there were about 4166 teachers employed at the time in the Department of whom 37,5% were male and 62,5% were female. The namelist of the provincial Teacher's Association was used to select a random proportionate sample of 510 teachers of whom 62% were female and 38% male. This sample is well within the sampling guidelines of Stoker (1981).

Out of 510 teachers approached with questionnaires 401 responded (i.e. a response rate of 79%). Sixteen of the questionnaires were not usable which left 385 for analysis.

For purposes of this study only instruments that were completed fully (no missing responses) were analysed (N = 279).

Some biographical information about the respondents (N = 385) is reported below.

TABLE 1
BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION OF RESPONDENTS
(N = 385)

1 GENDER	FREQUENCY	PERCENTAGE
male	158	41
female	224	58,2
no response	3	0,8
TOTAL	385	100
2 HOME LANGUAGE		
Afrikaans	354	91,9
English	27	7
other	1	0,3
no response	3	0,8
TOTAL	385	100
3 AGE CATEGORY		
21 - 30	89	23,1
31 - 40	128	33,3
41 - 50	107	27,8
51 - 60	55	14,3
61 - 70	2	0,5
no response	4	1,0
TOTAL	385	100
4 TEACHING EXPERIENCE		
1 - 10	150	38,9
11 - 20	134	34,8
21 - 30	78	20,3
31 - 40	16	4,2
no response	7	1,8
TOTAL	385	100
5 QUALIFICATIONS		
diploma only	128	33,2
advanced diploma	76	19,7
degree only	13	3,4
degree and diploma	85	22,1
post graduate	77	20
no response	6	1,6
TOTAL	385	100
6 MARITAL STATUS		
never married	54	14
married	306	79,5
divorced	14	3,6
widow/widower	7	1,8
no response	4	1
TOTAL	385	100

It appears from Table 1 that most respondents (58%) were female; were Afrikaans speakers (92%); were between the ages of 31-50 years (61%); had between 1-20 years of teaching experience (74%); were holding a teaching diploma (33%) or a first degree and diploma (22%); and were married (80%).

PROCEDURE

Because it was against the policy of the particular provincial Department of Education to approach teachers directly, the bilingual questionnaires were mailed to headmasters of 184 schools/institutions. The headmasters were requested to distribute the questionnaires to the different selected teachers and to receive the completed or incomplete questionnaires. The questionnaires contained a cover letter explaining the goal of the study. These questionnaires could be returned with a stamped business reply envelope. The study was conducted anonymous in the sense that no names could be linked to any of the responses.

Measuring instruments

For purposes of this study six instruments were developed to operationalise work-related commitment/involvement foci as cognitive predispositions. Both the Afrikaans and English versions of the questionnaire were included.

As explained above, items reflect a cognitive salience of a particular focus if they express the respondent's needs; values; goals; beliefs; interest; success; concern; pre-occupation; time expenditure; and ego-identification relative to another focus. Item response scales of all the different instruments were on a five point scale ranging from one (differ strongly) to five (strongly agree).

The **Work involvement questionnaire** measures involvement in work in general or in general work activities. The instrument consisted of 24 items of which six were reversed scored.

The **Job involvement questionnaire** measures involvement in the job or in the position a person holds in a organisation. The instrument consists of 24 items of which nine were negatively formulated.

The **Occupational involvement questionnaire** measures involvement in a particular profession/occupation for which specialised training is needed. The instrument consists of 23 items and six are reversed scored.

The **Career involvement questionnaire** measures a person's involvement in his/her career (a pattern of work-related experiences that transcend a person's life span) and consists of 23 items. Seven items are negatively formulated and should therefore be reversed scored.

The **Union commitment questionnaire** consists of 22 items and measures a person's level of commitment to the organisation which looks after her/his professional interests. Seven items are negatively formulated.

The **School commitment questionnaire** measures a person's level of commitment to the school where he/she works. The instrument consists of 23 items of which nine are negatively formulated.

Adapted and improved questionnaires can be obtained from the author.

Statistical analysis

In order to determine the relationship between the different foci intercorrelations between the foci were executed. Pearson product moment correlations were used in calculating the different intercorrelations. The squared correlation coefficients also indicate the common variance between the different foci and will give an indication of the possibility of concept redundancy.

The factor analyses were executed as follows by using a procedure described by Schepers (1992: pp. 140-142): The 139 items of the different work-related commitment questionnaires were intercorrelated. Owing to limited space the intercorrelation matrix (139 x 139) will not be reproduced here. A Principle Component Analysis (PCA) was used to calculate the eigenvalues

of factors obtained from this intercorrelation matrix. The 36 postulated factors [according to Kaiser's (1961) criterion of eigenvalues larger than one] were rotated to a simple structure, using the varimax rotation. Subscores were calculated for each of the 36 first-order factors and intercorrelated. (Again, the matrix is not reproduced here due to limited space).

According to Schepers (1992) the differential skewness of items poses a problem when these items are factor analysed and this may result in the creation of artefactors. This problem can be solved when the subscores of the first-order factor analysis are intercorrelated and are then subjected to a second-order factor analysis. In this case, 10 second-order factors were postulated, (resulting from a PCA) and rotated to a simple structure by using a Direct Oblimin rotation. All factor analyses were calculated by using the BMDP4M sub-routine.

For the purpose of the item analyses an interactive item analysis programme (NP50-programme) developed by the National Institute for Personnel Research (NIPR) was used.

This procedure will enable the researcher to identify factors with relative high internal consistencies (coefficient Alpha's). These identified factors would give an indication of the dimensionality of the "work commitment" concept and could probably solve the concept redundancy problem.

All statistical calculations were done by Statistical Consultation Service of the Rand Afrikaans University.

RESULTS

The results from the intercorrelation matrix are presented in Table 2.

TABLE 2
THE INTERCORRELATION MATRIX BETWEEN TOTAL SCORES OF SIX WORK RELATED FOCI (N = 299)

	work	job	occupa- tion	career	union	school
work	1					
job	0,5567 0,3099	1				
occupa- tion	0,5431 0,2950	0,7150 0,5112	1			
career	0,6126 0,3753	0,7526 0,5564	0,8099 0,6559	1		
union	0,3418 0,1168	0,3377 0,1141	0,3809 0,1451	0,3496 0,1222	1	
school	0,3055 0,0933	0,4705 0,2214	0,4878 0,2380	0,4802 0,2306	0,3021 0,0913	1

– All coefficients are significant on the 0,01 level

– Bold printed coefficients indicate common variance

It is clear from Table 2 that the foci "job", "occupation" and "career" share the largest common variance, indicating the possibility of concept redundancy. These three foci also share substantial common variance with the "work" focus, but to a lesser degree with the foci "union" and "school". In order to investigate this relationship further, the results of the factor analyses are reported below. The second-order PFA converged after 15 iterations and sub-score loadings on these factors are presented in Table 3.

The ten second-order factors explain about 89% of the total variance. It is clear from Table 3 that the most sub-scores are loading on the first four second-order factors, respectively 28, 38, 18 and 17 items for factors I – IV. These four factors explain about 66% of the total variance and one can infer that there are

TABLE 3
 FACTOR MATRIX WITH REGARD TO THE SECOND-ORDER FACTORS OF WORK RELATED INVOLVEMENT FOCI
 (DIRECT OBLIMIN ROTATION)

VARIABLES	items	Factor I	Factor II	Factor III	Factor IV	Factor V	Factor VI	Factor VII	Factor VIII	Factor IX	Factor X
Factor 1	u4, u14, u15, u8, u10, u3, u7, u11, u6, u22, u13, u18, u2, u12, u5	-0,049	0,106	0,706	-0,038	0,167	-0,224	0,018	0,061	0,031	-0,215
Factor 2	o10, c16, c8, j17, c15, c10, c7, 012, 019, 015, j14	0,269	0,080	0,215	-0,461	-0,086	-0,117	0,049	-0,278	0,176	0,070
Factor 3	s21, s3, s8, s6, s19, s15, s22, s9, s10	0,029	0,510	0,250	-0,169	0,139	-0,083	0,265	-0,168	-0,280	0,240
Factor 4	c17, c19, o8, j7, o2, j23	0,444	0,270	0,110	0,133	-0,000	-0,256	0,077	-0,154	0,055	-0,021
Factor 5	o1, j2, c1, w19, j4, o6, o13	0,246	0,433	0,072	0, -89	-0,280	0,010	-0,199	-0,149	0,066	0,153
Factor 6	s5, s11, s2, s20, s17, j6, s4, s7, s13	0,161	-0,425	-0,085	0,291	-0,026	0,087	0,105	0,311	0,152	-0,222
Factor 7	o5, c23, j12, j19, w21	0,694	-0,039	0,084	-0,071	0,111	-0,008	-0,107	-0,099	-0,118	-0,072
Factor 8	j8, c11, w22, o18	0,082	-0,342	0,221	0,249	-0,146	0,114	0,170	-0,016	0,032	0,111
Factor 9	j5, o3, c9, j18, j1	0,623	0,229	0,063	0,060	0,040	-0,000	0,004	-0,055	-0,158	-0,056
Factor 10	c12, o7, j22, c13, c21	0,077	0,523	0,161	0,223	-0,035	-0,028	-0,104	-0,247	0,234	0,047
Factor 11	j9, c6, s18, w24	0,187	0,673	-0,070	0,019	-0,001	-0,005	-0,050	0,056	0,066	-0,068
Factor 12	j3, c2, c3, o4	-0,113	-0,059	-0,045	-0,054	0,048	0,435	0,376	0,160	0,073	-0,019
Factor 13	w23, j13	0,366	0,095	-0,070	0,019	0,215	-0,047	-0,022	-0,016	0,013	0,053
Factor 14	s1, o22, s23, o21	0,070	-0,009	0,186	0,040	0,048	0,044	0,098	-0,113	0,494	-0,124
Factor 15	w7, w13, w12, w6, w1	0,378	0,197	0,035	-0,086	0,013	-0,263	-0,036	0,141	0,326	-0,061
Factor 16	w15, j16	-0,012	-0,048	0,101	-0,018	-0,265	-0,002	0,513	0,093	0,036	0,052
Factor 17	w18, o23, c22, o11	0,207	0,216	0,156	-0,008	-0,061	-0,047	-0,136	-0,283	0,227	0,095
Factor 18	j15, j21, j10	-0,100	-0,161	-0,167	0,035	0,063	0,141	0,387	0,169	0,041	-0,064
Factor 19	w11, w17, w16, w9, w10	0,391	0,153	0,201	-0,204	0,074	-0,058	-0,085	0,208	0,253	0,089
Factor 20	u9, s14	-0,031	-0,018	-0,032	0,149	-0,498	-0,046	-0,025	-0,009	0,068	0,061
Factor 21	u17, u16	-0,038	-0,147	-0,094	0,122	0,173	-0,227	0,174	0,011	0,110	0,238
Factor 22	u20, u21, u19	0,024	-0,039	0,639	-0,071	-0,055	-0,074	-0,032	0,032	0,016	0,017
Factor 23	w4, j20, w5	0,328	0,023	-0,016	-0,390	-0,140	-0,180	0,096	0,130	0,111	-0,017
Factor 24	w3, c18	-0,134	0,079	0,048	0,125	0,080	0,600	0,093	0,060	0,005	-0,035
Factor 25	w8, o9, o20	0,077	-0,007	-0,019	0,077	0,738	-0,016	-0,161	-0,063	0,129	0,012
Factor 26	c5, j11	-0,139	0,097	-0,070	0,604	-0,020	-0,018	0,025	0,230	-0,022	0,019
Factor 27	c4	-0,033	0,008	0,087	-0,005	-0,139	0,147	-0,176	-0,129	0,070	0,060
Factor 28	o17, o14	0,100	-0,029	0,142	0,128	0,294	-0,143	0,008	0,160	-0,061	0,116
Factor 29	c14, u1	-0,079	0,028	-0,055	-0,025	-0,092	-0,014	-0,096	0,040	-0,023	0,591
Factor 30	w20	0,060	0,024	-0,137	-0,034	0,128	0,147	0,160	-0,023	-0,055	0,213
Factor 31	w2	0,114	-0,037	-0,013	0,415	-0,052	0,020	0,022	-0,099	0,010	0,009
Factor 32	j24	0,078	-0,054	0,192	0,109	0,093	0,012	0,158	0,011	-0,066	0,255
Factor 33	s12, o16	-0,171	0,015	-0,090	-0,049	-0,004	0,038	-0,034	0,001	0,463	0,024
Factor 34	w14	-0,087	-0,092	-0,076	0,203	0,006	0,013	0,366	-0,023	-0,174	-0,072
Factor 35	c20	-0,021	0,036	0,171	0,002	-0,055	0,211	0,073	0,609	-0,097	0,099
Factor 36	s16	0,081	-0,124	-0,088	0,005	-0,070	0,509	-0,081	0,066	0,062	0,032
Number of items per factor		28	38	18	17	7	7	7	5	6	6

four properly defined second-order factors. The remaining 38 items are divided between the six remaining factors and are omitted for further analysis. Separate item-analyses for items loading on the four second-order factors were done and the results for Factor 1 are presented in Table 4.

An inspection of Table 4 clearly indicates that all items possess acceptable reliability indexes ranging from 0,332 to 0,817 and the standard deviations of individual items vary between 0,756 and 1,241. All 28 items were retained after the item analysis and this factor yielded a Cronbach Alpha of 0,908. Although subjective, this factor is called "workaholism". A high level of ego-involvement and a strong orientation towards the value of work is shown.

The results of the item analysis for Factor II are shown in Table 5.

An inspection of Table 5 clearly shows that most items have acceptable reliability indexes ranging from 0,120 to 0,772 (items W19 and O13 yielded reliability indexes of 0,120 and 0,157 respectively, but their omittance made no difference to the internal consistency), and standard deviations ranged from

0,365 to 1,283. Despite the two mentioned items having low reliability indexes, all 38 items were retained after the item-analysis and this factor yielded a Cronbach Alpha of 0,914. This factor is labeled "organisational-related involvement/commitment", because items on this factor are not only limited to the school (work organisation), but also include organisational-related involvement or commitment foci like "work", "job", "occupation" and "career".

The results of the item analysis for Factor III are shown in Table 6.

A review of Table 6 shows that most items have acceptable reliability indexes ranging from 0,493 to 0,827 and standard deviations ranged from 0,826 to 1,207. Two items (U12 and U19) were eliminated during item analysis, but the remaining 16 items yielded a Cronbach Alpha of 0,909. This factor is undoubtedly called "union commitment", because only items from one focus were included in this factor.

The results of the factor analysis for Factor IV are shown in Table 7.

TABLE 4
ITEM STATISTICS REGARDING FACTOR I OF THE SIX WORK RELATED INVOLVEMENT FOCI (N = 279)

ITEM	DESCRIPTION OF ITEMS	ITEM MEAN	ITEM S.D.	ITEM-TEST CORRELATION	RELIABILITY INDEX
W1	hard work makes me a better person	4,262	0,852	0,390	0,332
W6	hard work for its own sake is satisfying	4,108	0,871	0,437	0,380
W7	believe people's character is created by work	3,685	1,122	0,417	0,468
W9	few things so satisfying as the knowledge I have done my best in work	4,355	0,804	0,508	0,409
W10	people who are not successful simply do not work hard enough	2,582	1,042	0,503	0,524
W11	the most difficult work provides the best reward	3,154	1,148	0,408	0,468
W12	without work life would be meaningless	3,659	1,191	0,602	0,717
W13	work is the most important aspect in my life	2,674	1,048	0,569	0,597
W16	a person's value is determined by his contribution to work	3,473	1,059	0,519	0,549
W17	work by itself is a rewarding activity	3,996	0,756	0,384	0,290
W21	all achievements attained in my life involve work	3,226	1,326	0,447	0,592
W23	I prefer to be totally "absorbed" by work	2,047	0,997	0,431	0,430
J1	the most important things that happen to me involve work	3,039	1,087	0,557	0,606
J5	my own identity is largely based on my job	3,172	1,166	0,539	0,629
J7	I would be "lost" without my job	3,247	1,241	0,569	0,706
J12	all achievements I have reached in life involve my job	3,226	1,071	0,579	0,620
J13	I prefer to be totally "absorbed" by my job	2,294	0,944	0,465	0,439
J18	the best description of who I am would be based on the job that I have	3,104	1,157	0,559	0,646
J19	I prefer being involved in job activities rather than in other activities	3,018	1,030	0,487	0,502
J23	my job is my life	3,183	1,153	0,709	0,817
O2	my occupation is the most important activity in my life	3,394	1,113	0,620	0,691
O3	my own identity is largely based on my occupation	3,330	1,089	0,576	0,628
O5	all achievements I have reached can be related directly to my occupation	3,061	1,116	0,637	0,710
O8	without my occupation life would be meaningless to me	3,247	1,196	0,652	0,780
C9	the best description of who I am, is largely based on my career	3,219	1,066	0,607	0,647
C17	I would be "lost" without my career	3,011	1,204	0,623	0,750
C19	without my career life would be valueless	2,853	1,161	0,542	0,629
C23	all achievements I have attained in life can be linked directly to my career	3,136	1,127	0,648	0,730

Cronbach Alpha equals 0,908 for the 28 items

A closer inspection of Table 7 reveals that all items have acceptable reliability indexes ranging from 0,234 to 0,679 (item W5 had a reliability index of 0,234 but was also retained after the item analysis) and standard deviations ranged from 0,628 to 1,388. All 17 items were retained after the item analysis and yielded a Cronbach Alpha of 0,847. This factor is called "work-related alienation", because most items clearly refer to the inability of work-related foci to satisfy salient needs, realise values or achieve salient goals.

Finally the factor correlations for rotated second-order factors will be presented in Table 8.

It is clear from Table 8 that the four second-order factors correlate on a low level which indicates the relative independence of the different factors. Factors two and three intercorrelate relatively higher with factor one.

DISCUSSION

The problem of discriminant validity between different work-related foci and the issue of concept redundancy is not a new one. Some researchers did attempt solving these problems, assuming that different work-related foci are on a comparable theoretical basis. As indicated in the literature review above, this is clearly not the case. Most existing foci are operationalised on different and thus incomparable theoretical bases. For the purposes of this study six instruments were developed for operationalising the work-related foci (work, job, occupation, career, union and school) as cognitive predispositions. Cognitive predispositions regarding work-related involvement foci refer to the extent that these different foci possess the potential

to satisfy salient needs. The theoretical and empirical linkages between these theoretical comparable foci were explored by factor analyses.

This study is however not without problems. Quite a large number of questionnaires (about 75) had to be eliminated for further analysis due to a binding error in the questionnaire which resulted in incomplete responses. Secondly, this study was executed on only one professional group (teachers) and results cannot be generalised to other occupational groups. Thirdly, the fact that a comparable theoretical basis was used between the different foci also has its limitations, which is that common method variance may be increased.

Results of the intercorrelation matrix between the six foci clearly indicate that these different foci are significantly related to a larger or lesser degree. These results correspond with the findings of other multivariate studies like those of Morrow and McElroy (1986) but only partially with the findings of Randall and Cote (1991) who did use only some of the variables.

Due to the differential skewness of items and due to the possibility that the vector space of items may be multi-dimensional, a specific factor analytic procedure as described above was used. This procedure enables one to determine the loadings of item sub-scores on the different second-order factors. Hence, the different items loading on a particular factor were identified. Four factors that explain about 66% of the total variance were abstracted. It is highly probable that these four second-order factors are clusters on the same dimension. Subsequently, item analyses were done to determine the internal reliabilities of the factors.

TABLE 5
ITEMS STATISTICS REGARDING FACTOR II OF THE SIX WORK RELATED INVOLVEMENT FOCI (N = 279)

ITEM	DESCRIPTION OF ITEMS	ITEM MEAN	ITEM S.D.	ITEM-TEST CORRELATION	RELIABILITY INDEX
W19	everyone should have a feeling of pride in work	4,842	0,365	0,328	0,120
W22*	work is merely a means to other important ends	3,186	1,113	0,317	0,353
W24	most of my time and energy is willingly devoted to work	3,527	1,075	0,443	0,476
J2	I am very much involved in my job	4,283	0,637	0,431	0,274
J4	my job is one of the most important aspects of my life	3,950	0,904	0,511	0,462
J6*	most of my real interests are outside of my job	3,867	0,886	0,479	0,424
J8*	my job is merely a means to other important ends	3,509	1,092	0,377	0,411
J9	I devote most of my time and energy willingly to my job	3,864	0,919	0,566	0,520
J22	I give everything I have to my job	3,946	0,941	0,521	0,491
O1	I am very much involved in my occupation	4,333	0,606	0,434	0,263
O6	my occupation has special personal value to me	4,176	0,690	0,509	0,351
O7	I give everything I have to my occupation	4,111	0,813	0,547	0,445
O13	I can easily identify with the high standards in my occupation	4,201	0,659	0,238	0,157
O18*	My occupation is merely a means to other more important ends	3,853	0,995	0,351	0,349
C1	I am personally very much involved in my career	4,272	0,585	0,392	0,230
C6	I willingly devote most of my time and energy to my career	3,932	0,893	0,504	0,450
C11*	Involvement in my career is merely a means to other more important ends	3,609	1,015	0,364	0,369
C12	I give everything I have to my career	3,982	0,875	0,583	0,510
C13	Involvement in my career has special personal value for me	4,090	0,691	0,521	0,360
C21	Most of my spare time is absorbed by my career	3,814	1,001	0,347	0,347
S2	I see myself as part of this school	4,509	0,662	0,571	0,378
S3	I would do any kind of work to stay on at this school	2,828	1,283	0,500	0,641
S4	My own values and the values of the school are largely similar	3,950	0,966	0,582	0,562
S5	It would be embarrassing for me if my involvement with this school is made public	4,681	0,552	0,481	0,265
S6	Of all possible schools to work for this school is the best	3,681	1,236	0,583	0,720
S7	I am personally very much involved with this school	4,401	0,722	0,548	0,396
S8	To be part of this school is my life ideal	3,197	1,132	0,655	0,742
S9	The best description of who I am is related to my involvement in this school	2,993	1,196	0,553	0,662
S10	Of all organisations I am involved in, this school is the most important	3,763	1,145	0,675	0,772
S11*	If I could choose again I would not work for this school	4,226	1,040	0,517	0,538
S13*	This school presents hardly any potential for satisfying my most important needs	3,889	0,959	0,496	0,476
S15	Without this school I would be lost	2,315	1,067	0,498	0,532
S17*	Most of my interests are situated outside of this school	3,799	0,846	0,512	0,433
S18	Most of my time and energy is willingly devoted to this school	4,125	0,866	0,563	0,488
S19	This school presents the best potential for realising my career plans	3,287	1,149	0,598	0,687
S20*	This school does not present me with the opportunity to do things at which I am best	3,792	1,063	0,473	0,503
S21	I would take any job as long as I can stay on with this school	2,566	1,212	0,511	0,620
S22	This school stands central in my life	3,355	1,073	0,682	0,732

Cronbach Alpha equals 0,914 Items with * should be reflected

TABLE 6
ITEM STATISTICS REGARDING FACTOR III FOR THE WORK RELATED INVOLVEMENT FOCI (N = 279)

ITEM	DESCRIPTION OF ITEMS	ITEM MEAN	ITEM S.D.	ITEM-TOTAL CORRELATION	RELIABILITY INDEX
U2	no matter what type of work, I would stay on with the assoc.	2,918	1,207	0,580	0,700
U3	Of all the organisations, my association is most important	2,681	1,129	0,730	0,827
U4	to be part of this association is my life ideal	2,308	1,027	0,780	0,801
U5*	my association has hardly any potential for satisfying my needs	3,151	1,086	0,460	0,499
U6	I reach all important goals through my association	2,405	0,988	0,706	0,697
U7	I am personally very much involved in my association	2,423	1,073	0,662	0,711
U8	my association presents the opportunity to realise my own values	2,785	1,146	0,760	0,871
U10	I would be "lost" without my association	2,075	1,006	0,730	0,734
U11	I willingly devote most time and energy to my association	2,054	0,967	0,647	0,626
U13	Membership of this association has personal value for me	2,849	1,112	0,702	0,781
U14	I give everything I have for my association	2,337	1,029	0,785	0,807
U15	Without my association life would be valueless to me	1,849	0,839	0,733	0,615
U18	My own identity is largely based on membership with this assoc.	1,828	0,826	0,597	0,493
U20	Membership with this assoc. helps to overcome obstacles	2,921	1,138	0,512	0,583
U21	Membership of this assoc. enables me to promote my career	3,151	1,150	0,624	0,717
U22	Without membership my occupation would be of no value	2,337	1,067	0,712	0,760

Cronbach Alpha equals 0,918 for the 16 items Items with a * should be reflected

TABLE 7
ITEM STATISTICS OF FACTOR IV FOR THE WORK RELATED INVOLVEMENT FOCI (N = 279)

ITEM	DESCRIPTION OF ITEMS	ITEM MEAN	ITEM S.D.	ITEM-TOTAL CORRELATION	RELIABILITY INDEX
W2	hard work is not a recipe for success	1,735	1,157	0,297	0,344
W4*	with hard work I can overcome any obstacles	2,520	1,134	0,433	0,491
W5*	people who work hard deserve success	1,376	0,628	0,372	0,234
J11	in my job hard work is no guarantee of success	2,849	1,388	0,514	0,714
J14	my job has hardly any potential of satisfying my important needs	2,305	0,871	0,503	0,438
J17*	my job allows me to realise my own values	1,957	0,843	0,581	0,490
J20	my job prevents me from attaining other important goals	2,326	1,017	0,509	0,518
O10*	my occupation gives me opportunity to realise my own values	1,871	0,767	0,624	0,478
O12	my occupation prevents me from reaching my own goals	2,204	0,928	0,504	0,468
O15*	to belong to this occupation was always a life ideal	2,262	1,099	0,550	0,604
O19*	in this occupation I have best chance of fulfilling my career plans	2,412	1,042	0,619	0,645
C5	my career does not succeed in realising my important aims	2,405	1,013	0,616	0,624
C7*	involvement in my career is a rewarding investment	2,222	0,997	0,558	0,556
C8	my career does not have the potential to satisfy important needs	2,387	0,993	0,684	0,679
C10*	my career is suited for achievement of personal goals	2,606	0,972	0,663	0,644
C15*	by means of my career I satisfy all important needs	2,710	1,006	0,630	0,634
C16*	in my career I can realise my most important values	2,086	0,856	0,658	0,564

Cronbach Alpha equals 0,847 for all 17 items

Items with * should be reflected

TABLE 8
INTERCORRELATION MATRIX FOR FOUR SECOND-ORDER FACTORS (N = 279)

	FACTOR I	FACTOR II	FACTOR III	FACTOR IV
FACTOR I	1			
FACTOR II	0,338	1		
FACTOR III	0,318	0,188	1	
FACTOR IV	-0,104	-0,246	-0,067	1

The four factors, namely "workaholism", "organisational-related commitment/involvement", "union commitment" and "work-related alienation" consist respectively of 28, 38, 16 and 17 items. The respective Alpha coefficients are 0,908; 0,914; 0,909 and 0,847 which indicates that fairly robust factors were obtained. Only 99 items are retained in the final instrument which has acceptable metric properties.

These results indicate that Morrow's (1983) argument of concept redundancy holds some truth. According to these results there is apparently no theoretical reason to distinguish between the foci "work", "job", "occupation", "career" and "organisation". (This may however only be applicable to this particular sample). This clearly opposes the findings of Brooke, Russel and Price (1988); Mathieu and Farr (1991) and Wiener and Vardi (1980) who reported discriminant validities for organisational commitment and job involvement. The findings of these researchers may be ascribed to incomparable theoretical assumptions and differences in operationalisation of these two foci which would artificially enhance the differences. Also, only bivariate analysis techniques were used.

Kanungo (1982) however, found support for distinguishing between a "work" and "job" focus operationalised on the same theoretical basis by using a multi-trait multi-method approach in the bivariate analysis. This study does not support Kanungo's (1982) findings. This contradiction may be ascribed to what Morrow, Eastman and McElroy (1991) refer to as "rater naivety" i.e. the inability of respondents to distinguish clearly between concepts. It is certain that the profession/occupation respondents hold, play a vital role in their perception of work-related

tasks, roles and settings. Also, using more than two foci in the analysis might have resulted in different results.

The results also indicate that union commitment and organisational-related commitment are two fairly independent foci. On the one hand some of the work, job, occupation, and career foci items loaded on organisational commitment but not a single one of these items loaded on union commitment. This clearly shows that foci like *work*, *job*, *occupation*, and *career* are related to work organisations and not to unions. This may be ascribed to differences in the goals, ideologies and values of these two organisations.

The other two factors identified in this study are "workaholism" and "work-related alienation" which are apparently two relative independent dimensions of work-related involvement. This finding does not support research that was previously reported by Roodt (1991) and by Roodt, Bester & Boshoff (1994) who postulated a bipolar scale of work involvement ranging from workaholism to work alienation. Items in the union and organisation foci are excluded from these two factors. It seems as if respondents' basic response to "workaholism" or "work related alienation" will determine their level of involvement in either the union or the organisation. This is a question that needs further clarification and may shed some light on the question of dual allegiance.

Implications of these findings will be discussed briefly. It seems that a distinction between different work-related foci is only of theoretical importance. Managers should create an overall work setting which will facilitate the individual worker's need satisfaction, value realisation, goal achievement and consequently also their work commitment. A broad "shot-gun" approach in motivating strategies is no longer appropriate. It is clear from this research that workers only differentiate between their organisation and their union and whether they are obsessed or alienated. Careful attention should be given to conditions that may create or enhance workaholism (especially in competitive environments) or work alienation (in conditions where salient needs are not met). Consequences for both types of involvement are serious and would have long term financial and staffing effects.

Items which do not reflect a cognitive predisposition, like behavioural, attitudinal and intentional items, may be con-

taminated by cultural bias. The purely cognitive items are probably less prone to such contaminations. In South Africa with its multi-cultural population a management approach based on a "one size fits all" philosophy is no longer appropriate. In short, a generalised approach is no longer appropriate, but managers should know the needs, goals and values of their individual workers. It is of utmost importance that cross-cultural comparisons are made in deciding on appropriate management strategies. One should take cognisance of the fact that various cultural groups make use of different socialization processes which result in different value and need structures. It is therefore necessary to differentiate between different motivational strategies for individuals who come from different cultural groups. Strategies that are effective for one particular person may result in the alienation of another person. E.g. some persons show a clear preference for "individualistic" approaches while other persons prefer "collectivistic" approaches. The instrument developed in this study may contribute to assessing preferences of various persons in order to determine working conditions for optimal involvement.

REFERENCES

- 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.
- Barling, J., Wade, B. & Fullagar, C. (1990). Predicting employee commitment to company and union: Divergent models. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63, 49-61.
- Brooke, P.P., Russel, D.W. & Price, J.L. (1988). Discriminant validation of measures of job satisfaction, job involvement, and organizational commitment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 73(2), 139-145.
- Department of Education (1991). *Annual Report for the year ending 31 December 1991*. Pretoria: Government Printer.
- Dubin, R. (1956). Industrial worker's worlds: A study of the "central life interests" of industrial workers. *Social Problems*, 3, 131-142.
- Dubin, R., Champoux, J.E. & Porter, L.W. (1975). Central life interests and organizational commitment of blue-collar and clerical workers. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 20, 411-421.
- Elloy, D.F. & Terpening, W.D. (1992). An empirical distinction between job involvement and work involvement: Some additional evidence. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, 24(4), 465-478.
- Ferris, K.R. & Aranya, N. (1983). A comparison of two organizational commitment scales. *Personnel Psychology*, 36, 87-98.
- Goldstein, B. & Eichhorn, R. (1961). The changing Protestant Work Ethic: Rural patterns in health, work and leisure. *American Sociological Review*, 26, 557-565.
- Gordon, M.E., Philpot, J.W., Burt, R.E., Thompson, C.A. & Spiller, W.E. (1980). Commitment to the union: Development of a measure and an examination of its correlates. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 65, 479-499.
- Greenhaus, J.H. (1971). An investigation of the role of career salience in vocational behaviour. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 1, 209-216.
- Hall, D.T. & Schneider, B. (1972). Correlates of organizational identification as a function of career pattern and organizational type. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 17, 340-350.
- Hammond, P. & Williams, R. (1976). The Protestant ethic thesis: A social psychological assessment. *Social Forces*, 54, 579-589.
- Ho, R. (1984). Development of an Australian work ethic scale. *Australian Psychologist*, 19, 321-332.
- Kaiser, H.F. (1961). A note on Guttman's lower bound for the number of common factors. *British Journal of Statistical Psychology*, 14(1), 1
- Kanungo, R.N. (1982). *Work Alienation: An integrative approach*. New York: Praeger.
- Kidron, A. (1978). Work values and organizational commitment. *Academy of Management Journal*, 21(2), 239-247.
- Lawler, E.E. & Hall, D.T. (1970). Relationship of job characteristics to job involvement, satisfaction, and intrinsic motivation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 54, 305-312.
- Lefkowitz, J., Somers, M.J. & Weinberg, K. (1984). The role of need level and/or need salience as moderators of the relationship between need satisfaction and work alienation-involvement. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 24, 142-158.
- Lodahl, T.M. & Kejner, M. (1965). The definition and measurement of job involvement. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 49, 24-33.
- Mannheim, B. (1975). A comparative study of work centrality, job rewards and satisfaction. *Sociology of Work and Occupations*, 2(1), 79-102.
- Mathieu, J.E. & Zajac, D.M. (1990). A review and meta-analysis of the antecedents, correlates, and consequences of organizational commitment. *Psychological Bulletin*, 108(2), 171-94.
- Mirels, H.L. & Garrett, J.B. (1971). Concept redundancy in organizational research: The case of work commitment. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 36, 40-44.
- Morrow, P.C. (1983). Concept redundancy in organisational research: The case of work commitment. *Academy of Management Review*, 8, 486-500.
- Morrow, P.C. & McElroy, J.C. (1986). On assessing measures of work commitment. *Journal of Occupational Behaviour*, 7, 139-145.
- Morrow, P.C., Eastman, K. & McElroy, J.C. (1991). Concept redundancy and rater naivety in organisational research. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 21(3), 219-232.
- Mowday, R.T., Steers, R.M. & Porter, L.W. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 14, 224-247.
- Patchen, M. (1970). *Participation, achievement, and involvement on the job*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Pierce, J.L. & Dunham, R.B. (1987). Organizational commitment: Pre-employment propensity and initial work experiences. *Journal of Management*, 13(1), 163-178.
- Putti, J.M., Aryee, S. & Liang, T.R. (1989). Work values and organisational commitment: A study in the Asian context. *Human Relations*, 42(3), 275-288.
- Randall, D.M. & Cote J.A. (1991). Interrelationships of work commitment constructs. *Work and Occupations*, 18(2), 194-211.
- Ray, J. (1982). The Protestant work ethic in Australia. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 6, 127-138.
- Reichers, A.E. (1985). A review and reconceptualization of organizational commitment. *Academy of Management Review*, 10, 465-476.
- Roodt, G. (1991). *Die graad van werkbetrokkenheid as voorspeller van psigiese welsyn: 'n studie by bestuurders*. Unpublished D Admin thesis. Bloemfontein: University of the Orange Freestate.
- Roodt, G., Bester, C.L. & Boshoff, A.B. (1994). Die graad van werkbetrokkenheid: 'n bipolêre kontinuum? *Tydskrif vir Bedryfsielkunde*, 20(4), 12-16.
- Schepers, J.M. (1992). *Toetskonstruksie: Teorie en Praktijk*. Johannesburg: RAU-drukkers.
- Sheldon, M.E. (1971). Investments and involvements as mechanisms producing commitment to the organization. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 16, 143-150.
- Shore, T.H., Thornton, G.C. & Shore, L.M. (1990). Distinctiveness of three work attitudes: Job involvement, organizational commitment, and career salience. *Psychological Reports*, 67, 851-858.
- Stevens, J.M., Beyer, J.M. & Trice, H.M. (1978). Assessing personal, role, and organizational predictors of managerial commitment. *Academy of Management Journal*, 21, 380-396.
- Stoker, D.J. (1981). *Steekproefneming in die praktyk*. Lecture presented as honorary professor in the Statistics Department, University of Pretoria, Pretoria.
- Vroom, V. (1962). Ego-involvement, job satisfaction and job performance. *Personnel Psychology*, 15, 159-177.
- Wiener, Y. & Vardi, Y. (1980). Relationships between job, organization, and career commitments and work outcomes - An integrative approach. *Organizational Behaviour and Performance*, 26, 81-96.