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This dissertation meta-analytically examined the expansive material associated with work commitment. Work commitment, a multidimensional construct, encompasses the level of involvement an employee has with his or her work, organization, job, career, and union (Morrow & Goetz, 1998). Each of the dimensions of work commitment has been further divided into a number of subdimensions. The primary purpose of this study was to (1) cumulate the correlations found among each of the dimensions of work commitment to see which, if any, were intercorrelated, and to (2) determine the impact of work commitment dimensions and subdimensions on specific outcome variables (job satisfaction, job performance, and turnover).

A number of interesting results stemmed from the 213 separate meta-analyses that were conducted. First, the evidence did not indicate that all of the subdimensions for each respective dimension were positively correlated. Specifically, there was not enough evidence to indicate that continuance organizational commitment was positively correlated
with its other organizational commitment subdimensions. Future research might consider revamping the work commitment taxonomy so that all subdimensions that fall within a particular dimension are interrelated. It might be appropriate, therefore, to drop continuance organizational commitment from the work commitment taxonomy. Second, while most of the respective dimensions were interrelated, this was not the case across the board. For instance, there was no evidence of a significant positive relationship between organizational commitment and union commitment. In fact, the only significant relationship was negative between organizational commitment and belief in unionism. Further, there was no evidence of a positive relationship between union commitment and either work ethic endorsement or job involvement, respectively. These findings supported Morrow’s (1993) rationale for excluding union commitment from the work commitment taxonomy.
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CHAPTER I

Introduction

Work commitment is a central topic in organizational behavior (Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982). This concept encompasses the level of involvement an employee has with his or her work, organization, job, career, and union (Morrow & Goetz, 1988). Work commitment is a multidimensional construct (Morrow, 1983, 1993). In fact, much research has looked at various dimensions of work commitment and how those dimensions differentially impact organizational outcomes (cf. Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Morrow, 1983, 1993). Work commitment is negatively correlated with variables like employee turnover, absenteeism, and job theft (Morrow, 1993; Mowday et al., 1982; Steers & Rhodes, 1978; Tett & Meyer, 1993). Work commitment is positively correlated with outcome variables like job satisfaction and job performance (Mowday et al., 1982; Tett & Meyer, 1993).

The umbrella term of work commitment has been divided into a number of subdimensions, some of which are broader than others and are themselves further subdivided. Each of these dimensions and subdimensions collectively falls under the broader work commitment term while maintaining certain individual nuances. While a number of work commitment dimensions have been derived, there has not been much work done either to determine the specific impact of each concept or to assess the interrelationships among the various dimensions and subdimensions (cf. Morrow, 1983).

It is important to discern whether different sources of commitment are related, and also, how each of the dimensions and subdimensions is differentially related to various organizational outcomes. Hence, this dissertation cumulated the expansive material
associated with the various dimensions of work commitment. A meta-analysis was conducted on (1) the correlations found among each of the dimensions of work commitment and also on (2) the correlations between each of the respective dimensions and important outcome variables.

While some meta-analyses have looked at specific work commitment facets like job involvement or organizational commitment (e.g., Brown, 1996; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990), all of the articles written on the various dimensions of work commitment had not been meta-analyzed in one study. This is an extremely important task, in that it advances our study of organizational behavior, as it pinpoints which dimensions are interrelated as well as which dimensions might be more likely to affect specific outcome variables (Morrow, 1983).

There are certain outcome variables which are of particular interest to organizations and employers. These include job satisfaction, job performance, and employee turnover (cf. Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Riggio, 1999; Tett & Meyer, 1993). I specifically chose to explore these outcome variables because a preponderance of the literature considers work commitment and its relationship with these variables. I investigated the various dimensions of work commitment in order to gain a better understanding of the intercorrelations among the dimensions as well as the respective impact of each dimension on job satisfaction, job performance, and turnover.

*Job satisfaction* is referred to as a person’s “affective attachment” to his or her occupation (Tett & Meyer, 1993). It has even been dubbed “morale” by some researchers (Kim, Price, Mueller, & Watson, 1996). Job satisfaction is vital because it affects
employees’ attitudes toward work and the organization. It has been linked to a decrease in turnover and absenteeism (Beehr, 1996; Hackett, 1989).

Interestingly, job satisfaction is only minimally related to job performance (e.g., correlation of .17; Iaffaldano & Muchinsky, 1985). However, it is correlated with increased motivation, job involvement, organizational citizenship behavior, and organizational commitment (Kreitner & Kinicki, 1998).

*Job performance* is cited as an outcome variable that can be greatly impacted by certain human resource management practices (Becker & Gerhart, 1996). Job performance is important because an increase in output increases organizational effectiveness and may heighten net earnings of an organization (Becker & Gerhart, 1996). There is disagreement in the literature as to the definition of job performance. Campbell, McCloy, Oppler and Sager (1993) specifically emphasize the behavioral aspect of performance. They state that performance is that behavior which is under the control of the employee. Others (e.g., Bernardin & Beatty, 1984) measure performance by the outcomes that the organization gains (loses) due to employee behavior. Regardless, performance is of critical importance to an organization because it impacts the company’s bottom line (cf. Becker & Gerhart, 1996).

*Turnover* is an organizational outcome variable which deals with employees leaving an organization (Tett & Meyer, 1993). It is seen as an organizational withdrawal variable, as things like organizational commitment, attachment to an employing organization, and certain behavioral objectives have been cited as precursors of turnover (Hanisch & Hulin, 1991; Mobley, Griffeth, Hand, & Meglino, 1979).
Mobley et al. (1979) indicate that turnover is negatively correlated with job satisfaction, age, tenure, and desire to stay at an organization. Interestingly, Trevor, Gerhart, and Boudreau (1997) found a curvilinear relationship with turnover and performance. Specifically, turnover was greater for poor and excellent performers than it was for normal performers.

For theoretical as well as for practical purposes, it is important to understand the process by which the various facets of work commitment influence these important organizational outcome variables. The objective of this paper was to gain an understanding of the substantive role of work commitment as a global concept, and also as it pertains to each of the respective work commitment dimensions and subdimensions. The goal was to better understand how both the global concept and its respective dimensions impact job satisfaction, turnover, and job performance. By cumulating the correlations across these variables (the dimensions of work commitment, job satisfaction, job performance, and turnover) reported in the literature, meta-analytically derived correlations were used to further investigate the relationships between these important variables.

The use of meta-analytically derived correlations to test path models has several advantages (Viswesvaran & Ones, 1995). First, the increased sample size greatly mitigates the effects of sampling error and facilitates detection of moderator effects (Aiken & West, 1993). Further, the use of heterogeneous samples increases the generalizability of the results (Ganster, Fusilier, & Mayes, 1986). Additionally, meta-analytic research
appears to be most appropriate here, since it would be extremely difficult and impractical to administer so many measures to the same sample.

In summary, the objective of this dissertation was two-fold: (a) to cumulate the extant literature reporting correlations between the various dimensions of work commitment to see which, if any, of the dimensions are intercorrelated and (b) to determine the impact of work commitment (as a whole) along with the impact of the various dimensions of work commitment on specific outcome variables (job satisfaction, job performance, and turnover). This examination of interrelationships between dimensions and the impact of each dimension on three outcome variables (job satisfaction, job performance, and turnover) parallels what Nunnally and Bernstein (1994, p. 104-105) refer to as the internal and cross-structure analysis of a construct. A work commitment taxonomy as well as specific hypotheses are delineated in Chapter Two.
CHAPTER II

Literature Review

In this chapter, I first outline the work commitment taxonomy that has been generated for the purpose of this dissertation. The remainder of this chapter examines the meaning and respective roles of each of the dimensions of work commitment. There are five sections, one for each of the main dimensions of work commitment. The order in which each of the dimensions and subdimensions are presented follows the taxonomy presented below. Specific hypotheses are formulated within each section.

Work Commitment Taxonomy

The following taxonomy was devised by focusing on the major terms describing facets of work commitment in the literature. In her research on work commitment, Morrow (1983, 1993) presents a well-organized framework of various work commitment terms. This taxonomy is delineated in Table 1. Additionally, searches were conducted on PsychInfo and on the Social Science Citation Index to locate any other applicable terms. This investigation included a search of: (1) all meta-analyses conducted with commitment as one of the variables and (2) any term which appeared in the literature but not in Morrow’s (1983, 1993) work. Dimensions were kept for use in the taxonomy only if there were at least ten articles that had used the specific term. A list of the additional terms is found in Table 2. The completed taxonomy used in this dissertation is found in Table 3.
**Dimensions of Work Commitment**

Following is a detailed exploration of each of the dimensions and subdimensions delineated in the work commitment taxonomy. As mentioned above, there are five sections, one for each of the main categories of work commitment (e.g., organizational commitment, work ethic endorsement). Within each section, the definitions of the respective dimension and subdimensions are stated. Additionally, each section investigates the following four issues: (1) the intercorrelation among subdimensions, (2) the relationship of respective dimensions and subdimensions with outcome variables, (3) moderator effects, and (4) the intercorrelation between respective dimensions with other dimensions within the taxonomy. The moderator effects of dimension-dimension correlations are not explored. Specific hypotheses follow discussion of each of these particular issues. An examination of additional potential moderators is found in Appendix A.

**A. Organizational Commitment**

Organizational commitment has been defined as "the strength of an individual's identification with and involvement in a particular organization" (Porter, Steers, Mowday, & Boulian, 1974, p.604). One who is high in organizational commitment wants to: (1) stay with his or her organization, (2) work for the good of the organization, and (3) adhere to the prominent values of the organization (Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1979; Porter et al., 1974).
I. Intercorrelation among Subdimensions

Researchers have identified a number of different subdimensions that describe specific aspects of organizational commitment (e.g. Meyer & Allen, 1984; Porter et al., 1974). *Attitudinal organizational commitment*, which occurs among employees most frequently, is the degree of involvement that a person has with his or her employing organization (Porter et al., 1974). *Calculative organizational commitment*, defined by Hrebiniak and Alutto (1972), occurs when a person is committed to an organization because leaving the organization would result in the employee not receiving needed money or “side bets” that he or she would get by remaining with the company (i.e., retirement plan; cf. Becker, 1960). People with high attitudinal organizational commitment stay with a company because they desire to do so, while employees with a lot of calculative commitment stay with a company because they have to in order to get money and related benefits (cf. Meyer, Allen, & Gellatly, 1990). Interestingly, a person might start out with calculative organizational commitment when beginning work with an organization, but, over time, he or she might become attitudinally committed to the organization. Or, alternately, a person might join an organization because of attitudinal commitment, but continue to stay because of accumulated side bets resulting in calculative organizational commitment. Therefore, these subdimensions are, indeed, intertwined (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990).

The above two subdimensions are similar to the subdimensions proposed by Meyer and Allen (1984), namely *affective organizational commitment*, and *continuance organizational commitment*. Similar in meaning to attitudinal commitment, *affective*
organizational commitment deals with how closely a person relates to and is interested in being a part of his or her organization (Meyer & Allen, 1984). Meyer and Allen (1984) devised this construct to be used in place of or in addition to a measure of attitudinal commitment when measuring organizational commitment (cf. Morrow, 1993). It is important to note that, while the terms affective commitment and attitudinal commitment are similar, they are explored separately in this dissertation in an attempt to follow the framework provided by Morrow (1993). Further, by analyzing them separately, it is possible to test their extent of actual overlap. Therefore, in this dissertation, I kept affective and attitudinal commitment separate. Continuance commitment is quite similar to calculative commitment, although the term also considers how easy it would be to leave one organization for another job (Meyer & Allen, 1984). This term was devised to use in place of a measure of calculative commitment (cf. Morrow, 1993). As with attitudinal and affective commitment, both calculative and continuance commitment were analyzed separately here. Finally, normative organizational commitment occurs when a person becomes committed to an organization because the employee feels that this is how he or she ought to behave (Allen & Meyer, 1990).

Interestingly, Mathieu and Zajac (1990) indicate that, while related, attitudinal commitment and calculative commitment are, indeed, individual constructs. In a similar vein, Meyer et al. (1990) conducted a confirmatory factor analysis which showed that, while related, affective commitment and continuance commitment are, also, individual constructs. However, the general trend in the literature suggests that these subdimensions are positively correlated.
Hypothesis 1: The subdimensions (i.e., attitudinal organizational commitment, calculative organizational commitment, affective organizational commitment, continuance organizational commitment, and normative organizational commitment) of organizational commitment will be positively correlated.

II. Relationship with Outcome Variables

In a meta-analysis on organizational commitment, Mathieu and Zajac (1990) indicate that organizational commitment is positively correlated with motivation and job satisfaction, while it is negatively correlated with stress. This reflects the notion that a committed worker is a happy worker.

Organizational commitment has been linked to increases in performance and organizational output (Cohen, 1992; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990). Randall (1990) found that organizational commitment is positively associated with increased effort and timeliness when arriving to work, while it is negatively correlated with turnover. Interestingly, while job performance is not strongly correlated with organizational commitment, job performance is negatively correlated with turnover (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990).

Mathieu and Zajac (1990) found that one’s level of organizational commitment negatively impacts absenteeism and turnover within an organization. In fact, organizational commitment is seen as a better predictor of turnover than is job satisfaction (cf. Cohen, 1992; Williams & Hazer, 1986). And, Eby, Freeman, Rush, and Lance (1999) indicate that affective commitment is negatively correlated with absenteeism and turnover.
Hypothesis 2: Organizational commitment and its subdimensions will be positively correlated with job satisfaction and job performance and negatively correlated with turnover.

III. Moderator Effects

I discuss three moderators in this section. Due to the fact that there is one main dimension and five subdimensions of organizational commitment and because there are three outcome variables of interest, there exists the potential for 18 relationships that could have been affected by moderators. However, I have found support for moderating effects for only three such relationships.

The first moderator to be discussed is the type of organization (e.g., public versus private) to which an employee belongs. In their meta-analysis on reward and organizational commitment, Cohen and Gattiker (1994) found that the correlation between organizational commitment and satisfaction is higher in private than in public organizations. With 31 samples and a total sample size of 10,455, Cohen and Gattiker (1994) explain that in private organizations, rewards have a stronger impact on an employee’s organizational commitment than they do in public organizations. This is because “organizations differ in the primary mechanisms used to control the work behavior of their members” (Cohen & Gattiker, 1994, p. 139). Private organizations are more interested in profit, rewarding short-term behavior and performance, while public organizations reward for things like seniority (Brown, 1996). This argument is expanded from the facet level (e.g., pay satisfaction) to the global level (e.g., job satisfaction in general) here.
Hypothesis 3: Type of organization (e.g., public versus private) will serve as a moderator in the organizational commitment-job satisfaction relationship, such that the relationship will be stronger for those in a private organization.

The next moderator to be discussed is career stage of the employee. Career stage, as indicated by the age and tenure of an employee, serves as a moderator of the relationship between organizational commitment and job performance (Cohen, 1991). In a meta-analysis of 41 samples, late-career stage, as indicated by older age and more tenure, had the strongest relationship between organizational commitment and performance (Cohen, 1991). Cohen (1991) states that those in early or mid-level career stages have less experience than those in later career stages. “Organizational commitment will have a limited effect on performance in the early stage because these employees’ main obstacle is their lack of experience” (Cohen, 1991, p.257).

Career stage has also served as a moderator of the organizational commitment-turnover relationship. In fact, Cohen (1991) indicates that it is especially beneficial to improve work commitment when one is at the beginning of his or her career, as this will greatly reduce turnover of the employee. Career stage is important here because younger employees are more apt to leave an organization if there are problems within the organization or if a better opportunity surfaces elsewhere. Older and more tenured employees, on the other hand, have more time and energy invested in the organization, and are, in turn, more committed and less likely to leave the organization (cf. Cohen, 1991). In another meta-analysis with over 10,000 subjects, Cohen (1993b) found that
people who are younger as well as people who have greater tenure are more committed to an organization in general. In yet another meta-analysis with more than 36,000 subjects, Cohen (1993a) found that the relationship between organizational commitment and turnover is stronger for younger people than for older people, for the reasons mentioned above.

Hypothesis 4a: Age will serve as a moderator in the: (a) organizational commitment-job performance relationship, such that the relationship will be stronger for older employees; (b) organizational commitment-turnover relationship, such that the relationship will be stronger for younger employees.

Hypothesis 4b: Tenure will serve as a moderator in the: (a) organizational commitment-job performance relationship, such that the relationship will be stronger for more tenured employees; (b) organizational commitment-turnover relationship, such that the relationship will be stronger for those with less tenure.

The final moderator that will be discussed is that of type of job. In yet another meta-analytic study with 36 samples and over 10,000 subjects, Cohen and Hudecek (1993) found that the relationship between organizational commitment and turnover was weaker for blue-collar employees than for white-collar employees. Due to extensive schooling and training, white-collar workers generally have skills that can be easily transferred to a variety of work settings. Therefore, white-collar workers are more apt to leave an organization for other employment opportunities. Blue-collar workers, on the
other hand, lack extensive education and generally gain their job-related skills through on-the-job training. This results in fewer opportunities for blue-collar workers to transfer to other organizations (Cohen & Hudecek, 1993).

*Hypothesis 5:* Type of job (e.g., blue-collar versus white-collar) will serve as a moderator in the organizational commitment-turnover relationship, such that the relationship will be stronger for those with white-collar jobs.

**IV. Intercorrelation between Dimensions within the Taxonomy**

Organizational commitment, as it relates to other dimensions (e.g., job involvement), is discussed in future sections of this dissertation.

**B. Job Involvement**

Lodahl and Kejner (1965) instituted the term job involvement. Job involvement is defined as the amount that an employee psychologically relates to his or her job and to the work performed therein. It is often “a function of how much the job can satisfy one’s present needs” (Kanungo, 1982, p. 342). Job involvement is also indicated by the way that job performance impacts an employee’s self esteem (Lodahl & Kejner, 1965).

One who has high job involvement will be personally impacted by the ongoings at work (cf. Cook, Hepworth, Wall, & Warr, 1981). And, people who are promoted from within a company often have more job involvement than someone who is chosen externally (cf. Dailey & Morgan, 1978). Some researchers (cf. Farrell & Rusbult, 1981; Morrow, 1993) have referred to these aspects of work commitment as *job commitment*. So, in this dissertation, any studies that use the term job commitment are treated as job involvement.
I. **Intercorrelation among Subdimensions**

There are no identified subdimensions of job involvement, since job involvement is a monolithic dimension.

II. **Relationship with Outcome Variables**

One’s level of job involvement affects his or her level of job satisfaction, as job involvement is significantly and positively correlated with job satisfaction (Brown, 1996; Kahn, 1990; Schuler, 1977). In fact, one who is extremely involved in his or her job is happier, according to the literature, than one who is not involved in his or her work (Lodahl & Kejner, 1965). However, in a recent meta-analysis on this dimension, job involvement was not significantly related to performance, absenteeism, or turnover (Brown, 1996).

*Hypothesis 6:* Job involvement will be positively correlated with job satisfaction and will not be significantly correlated with either job performance or turnover.

III. **Moderator Effects**

I discuss one moderator in this section. Due to the fact that there is one main dimension of job involvement and because there are three outcome variables of interest, there exists the potential for three relationships that could have been affected by moderators. I have found support for moderating effects in all three such relationships.

Interestingly, Brown (1996) found evidence for type of organization (e.g., public versus private) to serve as a moderator in the relationship between job involvement and outcome variables. Specifically, there is a stronger relationship between job involvement
and outcome variables in private organizations than in public organizations. This might be due to the fact that private organizations are more interested in profit and, therefore, reward appropriate short-term behavior and performance. In public organizations, on the other hand, rewards are more likely to be related to seniority within an organization. (Brown, 1996). Therefore, the psychological relationship between the employee and organization is stronger in private than in public organizations (Brown, 1996).

**Hypothesis 7:** Type of organization (e.g., public versus private) will serve as a moderator in the: (a) job involvement-job satisfaction relationship, such that the relationship will be stronger for employees in private organizations; (b) job involvement-job performance relationship, such that the relationship will be stronger for employees in private organizations; (c) job involvement-turnover relationship, such that the relationship will be stronger for employees in public organizations.

IV. **Intercorrelation between Dimensions within the Taxonomy**

Interestingly, there was a definite strong correlation between organizational commitment and job involvement, although they are separate constructs (Brown, 1996; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990). Brown (1996) specifically indicates that correlations with organizational commitment and turnover are stronger than correlations between job involvement and turnover. There is also a positive correlation between job commitment and organizational commitment (Morrow, 1993). Further, there is not a significantly different correlation between global job satisfaction and either job involvement or organizational commitment.
Hypothesis 8: Job involvement will be positively correlated with organizational commitment.

C. Career/Professional/Occupational Commitment

The term Career/Professional/Occupational commitment (CPO) encompasses one’s commitment or dedication to his or her career, profession, or occupation (cf. Blau, 1985; Morrow & Goetz, 1988). The subdimensions of career commitment, professional commitment, and occupational commitment have been placed in one major category specifically because one’s career, profession, and occupation are often viewed as synonyms (cf. Lee, Carswell, & Allen, 2000). However, it is important to note the distinction between these constructs. Professional commitment is the degree to which employees are involved in their profession while career commitment is referring to the employee’s dedication to his or her career, per se (Aranya, Pollack, & Amernic, 1981; Blau, 1985; Morrow & Goetz, 1988; Morrow & Wirth, 1989). And, occupational commitment refers to one’s level of involvement with his or her occupation (Lee et al., 2000). One’s career may span more than one occupation.

Specifically, professional commitment refers to a person’s desire to: (1) agree with and adhere to the prominent values of the profession, (2) work for the good of the profession, and (3) continue working in the profession (Aranya et al., 1981). Career commitment, on the other hand, is described by the advancement of individual vocational goals, and by the drive and commitment associated with completing these goals (Colarelli & Bishop, 1990). Career commitment is important because it enables an employee to develop the needed skills and relationships in order to have a profitable career, regardless
of the organization within which he or she is employed (Colarelli & Bishop, 1990). Meanwhile, occupational commitment is defined as “a psychological link between a person and his or her occupation that is based on affective reaction to that occupation” (Lee et al., 2000, p.800).

I. Intercorrelation among Subdimensions

A number of subdimensions fall within this broad category of CPO. The first of these subdimensions to be discussed is career salience. Career salience is defined as the significance that an employee places on his or her career (Greenhaus, 1971). Interestingly, in addition to being used as a synonym for career commitment, professional commitment has also been dubbed career salience (Wallace, 1993). Career involvement is defined as the degree of identification with one’s career (Gould, 1979). It is also considered the attitude with which one views his or her career (Gould, 1979).

The next subdimension to be discussed is professionalism. Professionalism is “the extent to which one identifies with one’s profession and accepts its values” (Morrow & Goetz, 1988, p.93). One who exhibits a high degree of professionalism is more likely to put new topics or courses of action into practice (Damanpour, 1991). Hall (1968) noted five indicators of professionalism: (1) the utilization of the profession and of peers within the profession when making decisions, (2) confidence that the profession contributes meaningfully to the community, (3) faith that the profession should be controlled by people within the profession, (4) confidence that fellow members of the profession believe that this profession is their mission in life, and (5) an assumption that those within the profession are allowed to conduct various endeavors without needing others’ consent.
The last three subdimensions to be discussed in this subsection are affective occupational commitment, continuance occupational commitment, and normative occupational commitment. Interestingly, Meyer, Allen, & Smith (1993) branched-out their organizational commitment model to one of occupational commitment. So, these subdimensions are very similar in meaning to their organizational commitment subdimension counterparts. Specifically, affective occupational commitment is when a person stays with his or her occupation because he or she desires to do so (cf. Irving, Coleman, & Cooper, 1997; Meyer & Allen, 1984). With continuance occupational commitment, a person is committed to his or her occupation because it would be difficult to leave the occupation for another occupation, and because leaving the occupation would result in the person not receiving needed money and the like (cf. Irving et. al, 1997; Meyer & Allen, 1984). With normative occupational commitment, a person stays with his or her occupation because he or she feels that he or she ought to do so (cf. Allen & Meyer, 1990; Irving et al., 1997). Interestingly, confirmatory factor analysis indicated that affective, continuance, and normative occupational commitment are, respectively, considered distinct subdimensions in various occupations (Irving et al., 1997). The general trend in the literature does indicate that these subdimensions are positively correlated.

Hypothesis 9: The subdimensions (i.e., career salience, career involvement, professionalism, affective occupational commitment, continuance occupational commitment, and normative occupational commitment) of CPO will be positively correlated.
Morrow (1983, 1993) has listed local/cosmopolitanism (L/C) under the professional commitment dimension. L/C is a term used by Gouldner (1958) to differentiate between people who are either committed to their profession (cosmopolitans) or to their organization (locals). While the “cosmopolitanism” term does, indeed, relate to professional commitment, the “local” aspect refers to committed people in an organization. Therefore, while L/C is placed here in an effort to follow Morrow’s (1993) framework, it is considered a “free-floater” among the organizational commitment and CPO dimensions.

II. Relationship with Outcome Variables

Occupational commitment is positively correlated with job satisfaction (Irving et al, 1997; Lee et al., 2000). Career salience is also correlated with job satisfaction (Greenhaus, 1971).

Career salience is correlated with performance outcome variables like self-rated effort and accomplishments (Greenhaus, 1971). Occupational commitment is also positively correlated with job performance. Due to the sometimes synonymous application of the terms occupational commitment, professional commitment, and career commitment, it can be inferred that these findings are applicable to the CPO dimension at large (cf. Lee et al., 2000).

Hypothesis 10: CPO and its subdimensions will be positively correlated with job satisfaction and job performance.
III. *Moderator Effects*

I discuss two moderators in this section. Due to the fact that there is one main dimension and six subdimensions of CPO and because there are three outcome variables of interest, there exists the potential for 21 relationships that could have been affected by moderators. However, I have found support for moderators in only two such relationships.

The first moderator that will be discussed is locus of control. Locus of control serves as a moderator of the relationship between CPO and outcome variables. Those with an internal locus of control will be more likely to be committed to and involved in their careers (Colarelli & Bishop, 1990; Gould, 1979). With their sample of 436 subjects, Colarelli and Bishop (1990) indicate that those with an internal locus of control have more effective careers than those with an external locus of control. This is seen as internals earn more money and have greater career advancement than do externals (Andrisani & Nestel, 1976).

*Hypothesis 11:* Locus of control (e.g., internal versus external) will serve as a moderator in the: (a) CPO-job satisfaction relationship, such that the relationship will be stronger for employees with an internal locus of control; and (b) CPO-job performance relationship, such that the relationship will be stronger for employees with an internal locus of control.

The final moderator to be discussed here is age of employee. Age serves as a moderator of the relationships between CPO and outcome variables. Specifically, older
people are more dedicated to their careers than are younger people (Colarelli & Bishop, 1990). Colarelli and Bishop (1990) indicate that one’s career commitment is enhanced as an employee becomes more focused on his or her career path. This occurs, specifically, as people age (Colarelli & Bishop, 1990). Also, as a person gets older and stays with a particular career, he or she does not have as much time to learn new skills so as to make a career change. All of these reasons show how age can serve as a moderator between CPO and various outcome variables (Colarelli & Bishop, 1990).

Hypothesis 12: Age will serve as a moderator of the: (a) CPO-job satisfaction relationship, such that the relationship will be stronger for older employees; and (b) CPO-job performance relationship, such that the relationship will be stronger for older employees.

IV. Intercorrelation between Dimensions within the Taxonomy

Interestingly, CPO and organizational commitment have been found to be positively correlated (cf. Brierley, 1998). In fact, Wallace (1993) conducted a meta-analysis to see if professional commitment and organizational commitment are positively related. Her results indicate that the two variables, are, indeed, positively correlated. This is an important finding because it implies that one who is committed to his or her profession is not necessarily uncommitted to his or her organization. Interestingly, these findings are in conflict with the literature, which states that the two variables are necessarily negative in their correlation (e.g., March & Simon, 1958). Wallace (1993) does point out, though, that one might be more dedicated to his or her profession than to his or her organization, even though the two are positively correlated. Morrow and Wirth
(1989) indicate that professional commitment may be more important than organizational commitment when it comes to small companies and to those who are self-employed. CPO has also been found to be positively correlated with job involvement (Brown, 1996).

Concerning additional relationships between subdimensions mentioned in this section and other dimensions found in the taxonomy, Meyer, Allen, & Smith (1993) actually branched-out their organizational commitment model when designing one of occupational commitment. While related, the two dimensions are completely different constructs (Irving et al., 1997). It has also been discerned in the literature that career salience is correlated with job involvement and organizational commitment (Greenhaus, 1971; Morrow, 1993).

_Hypothesis 13:_ CPO will be positively correlated with organizational commitment and with job involvement.

### D. Work Ethic Endorsement

Work ethic endorsement is the degree to which an employee “believes in the importance of work itself” (Morrow, 1993, p.1). This broad term encompasses the following more narrow subdimensions: Protestant work ethic endorsement, work ethic, work involvement, and employment commitment.

#### I. Intercorrelation among Subdimensions

_Protestant work ethic endorsement_, the first of the many subdimensions in this category, was initiated by Mirels and Garrett in 1971. Its use in psychology is an extension of the work on Protestant work ethic by Weber (1905). It deals with one’s belief in diligent pursuit of work and monetary gain while ignoring one’s own self-regard
and while staying away from distractions (Furnham, 1990; Morrow, 1993). Interestingly, Mirels and Garrett (1971) indicate that jobs which ascribe to strict rules and regimented behavior (e.g., army officer, police officer) are more strongly correlated with Protestant work ethic endorsement than are jobs that are especially artistic or creative (e.g., artist, music teacher).

*Work ethic* deals with one’s view that dedication to work itself is positive and necessary to succeed in society (Buchholz, 1976). This term is positively correlated with Protestant work ethic endorsement (Furnham, 1990). In fact, the definition of work ethic mirrors much of the definition of Protestant work ethic endorsement (cf. Buchholz, 1976; Dickson & Buchholz, 1979). Buchholz (1976) defines work ethic as follows:

Work is good in itself and bestows dignity on a person. Everyone should work and those who don’t are not useful members of society. By working hard a person can overcome every obstacle that life presents and make his own way in the world. Success is thus directly linked to one’s own efforts and the material wealth a person accumulates is a measure of how much effort he has expended. Wealth should be wisely invested to earn still greater returns and not foolishly spent on personal consumption. Thus thrift and frugality are virtues to be practiced in the use of one’s material possessions (p. 1179).

*Work involvement* is defined as the degree that one relates to work itself (Kanungo, 1982). It is an idea that one has about the importance of work in his or her life (Kanungo, 1982). Finally, *employment commitment* is defined as the extent to which one desires to be employed (Jackson, Stafford, Banks, & Warr, 1983). It is also determined by how dedicated one is to the labor market (Jackson et al., 1983). Interestingly, employment commitment serves as a moderator between status of employment and psychological anguish. Specifically, people with higher employment commitment “showed greater
change in distress scores as a result of change in employment status” (Jackson et al., 1983, p.532).

_Hypothesis 14:_ The subdimensions (i.e., Protestant work ethic endorsement, work ethic, work involvement, and employment commitment) of work ethic endorsement will be positively correlated.

II. Relationship with Outcome Variables

There is evidence of a slight correlation between Protestant work ethic endorsement and outcome variables like job satisfaction and job performance (Morrow & McElroy, 1987). There is also evidence of a correlation between Protestant work ethic and intention to stay at a particular organization (Morrow & McElroy, 1987). Since the subdimensions are hypothesized to be intercorrelated, it can be inferred that these findings are applicable to the work ethic endorsement dimension at large (cf. Morrow, 1993).

_Hypothesis 15:_ Work ethic endorsement will be positively correlated with job satisfaction and job performance and negatively correlated with turnover.

III. Moderator Effects

I discuss one moderator in this section. Due to the fact that there is one main dimension and four subdimensions of work ethic endorsement and because there are three outcome variables of interest, there exists the potential for 15 relationships that could have been affected by moderators. However, I found support for moderating effects for only three such relationships.
The only moderator that will be discussed in this section is age of the employee. The literature indicates that age may serve as a moderator between work ethic endorsement and outcome variables (cf. Morrow, 1983; Morrow & McElroy, 1987). In fact, older people are more prone to work ethic endorsement in general (Morrow, 1983; Morrow & McElroy, 1987). In their study with a sample of 2,200 employees, Morrow and McElroy (1987) found that older people are generally less likely to voluntarily leave an organization and are more satisfied with work. This might be because older people have fewer opportunities to change career paths and because they are more involved in their specific vocation.

Hypothesis 16: Age will serve as a moderator in the: (a) work ethic endorsement-job satisfaction relationship, such that the relationship will be stronger for older people; (b) work ethic endorsement-job performance relationship, such that the relationship will be stronger for older people; and (c) work ethic endorsement-turnover relationship, such that the relationship will be stronger for younger people.

IV. Intercorrelations between Dimensions within the Taxonomy

Work ethic endorsement is positively correlated with job involvement and organizational commitment (Brown, 1996; Morrow & McElroy, 1986). At the subdimension level, Protestant work ethic endorsement and employment commitment are slightly correlated with job involvement and with organizational commitment (Jackson et al., 1983; Morrow & McElroy, 1987). And, since CPO and organizational commitment
have been found to be positively correlated in the literature (cf. Brierley, 1998), it can be inferred that work ethic endorsement is also correlated with CPO.

**Hypothesis 17:** Work ethic endorsement will be positively correlated with organizational commitment, job involvement, and CPO.

### E. Union Commitment

In her 1983 article on work commitment, Morrow included union commitment in her framework as one of the many dimensions of work commitment. However, due to lack of continued research in this area, she did not include union commitment in the latest framework provided (Morrow, 1993). Regardless, union commitment, which refers to how dedicated one is to his or her union, is included in this dissertation to ensure the most complete coverage of the work commitment construct (cf. Gordon, Philpot, Burt, Thompson, & Spiller, 1980).

People are generally more committed to their union when the union is fighting for worker rights and the like. In fact, union commitment is often based on the type and amount of benefits that the union can bestow on its members (Gordon et al., 1980). Also, union commitment can change quite frequently, depending on how often a person joins a new organization, profession, or job (cf. Morrow, 1983). Commitment is needed to guarantee the basic functioning of a union (Gordon et al., 1980).

#### I. Intercorrelation among Subdimensions

There are four main subdimensions of union commitment, namely *union loyalty, responsibility to the union, willingness to work for the union, and belief in unionism* (Gordon et al., 1980, p. 487). *Union loyalty* refers to the degree of allegiance that one
has toward his or her union (Gordon et al., 1980). *Responsibility to the union* represents the desire that one has to complete daily requirements and responsibilities in order to maintain the union (Gordon et al., 1980). *Willingness to work for the union* refers to the desire one has to utilize his or her spare time to benefit the union (Gordon et al., 1980). Finally, *belief in unionism* refers to “the member’s belief in the concept of unionism” (Gordon et al., 1980, p.487). The literature indicates that these subdimensions are positively correlated.

*Hypothesis 18:* The subdimensions (i.e., union loyalty, responsibility to the union, willingness to work for the union, and belief in unionism) of union commitment will be positively correlated.

II. *Relationship with Outcome Variables*

Interestingly, union commitment is negatively correlated with job satisfaction in the literature (Gordon et al., 1980). “Members who were dissatisfied with ‘bread and butter’ matters or with management were more willing to fulfill their normal obligations to the union as well as to perform special duties on behalf of the local” (Gordon et al., 1980; p 492). It can be inferred that union commitment is not significantly related to performance on the job (cf. Gordon et al, 1980; Morrow, 1983).

*Hypothesis 19:* Union commitment and its subdimensions will be negatively correlated with job satisfaction and will not be significantly related to job performance.
III. Moderator Effects

I will be discussing one moderator in this section. Due to the fact that there is one main dimension and four subdimensions of union commitment and because there are three outcome variables of interest, there exists the potential for 15 relationships that could have been affected by moderators. I found support for moderating effects for two such relationships.

The moderator that will be discussed in this section is type of job. Johnson, Johnson, and Patterson (1999) indicate that type of job (e.g., white-collar versus blue-collar) might serve as a moderating variable when considering the relationship between union commitment and other variables. For instance, when comparing the relationship between company and union commitment, there was a stronger relationship for blue-collar employees than for white-collar employees (Johnson et al., 1999). This might be because white-collar employees have more employment opportunities than do blue-collar employees (cf. Cohen & Hudecek, 1993). Those who believe that there are not too many job opportunities might maintain a stronger relationship with the union in hopes that the union will protect their position in their current place of employment.

*Hypothesis 20:* Type of job (e.g., white-collar versus blue-collar) will serve as a moderator in the: (a) union commitment-job satisfaction relationship, such that the relationship is stronger for blue-collar employees; and (b) union commitment-job performance relationship, such that the relationship will be stronger for blue-collar employees.
IV. Intercorrelation between Dimensions within the Taxonomy

Union commitment is only applicable to those who are union members (Morrow, 1983). This facet, therefore, is not as generalizable as some of the other work commitment facets (e.g., work ethic involvement, job involvement). Regardless, union commitment is still correlated with the other dimensions of work commitment (cf. Morrow, 1983, 1993). Specifically, union commitment is correlated with organizational commitment, job involvement, CPO, and work ethic endorsement (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Morrow, 1983).

An interesting difference between union commitment and organizational commitment is how voluntary the participation is within a union versus within an organization (Morrow, 1983). When someone joins an organization, it is almost always according to his or her own volition. But, sometimes a person has to join a union because he works for a particular organization (Morrow, 1983).

*Hypothesis 21:* Union commitment will be positively correlated with organizational commitment, job involvement, CPO, and work ethic endorsement.
CHAPTER III

Methods

Database

A computerized search was conducted on PsychInfo and on the Social Science Citation Index to identify articles to be used for the meta-analyses. Approximately 8,000 articles were found containing any of the following 26 key words: work commitment, organizational commitment, calculative organizational commitment, attitudinal organizational commitment, continuance organizational commitment, affective organizational commitment, normative organizational commitment, job involvement, job commitment, career commitment, professional commitment, occupational commitment, career salience, career involvement, professionalism, affective occupational commitment, calculative occupational commitment, normative occupational commitment, local/cosmopolitanism, work ethic endorsement, Protestant work ethic endorsement, work ethic, work involvement, employment commitment, union commitment, and unionism.

Additionally, I “snowballed” the references from any applicable article or book (e.g., Brown, 1996; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Morrow, 1993) to identify other potential articles. I did not actively seek conference articles or chapters from books. However, I included any that were identified in my search.

A total of 868 articles were tagged as appropriate for the meta-analysis. A complete list of citations of all articles used in the meta-analysis is provided in Appendix B.
There were certain inclusion criteria used when designating articles: (1) The study needed to use employees in an actual organization; (2) There had to be evidence of at least either: (a) two of the 26 keywords (e.g., organizational commitment, job involvement) used in the study or (b) one of the 26 keywords and one of the aforementioned outcome variables (job satisfaction, job performance, or turnover) used in the study.

**Procedure**

After gathering all of the designated articles (see above for criteria), I coded the located articles. The correlations, their corresponding sample sizes, and the reliabilities of the measures were (abstracted and) coded. Also coded were the types of measures of the respective variables used in each study. It is important to note that the outcome variables (job satisfaction, job performance, and turnover) were coded globally. This means that facets of job satisfaction, for example, were not coded; however, job satisfaction, in general, was coded. Job satisfaction and job performance were coded such that a high number indicated a positive value (e.g., higher job satisfaction, greater job performance). Turnover was coded such that a high number indicated a larger amount of turnover. Reverse coding took place when needed for all applicable variables.

When age was used as a moderator, I used the average age in each sample and took a median split. Similarly, when tenure was used as a moderator, I used the average tenure in each sample and took the median split. When either type of organization (e.g., public versus private) or type of job (e.g., blue-collar versus white-collar) was used as a moderator, I disregarded any heterogeneous samples and coded accordingly. When locus
of control was used as a moderator, one of two options occurred. For those samples using solely internal or external locus of control, I coded the study appropriately. However, if such a distinction was not made, I took the average of the locus of control measure and noted where it fell, according to Rotter and Mulray’s (1965) scale for locus of control. The respective levels that were used when coding each moderator variable can be seen in Table 4.

Analyses

When testing zero-order correlations for bivariate relationship hypotheses concerning the relationship of dimensions and subdimensions with outcome variables (i.e., Hypotheses 2, 6, 10, 15, and 19), one has an option of using ρ (roe; true score correlation) or R-BAR. Since I focused only at the construct level, I used ρ. When considering effect size, one has an option: (1) to focus on correlational measures (e.g., ρ, where the respective value of the true score correlation represents either a small, medium, or large effect; Cohen, 1988), or (2) to utilize a 95% confidence interval for significance testing. I used the confidence interval approach here. For instance, when testing one of the direct effects models for Hypothesis 2, the true score correlation between, e.g., organizational commitment and job satisfaction was examined. A substantive positive correlation between organizational commitment and job satisfaction, where the 95% credibility interval excluded zero, was taken as evidence supporting that part of the hypothesis. To completely test Hypothesis 2, it is important to recognize that there were 18 distinct correlations of interest. This was due to the fact that the hypothesis considered organizational commitment and its five subdimensions as they respectively related to the
three outcome variables. So, the same process mentioned above that was used to analyze the bivariate relationship between organizational commitment and job satisfaction was used to analyze each of the other 17 relationships highlighted in this hypothesis.

When analyzing hypotheses dealing with intercorrelations among subdimensions (i.e., Hypotheses 1, 9, 14, and 18), one must choose again between using ρ or R-BAR. I used the true score correlation because I was interested in the construct level. One might choose to look at the average true score correlation (ρ) when testing these hypotheses. However, average standard deviation of ρ is difficult to interpret. There are similar problems when using the sample size weighted standard deviation of ρ. So, factor analysis was utilized instead of the above possibilities. For instance, concerning Hypothesis 1, there are five subdimensions of organizational commitment. So, I conducted factor analysis with a 5-by-5 matrix. I assessed how much variance each factor explained as well as the root mean square residual. When conducting factor analysis, it is necessary to input the size of the sample being analyzed. There are a number of possibilities that one may use when determining the number to input for the sample size, namely: (1) the average sample size of all of the included studies, (2) the smallest sample size of all of the included studies, (3) the maximum sample size of all included studies, or (4) the harmonic mean. I chose to input the harmonic mean for the sample size in the factor analysis program.

Finally, the hypotheses that I developed are stand-alone hypotheses. However, after testing the hypothesized models, I also tested for alternate models.

When testing for moderators that are discrete variables, like type of organization (i.e., Hypotheses 3 and 7) and type of job (i.e., Hypotheses 5 and 20), I dropped any
heterogeneous samples and applied subgroup analysis. For instance, with Hypothesis 3, I discarded any heterogeneous samples that included both private and public employees (collectively). I also discarded any ambiguous samples. I was left with studies that assessed private and public organizations with separate sample groups. From there, I conducted subgroup analysis to test for a moderator effect. When using the 95% confidence intervals, if there was overlap, then there was no evidence of a moderator effect. If there was no overlap, then there was evidence of a moderator effect. It is important to note that when testing moderator hypotheses, any study including the related dimension or subdimensions was used, since the subdimensions are considered to be manifestations of the respective larger dimension. So, for instance, with Hypothesis 3, any study that discussed type of organization and either organizational commitment or any of its subdimensions was used when testing for moderator effects. Hence, organizational commitment or any of its subdimensions were treated as if they measured the same construct.

When testing for moderators that are continuous variables, like age or tenure (i.e., Hypotheses 4, 12, and 16), I first took the median split. For instance, with Hypothesis 4, I used the average sample age when coding the studies. The median split for age occurred at 35.7 years. So, when the average sample age was 35.6 years or less, it was coded as "younger" while a sample age of 35.7 years or higher was coded as "older." The median split for tenure occurred at 7.24 years. So, when the average sample tenure was 7.23 years or less, it was coded as "less tenured" while a sample tenure of 7.24 years or more was coded as "more tenured." (It is important to note here that if I would have taken into
account the variability of age or tenure, the results might have changed.) Another moderator that is a continuous variable is locus of control (i.e., Hypothesis 11). In this case, if the study was specifically about those with either an internal or external locus of control, I coded accordingly. However, if the study reported only average values, one could either: (1) apply the median split, or (2) go to Rotter and Mulray's (1965) manual, see where the average value falls, and code accordingly (i.e., at the internal or external level). I used Rotter and Mulray's (1965) manual. Again, it is important to note that any study including the appropriate dimensions or subdimensions and the moderator variable of interest was used here.

When addressing hypotheses concerning intercorrelations between dimensions within the taxonomy (i.e., Hypotheses 8, 13, 17, and 21), any study including the respective dimensions or subdimensions was used, as the subdimensions are considered manifestations of the larger dimension in this dissertation. For instance, in Hypothesis 8, job involvement is a monolithic dimension, while organizational commitment has five subdimensions. Hence, there were six potential bivariate relationships to consider here. As mentioned above, ρ was used because I was interested in the construct level relationship. And, confidence intervals were used when testing for significance.

Coding Decisions

There were a number of decisions that were made when coding to determine whether or not a particular article should be tagged as appropriate for inclusion in the meta-analysis. This section explicates the various determinations made when coding.
There are six subheadings in this section, one for general coding decisions and one for each of the respective dimensions of work commitment.

I. **General Coding Decisions**

   a. **Related to Subjects**

   Studies were included only if they used actual employees in an organization. I did not use student samples, where subjects enacted a simulation (i.e., Allen & Russell, 1999; Zellars & Kacmar, 1999). Similarly, articles where nurses read scenarios and voted on a hypothetical employee’s level of performance were not included (i.e., Grover, 1993).

   A student’s academic job involvement, academic commitment, and academic performance were not included as usable terms in this study. This was because it was determined that the studies used should only deal with one’s level of commitment to his or her work organization, involvement with his or her job, and so forth. To clarify, a full-time student’s commitment to his or her university was not coded. However, a professor’s commitment to his or her university was coded, since this was his or her place of employment. Similarly, teacher trainees’ career commitment and job satisfaction were also deemed appropriate to code (e.g., Lam, Foong, & Moo, 1995).

   An article with a “convenience” sample (i.e., Furnham, 1997) was included, where 85% of the subjects labeled themselves as workers and 15% labeled themselves as students (but not necessarily as non-workers). This article was included in the dataset because it was possible for the remaining 15% of the subjects to have a job. And, since 85% of the subjects definitely worked for an organization, it seemed fitting to keep the article.
A study with volunteer workers (i.e., Grube & Piliavin, 2000) was included in the dataset. This article reported the commitment of volunteers to the organization for which they worked, and their intent to leave the organization. This study was permitted because the volunteers had a job; they just opted not to be paid for it. I also used an article that asked retired people to reflect on their job satisfaction and job involvement when they used to be employed (i.e., Schmitt, White, Coyle, & Rauschenberger, 1979).

b. Related to Outcome Variables

Although pride in work is not generally the same as job satisfaction, it was coded as such with the Putti, Aryee, and Liang (1989) article. This was because the term was specifically defined as the feeling of satisfaction that an employee derived from work. Quality of work life was coded as job satisfaction in the Higgins, Duxbury, and Irving (1992) article. (According to the article, job satisfaction is a part of the broader term, quality of work life.) Outcome satisfaction was coded as job satisfaction in the Kim and Mauborgne (1993) study, based on the definition provided.

The term work enjoyment (i.e., my job is more like fun than work) was not counted as job satisfaction. Organizational morale was also not included as job satisfaction, since it was at the organizational level. And, satisfaction with training was not coded as job satisfaction. The specific article under consideration here (i.e. Mathieu, 1988) dealt with Army and Navy ROTC cadets' satisfaction with ROTC training and commitment to the ROTC in general.
I coded *over satisfaction* as a measure of performance of a bank teller sample in the Shore and Martin (1989) article. Over satisfaction reflected positive performance in this article.

**c. Related to Moderator Variables**

When coding for age or tenure, I coded this variable as ambiguous unless the article clearly indicated the mean or median age or tenure. For instance, if the article said that 53% of the sample was 34 years of age, then I coded age as 34. If, however, the article said that nearly half of the sample was 25, then I coded that as ambiguous. If an age range was given, I took the median number.

When coding for type of organization, the organization in each study was coded as private, public, mixed, or unknown/ambiguous. Regarding type of job, the subjects were coded as either blue-collar, white-collar, mixed-collar, or unknown/ambiguous collar.

**d. Related to Correlations, LISREL**

Only articles that reported correlations were used in the meta-analysis. Therefore, if there were beta weights but no correlations reported, then the article was not used in this study. I coded all cross-lagged correlations. I did not include articles with ranges of correlations. When there was an option to code for a scale or a factor, I always coded the scale (e.g., Drasgow & Miller, 1982).

I chose to include LISREL and interitem correlations in the dataset. I used any LISREL article that reported a correlation matrix, regardless of whether it reported corrected or uncorrected correlations. I dropped all articles that reported charts or path coefficients in a path model, since they offered no data for cumulation. With interitem
correlations, I formed a composite of all scale items (cf. Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994) and then took the appropriate correlations.

e. Related to Problem Articles

There were two Ting (1996, 1997) articles that appeared to use the same dataset, namely the Survey of Federal Employees. There was even similar wording in the articles. I decided to use only one article in the dataset. I chose to include the study with the larger sample size (Ting, 1996) and kept the other one for reference (Ting, 1997).

There was a problem with the matrix of an article written by Ko, Price, and Mueller (1997). It appeared as if every row needed to be shifted over in order to read the matrix properly. However, even with that adjustment, there were still some correlations that were unaccounted for. I sent an email to Price (co-author) on 10-24-01, requesting a copy of the matrix as it should read. He was unable to locate the matrix. Therefore, this article was not used in the meta-analysis.

f. Related to Extraneous Commitment Terms

There were a number of articles which mentioned names for commitment terms not included in the taxonomy, namely behavioral commitment, moral commitment, value commitment, compliance, internalization, identification, and instrumental commitment. I initially attempted to dub the terms as facets with similar meanings found within the taxonomy (e.g., behavioral commitment might be coded as continuance commitment). However, these additional terms did not conform to the construct domain found within the dissertation. Therefore, those articles which cited commitment terms other than those that easily (and cleanly) fit into the construct domain were not included in the analysis. Those
terms which could fit easily into the construct domain were included in the analysis in the most general sense (e.g., as organizational commitment and not as one of the various facets of organizational commitment).

g. Related to Publication Date of Articles

This dissertation covered all articles through December 2000. However, some 2001 articles were detected during the data gathering process. It was determined that these 21 additional articles should be included in the meta-analysis for sake of thoroughness.

II. Organizational Commitment Coding Decisions

Organizational identification and organizational loyalty were coded as organizational commitment.

III. Job Involvement Coding Decisions

In the Indiresan (1975) article, job saliency was determined to be like job involvement. Therefore, the correlation between job saliency and job satisfaction was coded as if it were the correlation between job involvement and job satisfaction. Job dedication was coded as job involvement in the Van Scotter and Motowidlo (1996) article, since its definition included working diligently, taking initiative, and the like.

I chose not to use a study where job involvement was measured by the amount of hours that an employee worked. It was also determined not to include a study where constructs were measured at the group or organizational level. Job involvement was not coded in the study by Hall and Lawler (1970), since the job involvement scores for
individuals were averaged for all respondents in the organization and performance was measured at the organizational level.

IV. Career/Professional/Occupational Commitment (CPO) Coding Decisions

Committedness to the field of practice was coded as CPO in the Ben-Sira (1986) article, since it described how much one wanted to remain in his or her specific field of medicine.

V. Work Ethic Endorsement Coding Decisions

Military ethos was coded as work ethic, since it was described as a measure of professional military values (i.e., Guimond, 1995). Work role centrality and central life interest were coded as either job involvement or work ethic endorsement, depending on the definition provided in the article (e.g., Elfering, Semmer, & Kalin, 2000). When an article dealt with a facet of, i.e., Protestant work ethic endorsement, I coded each facet as Protestant work ethic endorsement, since I did not specifically explore the facets of subdimensions in this meta-analysis.

VI. Union Commitment Coding Decisions

The term union instrumentality was generally not considered to be the same as union commitment. However, it was coded as general union commitment in the Fullager (1986) article, when it was specifically described as a union commitment variable. In the Shore, Tetrick, Sinclair, and Newton (1994) article, the term general attitude toward unions was considered to be similar enough to belief in unionism to be coded as such.
CHAPTER IV

Results

This chapter is divided into five sections. The first section discusses dropped variables. The second section delineates the frequency distribution of available studies. The third section assesses the reliability analysis. The fourth section reviews the intercorrelations among the 18 subdimensions. Finally, the fifth section tests the 21 respective hypotheses.

A. Dropped Variables

Of the 8,000 articles that were reviewed, there were not enough tagged articles that reported locus of control. Specifically, there were 20 studies that used locus of control as it pertained to the hypotheses (e.g., in an article about career commitment). However, only 12 of those studies reported a mean value. Further, of these 12, five cited Rotter (1966) for their scale, one cited Valecha (1972), four cited Spector (1988), and two cited Levenson (1973). When using locus of control as a moderator variable, there were two options that were available for analyses: (1) If the study was specifically about those with an internal or external locus of control, I could code accordingly; (2) If the study reported only average values, I could go to Rotter and Mulray’s (1965) manual, see where the average value fell, and code accordingly (i.e., at the internal or external level). However, neither option could be utilized here due to the distribution of articles. Therefore, this moderator was unable to be tested. So, Hypothesis 11 was not included in the analysis. Similarly, only five articles in the dataset mentioned self-esteem. Therefore, all analyses with self-esteem were also dropped.
There were only four articles tagged as appropriate for the meta-analysis that used local/cosmopolitanism as a construct of interest. Therefore, this term was dropped from the analysis. Two of the articles (i.e., Baack, Luthans, & Rogers 1993; McKelvey & Sekaran, 1977) that included correlations with local/cosmopolitanism contained other usable correlations and were not dropped completely from the study. However, the two other articles were used only for reference, since they only contained local/cosmopolitanism constructs (i.e., Larwood, Wright, Desrochers, & Dahir, 1998; London, Cheney, & Tavis, 1977). Similarly, the one article that used the term employment commitment was better coded as work commitment (Wanberg et al., 1999). Hence, any analyses with employment commitment were dropped. So, portions of Hypotheses 14, 15, 16, and 17 concerning employment commitment were not tested.

**B. Frequency Distribution of Available Studies**

The majority of the studies used in the meta-analysis addressed organizational commitment or one of its subdimensions. Job satisfaction was the most popular outcome variable used in the dataset. While this meta-analysis covered all studies until December 2000, most of the tagged studies were from the last decade.

The measures of organizational commitment that were included in the database along with the frequencies of their use are listed in Table 5. Similarly, the scales or instruments used to measure job involvement, CPO, work ethic endorsement, and union commitment are summarized in Tables 6, 7, 8, and 9, respectively. The scales used to measure the outcome variables in this study are found in Table 10. (In general, measures are included in the respective tables only if they are listed five or more times in the dataset.
for a particular subdimension. However, in instances where the measure with the greatest frequency for a subdimension is found fewer than five times in the dataset, this measure is still included in the table.)

C. Reliability of the Assessments

Table 11 summarizes the artifact distributions of the variables used. The table includes the mean and standard deviation of both frequency-weighted and sample size-weighted reliabilities as well as those for the square root of reliabilities for each of the constructs used in the meta-analyses.

The frequency-weighted mean is a simple average taken by adding up all of the reliability estimates and dividing by the total number of estimates. With the sample size-weighted mean, however, the reliability estimate for each study is weighted based on the sample size for that particular study. The sum of each reliability estimate times its sample size is calculated before dividing by the total sample size (of all of the studies used). The benefit of using a frequency-weighted mean and standard deviation is that one study with a large sample size will not skew the results, since each reliability estimate is weighted the same. However, the sample size-weighted mean and standard deviation provide a more accurate figure (Viswesvaran, Ones, & Schmidt, 1996). Hence, both are depicted in this dissertation. Reliabilities are included because we are interested in the internal consistency of the measures used (cf. Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). The square root of reliability is also included, though, as that is what is needed to conduct the meta-analysis. Generally, the reliabilities and square roots of reliability are similar, numerically. However, all of the terms defined above are included in Table 11 for sake of thoroughness.
The mean frequency-weighted reliability ranged from .70 (for Protestant work ethic endorsement or PWE) to .88 (for union loyalty). The standard deviation of the frequency-weighted reliability varied from .0071 (for turnover) to .1272 (for PWE). The mean sample size-weighted reliability ranged from .67 (for PWE) to .87 (for union commitment and union loyalty). The variability of the sample size-weighted reliability ranged from .0048 (for turnover) to .1272 (for PWE).

The mean frequency-weighted square root of reliability varied from .83 (for PWE) to .94 (for union loyalty). The standard deviation of the frequency-weighted square root of reliability ranged from .0038 (for turnover) to .0841 (for PWE). The mean sample size-weighted square root of reliability ranged from .81 (for PWE) to .93 (for union commitment and union loyalty). The variability of the sample size-weighted square root of reliability ranged from .0026 (for turnover) to .0838 (for PWE).

It is important to note the similarities of results across the frequency-weighted and sample size-weighted reliabilities and square roots of reliability. The PWE construct is the least reliable across the board. Union loyalty and union commitment are the most reliable overall. Turnover has the least amount of variability while PWE has the greatest variability, regardless of type of reliability or square root of reliability being assessed.

The mean frequency-weighted square root of reliability is the artifact distribution used in meta-analysis. This is why it is italicized in the table. All mean frequency-weighted square roots of reliability have values of acceptable magnitude (Nunnally and Bernstein, 1994).
D. Intercorrelations Among Subdimensions

There are four tables that are described, in detail, in this section. Table 12 looks at the meta-analytic results for the organizational commitment subdimensions. Table 13 portrays the results for the job involvement and CPO terms. Tables 14 and 15 provide the work ethic endorsement and union commitment meta-analytic results, respectively.

Regarding the organizational commitment subdimensions, the number of estimates used in each meta-analysis ranged from one to 97. The total sample size used in each meta-analysis varied from 133 to 27,569. The sample size-weighted mean observed correlations (RBAR) varied from .01 to .51. With organizational commitment, the true score correlation (ρ) ranged from .02 to .63. The highest ρ was between continuance organizational commitment and attitudinal organizational commitment. The lowest ρ was between normative organizational commitment and calculative organizational commitment.

It is apparent that there is great discrepancy among the results in this table. Firstly, one must be wary of results for meta-analyses with three or fewer estimates. (They were conducted here solely for the sake of thoroughness.) These results must be interpreted with caution. Secondly, three cells of interest are incomplete. This means that there were no studies that tested, i.e., the correlation between attitudinal organizational commitment and affective organizational commitment. (Please note that each cell is incomplete with regard to the relationship between organizational commitment and each of its subdimensions, as these relationships were not tested.)
Ignoring the incomplete cells as well as those with three or fewer estimates, RBAR varies from .05 to .48 and ρ ranges from .07 to .60. The weakest correlation is between affective organizational commitment and continuance organizational commitment. The strongest correlation is between affective organizational commitment and normative organizational commitment.

Table 13 depicts the meta-analytic results for job involvement and CPO. Job involvement is a monolithic dimension, so we are only concerned with CPO subdimensions here. Interestingly, there are a number of incomplete cells. And, the three cells that are not vacant have three or fewer estimates. Hence, these results must be viewed with caution. The sample size ranges from 835 to 9,875. RBAR varies from .21 to .41, and ρ ranges from .26 to .50. The weakest correlation is between continuance occupational commitment and normative occupational commitment. The strongest correlation is between affective occupational commitment and normative occupational commitment.

The meta-analytic results for the work ethic endorsement subdimensions are found in Table 14. Of the three cells of interest, there is one incomplete cell (i.e., for the correlation between work ethic and work involvement). The number of estimates range from four to nine. The sample size varies from 641 to 3,436. The relationship between PWE and work ethic has an RBAR of .51 and ρ of .72. The relationship between PWE and work involvement has an RBAR of .34 and ρ of .46.

The last meta-analytic table to be discussed in this section is that of union commitment. All of the cells of interest are filled here. The number of estimates range
from 20 to 25. The sample size varies from 7,517 to 12,300. The lowest RBAR value is .36 while the highest RBAR is .55. The true score correlation ranges from .45 to .66.

**E. Testing the Hypotheses**

Originally, the three outcome variables of interest were job satisfaction, job performance, and turnover. However, turnover intent was added as a separate construct during coding, since there were so many articles that differentiated between turnover and turnover intent. (Withdrawal intentions and cognitions were included as turnover intent. Thus, turnover intent included terms like *thoughts of quitting, search intentions, and quit decisions.*)

The meta-analytic results of the 24 work commitment terms with the respective four outcome variables (i.e., job satisfaction, job performance, turnover, and turnover intent) are found in tables 16, 17, 18, and 19. Table 16 looks at the meta-analytic results of work commitment and organizational commitment with the outcome variables. Table 17 analyzes the relationship between job involvement and CPO and the outcome variables. Table 18 depicts the results between work ethic endorsement variables and the outcome variables. Finally, Table 19 shows the meta-analytic results for union commitment with the outcome variables.

The number of estimates here ranged from as low as one to as high as 776. The sample size varied from 48 to 452,688. Specific RBAR and \( \rho \) comparisons are made as each hypothesis is analyzed (later in this chapter).

Tables 20 through 25 depict the meta-analytic results of the relationships between the various work commitment terms. For instance, Table 20 contains the results of the
meta-analyses of organizational commitment with job involvement and CPO. Table 21 portrays the meta-analytic results of organizational commitment variables with work ethic endorsement variables. Table 22 looks at organizational commitment and union commitment terms. Table 23 shows the meta-analytic results for job involvement and CPO with work ethic endorsement variables. Table 24 reflects the relationships between job involvement and CPO with union commitment variables. Lastly, Table 25 portrays the meta-analytic results for work ethic endorsement and union commitment variables.

It is interesting to note the scattering of incomplete cells across the respective tables. Specifically, of the 194 cells of interest, 124 are incomplete. Further, 42 of the remaining 70 cells have three or fewer indicators. With the above in mind, the number of estimates ranged from one to 137. Sample size varied from 48 to 45,934. Specific RBAR and ρ comparisons are made as each hypothesis is analyzed.

I. Hypothesis 1

Hypothesis 1 states that the subdimensions of organizational commitment will be positively correlated. This hypothesis is first tested by analyzing the various confidence intervals and then by employing factor analysis. Overall, this hypothesis is only partially supported since there is not enough evidence to indicate that all five variables are intercorrelated.

a. Testing of Confidence Intervals

Since there are five subdimensions, there are 10 correlations of interest here. Three of these cells are incomplete. (Please see Table 12.) Therefore, the results are inconclusive for the correlations between: (1) attitudinal organizational commitment and
affective organizational commitment, (2) attitudinal organizational commitment and normative organizational commitment, and (3) calculative organizational commitment and continuance organizational commitment.

The confidence intervals range from -.50 to .86 throughout the various cells. There is enough evidence to indicate that affective organizational commitment is positively correlated with normative organizational commitment, since the true score correlation ($\rho$) is .60. The 95% confidence interval ranges from .34 to .86 here. The confidence interval does not include zero, so there appears to be a significant direct effect.

Three other cells also provide evidence of intercorrelation, since the confidence interval in each respective case excludes zero. The concern, though, is that these three cells contain three or fewer indicators. Hence, such results must be viewed with caution. The positive correlations are between these variables: (1) attitudinal organizational commitment and calculative organizational commitment, (2) attitudinal organizational commitment and continuance organizational commitment, and (3) calculative organizational commitment and normative organizational commitment.

Finally, there is not enough evidence to indicate that affective organizational commitment is positively correlated with continuance organizational commitment or that continuance organizational commitment is positively correlated with normative organizational commitment. This is because, in both instances, the credibility interval includes zero. The correlation between calculative organizational commitment and affective organizational commitment is also not supported; however, there are only three indicators here, so these results must be viewed with caution.
b. Use of Factor Analysis

In the factor analysis, the first factor explains 43.13% of the variance. The eigenvalue is 2.16. The root mean square residual is .2283. All of the residuals are between -.32 and .28. The second factor has an eigenvalue of 1.37 and explains 27.45% of the variance. Support for a one factor model is, therefore, equivocal. While there is a strong general factor, there is also evidence in support of a second factor. The third factor accounts for 16.32% of the variance, while the fourth factor explains 7.41% of the variance. The third and fourth factors have eigenvalues less than one. Attitudinal and continuance organizational commitment have high loadings on the first factor. Affective and normative organizational commitment have high loadings on the second factor. And, calculative organizational commitment is strongly loaded on the third factor.

II. Hypothesis 2

Hypothesis 2 states that organizational commitment and its five subdimensions will be positively correlated with job satisfaction and job performance while being negatively correlated with turnover. (Please refer to Table 16.) Hypothesis 2 is only partially supported. In general, organizational commitment and its subdimensions are positively correlated with job satisfaction but are not significantly correlated with job performance. It also appears that, overall, the organizational commitment variables are negatively correlated with turnover and with turnover intent. Specific details are recounted below:

Organizational commitment and four of the five subdimensions do provide enough evidence to indicate that they are correlated with job satisfaction. The lowest true score correlation (ρ) among the five constructs is .37 (for the two respective relationships
between job satisfaction and calculative and normative organizational commitment), while
the highest \( \rho \) here is .70 (for the correlation between job satisfaction and attitudinal
organizational commitment). The confidence intervals range from a low of .11 to a high
of 1.12. The only correlation that includes zero in its confidence interval is that of
continuance organizational commitment with job satisfaction. Hence, in general,
organizational commitment and its subdimensions are positively correlated with job
satisfaction.

With regard to job performance, the confidence intervals range from -.63 to .57.
Five of the six confidence intervals include zero, thus not providing enough evidence to
indicate that they are positively correlated with performance. However, there is enough
evidence to indicate that the correlation between normative organizational commitment
and job performance is significant, since that credibility interval does not include zero.

There is enough evidence to indicate that turnover is negatively correlated with
three of the six constructs of interest. (There is an incomplete cell for the correlation
between calculative organizational commitment and turnover. There are also two cells
with three indicators.) The credibility intervals range from -.53 to .21. The three intervals
that do not include zero are those for correlations between turnover and organizational
commitment, attitudinal organizational commitment, and normative organizational
commitment, respectively. There is evidence in support of a negative correlation here.
(Please note, however, that attitudinal and normative organizational commitment have
only three indicators, so these results must be viewed with caution.) The confidence
intervals between turnover and affective and continuance organizational commitment,
respectively, do include zero. Hence, there is not enough evidence to indicate that there is a negative relationship between these variables and turnover.

Regarding turnover intent, there is enough evidence to indicate that four of the six constructs are negatively related to turnover intent. This is because their confidence intervals exclude zero. The confidence interval here ranges from -.91 to .13. The confidence interval for the relationships between calculative and continuance organizational commitment and turnover intent, do include zero, indicating that there is not enough evidence to state that those two sets of variables are negatively correlated.

III. Hypothesis 3

Hypothesis 3 states that the type of organization (either public or private) will act as a moderator in the organizational commitment-job satisfaction relationship, such that the relationship will be stronger for employees in a private organization. Hypothesis 3 is not supported.

As indicated in the methods section, when testing for moderators, organizational commitment and its subdimensions are collapsed into one group, labeled organizational commitment. The organizational commitment-job satisfaction correlation is split into two distributions, one for private organizations and one for public organizations. The 95% confidence interval for the correlations between organizational commitment and job satisfaction for private organizations ranges from .15 to 1.01. The confidence interval for that of public organizations varies from .23 to .92. Since the confidence intervals overlap, there is not enough evidence to support a moderator effect here.
IV. **Hypothesis 4a**

Hypothesis 4a states that age will serve as a moderator in the (a) organizational commitment-job performance relationship, such that the relationship will be stronger for older employees and in the (b) organizational commitment-turnover relationship, such that the relationship will be stronger for younger employees. Hypothesis 4a is not supported.

The confidence interval for the reported correlations between organizational commitment and performance, involving the older sample, ranges from -.23 to .51. The confidence interval for the younger sample ranges from -.11 to .45. Since there is overlap of the confidence intervals, there is not enough evidence to support a moderator effect here. Similarly, the confidence intervals for the older and younger distributions of the organizational commitment-turnover and -turnover intent relationships also overlap. Specifically, the confidence interval for the older sample concerning the organizational commitment-turnover correlations varies from -.47 to .05, while the confidence interval for the younger sample ranges from -.51 to -.01. And, with the organizational commitment-turnover intent relationship, the older distribution’s confidence interval ranges from -.90 to -.06, while the younger distribution’s confidence interval varies from -.89 to -.23. Hence, there is no evidence of moderator effects.

V. **Hypothesis 4b**

Hypothesis 4b states that tenure will serve as a moderator in the (a) organizational commitment-job performance relationship, such that the relationship will be stronger for more tenured employees and in the (b) organizational commitment-turnover relationship,
such that the relationship will be stronger for those with less tenure. Hypothesis 4b is not supported.

The organizational commitment-job performance correlations are divided into two distributions, one for more tenured and one for less tenured individuals. The confidence interval for the more tenured group varies from -.24 to .52, while the confidence interval for the less tenured group ranges from -.22 to .48. Since there is overlap among the confidence intervals, there is not enough evidence to support a moderator effect.

With the organizational commitment-turnover and turnover intent relationships, the confidence intervals also overlap. Specifically, with the organizational commitment-turnover correlation, the more tenured distribution has a confidence interval of -.45 to -.09. The less tenured distribution’s confidence interval ranges from -.55 to .05. And, with organizational commitment-turnover intent, the more tenured distribution has a confidence interval of -.86 to -.12. The less tenured group has a confidence interval that ranges from -.97 to -.19. Again, since there is overlap among the confidence intervals, there is no evidence of a moderator effect here.

VI. Hypothesis 5

Hypothesis 5 states that type of job (blue-collar versus white-collar) will act as a moderator in the organizational commitment-turnover relationship, such that the relationship will be stronger for those with white-collar jobs. Hypothesis 5 is not supported.

The confidence interval for the blue-collar distribution of the organizational commitment-turnover relationship ranges from -.26 to -.08. The white-collar distribution
has a confidence interval which varies from -.49 to .03. The overlap in the confidence intervals indicate that there is not enough evidence to support a moderator effect here.

Similarly, there is overlap in the confidence intervals of the blue- and white-collar distributions of the organizational commitment-turnover intent correlations, indicating that there is no moderator effect there, either. The confidence interval for the blue-collared distribution ranges from -.77 to -.37. The confidence interval for the while-collar group ranges from -.93 to -.09.

VII. Hypothesis 6

Hypothesis 6 states that job involvement will be positively correlated with job satisfaction but will not be significantly correlated with either job performance or turnover. (Please see Table 17.) Hypothesis 6 is only partially supported. There is not enough evidence to indicate that job involvement is positively correlated with job satisfaction, since the confidence interval varies from -.15 to .83, including zero. This finding runs counter to part of the hypothesis. However, the magnitude and direction of the correlation is as hypothesized. There is also not enough evidence to indicate that job involvement is positively correlated with performance or negatively correlated with turnover. This is because the confidence interval includes zero in both instances. These findings are in concert with the hypothesis. There is evidence, however, of a significant negative relationship between job involvement and turnover intent, since the credibility interval is from -.56 to -.04, excluding zero. This finding runs counter to the hypothesis.
VIII. Hypothesis 7

Hypothesis 7 states that type of organization (e.g., private versus public) will act as a moderator in the: (a) job involvement-job satisfaction relationship, such that the relationship will be stronger for employees in private organizations; (b) job involvement-job performance relationship, such that the relationship will be stronger for employees in private organizations; and (c) job involvement-turnover relationship, such that the relationship will be stronger for employees in public organizations. Hypothesis 7 is not supported.

The job involvement-job satisfaction correlations are divided into two distributions, one for public organizations and one for private organizations. The confidence interval for the public organization distribution ranges from -.06 to .74. The confidence interval for the private company distribution varies from .06 to .70. Since the two sets of confidence intervals overlap, there is not enough evidence to support a moderator effect. However, the magnitude of the correlations are as hypothesized.

The same circumstances also apply to the confidence intervals concerning the public and private company distributions of the correlations between job involvement and performance, turnover, and turnover intent, respectively. Concerning the private company distribution of the job involvement-performance correlations, the confidence interval ranges from -.03 to .33. The distribution for the public organization ranges from -.24 to .54. Similarly, with regard to the job involvement-turnover relationship, the confidence interval for private companies ranges from -.22 to -.08, while the confidence interval for public organizations varies from -.66 to .26. And, for the job involvement-turnover intent
correlations, the confidence interval for the private distribution ranges from -.54 to -.04, while it varies from -.48 to -.12 for the public distribution. In each of these respective instances, the confidence intervals overlap, indicating that there is not enough evidence to support the hypothesized moderator effects.

IX. Hypothesis 8

Hypothesis 8 states that job involvement will be positively correlated with organizational commitment. (Please refer to Table 20.) This hypothesis is only partially supported, since there is not enough evidence to indicate that all of the subdimensions of organizational commitment are related to job involvement. The confidence intervals range from -.21 to 1.19. There is enough evidence to indicate that job involvement is positively correlated with organizational commitment, attitudinal organizational commitment, calculative organizational commitment, and normative organizational commitment, since the confidence intervals in each case exclude zero. (The highest $\rho$ here is .52 for the normative organizational commitment-job involvement relationship. The lowest $\rho$ here is .13 for the calculative organizational commitment-job involvement relationship.) However, the confidence intervals include zero for the relationships between job involvement and affective and continuance organizational commitment, respectively. Hence, there is not enough evidence to support a positive correlation between those variables and job involvement.

X. Hypothesis 9

Hypothesis 9 states that the six subdimensions of CPO will be positively correlated. First, testing by confidence intervals is explored. Then, the use of factor
analysis is discussed. Overall, this hypothesis is only partially supported since there is not enough evidence to indicate that all six variables are intercorrelated.

a. Testing of Confidence Intervals

There are six subdimensions, so there are 15 correlations of interest here. (Please refer to Table 13.) Twelve of the cells are incomplete, leaving only three left to analyze. It is important to note that each of the remaining cells has three or fewer indicators. This means that the results must be viewed with caution. The ρ's are .46 and .50 for the relationships between affective occupational commitment and continuance and normative occupational commitment, respectively. The true score correlation (ρ) is .26 for the relationship between continuance occupational commitment and normative occupational commitment. The confidence intervals range from .14 to .78 for the respective correlations between the three variables. In each case, the confidence interval excludes zero, indicating that the three variables are intercorrelated. The positive manifold of the correlations does indicate the presence of a common factor across these subdimensions.

b. Use of Factor Analysis

Since there were only three out of the possible 15 correlations available for analysis, factor analysis was not conducted.

XI. Hypothesis 10

Hypothesis 10 states that CPO and its subdimensions will be positively correlated with job satisfaction and job performance. (Please see Table 17). Hypothesis 10 is only partially supported. Overall, CPO and its subdimensions are positively correlated with job
satisfaction but the results are inconclusive with regard to job performance. Specific
details are given below:

There is enough evidence to indicate that career salience, professionalism, affective
occupational commitment, and normative occupational commitment are positively
correlated with job satisfaction, since their confidence intervals exclude zero. (Please note
that the normative occupational commitment cell has only two indicators.) The lowest true
score correlation ($\rho$) among these four constructs is .24 (for the respective relationship
between job satisfaction and professionalism), while the highest $\rho$ here is .59 (for the
correlation between job satisfaction and affective occupational commitment).

Regarding all seven constructs of interest, the confidence intervals range from a
low of -.15 to a high of .98. It is interesting to note here that CPO has a $\rho$ of .40 with job
satisfaction. Its confidence interval ranges from -.01 to .80. So, this confidence interval
just misses the cutoff to be considered as evidence of a positive relationship. The
confidence interval for the career involvement-job satisfaction relationship also includes
zero, indicating that there is not enough evidence to show that there is a positive
relationship here. Finally, the confidence interval for continuance occupational
commitment and job satisfaction does not include zero. However, the true score
correlation here is -.15, indicating a negative relationship between the two variables. This
does not support the hypothesis. It is important to mention here that this cell only has two
indicators, so its results must be viewed with caution.

With regard to job performance, there are two incomplete cells. Of the remaining
five cells, four have indicators of three or fewer. The only one that has more than three
indicators is the CPO cell. The confidence intervals range from -.15 to .19. There is enough evidence to indicate that CPO and affective occupational commitment are positively correlated with job performance, since their confidence intervals do not include zero. There is not enough evidence to indicate that career salience is positively correlated with job performance, since its credibility interval includes zero. And, there is evidence in support of a negative relationship between job performance and continuance and normative occupational commitment, respectively. This runs counter to the hypothesis. However, all of these results, except for those involving CPO must be viewed with caution due to the low number of indicators, as mentioned above.

XII. Hypothesis 11

Hypothesis 11 states that locus of control (e.g., internal or external) will act as a moderator in the (a) CPO-job satisfaction relationship, such that the relationship will be stronger for employees with an internal locus of control, and (b) CPO-job performance, such that the relationship will be stronger for employees with an internal locus of control. This hypothesis was unable to be tested, as explained in the beginning of this chapter.

XIII. Hypothesis 12

Hypothesis 12 states that age will serve as a moderator of the (a) CPO-job satisfaction relationship, such that the relationship will be stronger for older employees, and (b) CPO-job performance relationship, such that the relationship will be stronger for older employees. Hypothesis 12 is not supported.

In both instances, the correlations are divided into two distributions, one for older and one for younger employees. With the CPO-job satisfaction relationship, the older
distribution has a confidence interval of -.05 to .85 while the younger group has a
distribution of -.05 to .71. Since there is overlap in the confidence intervals, there is not
enough evidence to support a moderator effect. Similarly, there is overlap of the
confidence intervals in the two distributions for the CPO-performance relationship.
Hence, there is not enough evidence to support a moderator effect here.

XIV. Hypothesis 13

Hypothesis 13 states that CPO will be positively correlated with organizational
commitment and with job involvement. (Please refer to Tables 20 and 13). This
hypothesis is only partially supported. In general, organizational commitment and its
subdimensions are positively correlated with CPO and its subdimensions. And, job
involvement is positively correlated with CPO and its subdimensions. The reason this
hypothesis is only partially supported is because not all of the cells of interest are complete
and because there are certain cells that do not support the hypothesis, as explained below.

There are six organizational commitment constructs and seven CPO constructs of
interest. Hence, there are 42 potential relationships to consider in the first part of this
hypothesis. Of these, 21 are incomplete cells. Additionally, 15 of the remaining cells have
three or fewer indicators. So, the results must be reviewed with caution. For the
organizational commitment and CPO terms, the confidence intervals range from -.67 to
1.3. The highest $\rho$ is .99 and the lowest $\rho$ is -.25.

The confidence intervals exclude zero (indicating a positive relationship) for the
following pairs of variables: (1) organizational commitment with CPO, career salience, and
career involvement; (2) attitudinal organizational commitment with CPO; (3) affective
organizational commitment with CPO, professionalism, affective occupational commitment, continuance occupational commitment, and normative occupational commitment; (4) continuance organizational commitment with continuance occupational commitment, and normative occupational commitment; and (5) normative organizational commitment with CPO, affective occupational commitment, continuance occupational commitment, and normative occupational commitment.

There is not enough evidence to indicate that organizational commitment is positively correlated with professionalism or that normative organizational commitment is positively correlated with career salience. Additionally, there is not enough evidence to indicate that either continuance or calculative organizational commitment is negatively correlated with CPO. (While there are negative true score correlations reported here, the confidence intervals include zero.) Finally, there is enough evidence to indicate that the correlations between: (1) calculative organizational commitment and career salience, and (2) continuance organizational commitment and affective occupational commitment are negative. This is evident since there is a negative $p$ reported, and in both cases, since the confidence interval excludes zero. It is important to note that these two cells have two or fewer indicators each. This greatly affects the level of importance that we should place on such results.

With regard to job involvement and its relationship to CPO and its subdimensions, there are seven potential cells of interest. Two of these cells are incomplete. Of the remaining five, three have two or fewer indicators. Hence, the results must be interpreted with caution. The confidence intervals range from -.01 to .94. The lowest reported $p$ was
.43 and the highest was .68. There is enough evidence to indicate that job involvement is positively correlated with career salience, career involvement, professionalism, and affective occupational commitment, since the respective confidence intervals exclude zero. Interestingly, the confidence interval for the correlation between job involvement and CPO is from -.01 to .87. So, this confidence interval just misses the cutoff to be considered in support of the hypothesis.

XV. Hypothesis 14

Hypothesis 14 states that the subdimensions of work ethic endorsement will be positively correlated. This hypothesis is first tested by analyzing the various confidence intervals and then by employing factor analysis. Overall, this hypothesis is generally supported, although there is not enough evidence to indicate that all three variables are intercorrelated when testing confidence intervals. Also, employment commitment was dropped from the analysis, for reasons mentioned above.

a. Testing of Confidence Intervals

Since there are three subdimensions, there are three correlations of interest here. One of these cells is incomplete. (Please see Table 14.) Therefore, the results are inconclusive for the correlations between work ethic and work involvement.

There is enough evidence to indicate that Protestant work ethic endorsement is positively correlated with work ethic and with work involvement, since the true score correlations (p) are .72 and .46, respectively. The 95% confidence intervals range from .25 to .85 here. The confidence intervals do not include zero, so there appear to be significant direct effects.
b. *Use of Factor Analysis*

In the factor analysis, the first factor explains 70.95% of the variance. The eigenvalue is 2.13. The root mean square residual for the one factor model is .2107. All of the residuals are between -.30 and -.06. The second factor explains 19.78% of the variance and has an eigenvalue less than one. Based on these results, there is support for a one factor model here.

**XVI. Hypothesis 15**

Hypothesis 15 states that work ethic endorsement will be positively correlated with job satisfaction and job performance, and negatively correlated with turnover. (Please see Table 18.) This hypothesis is partially supported. In general, work ethic endorsement and its subdimensions are not positively correlated with job satisfaction and are negatively correlated with turnover and turnover intent. With regard to performance, the results are inconclusive. It is important to note that the part of the hypothesis concerning employment commitment was not tested, as explained previously. The specific details of hypothesis testing are depicted below.

Four of the 16 cells of interest are incomplete. Of the remaining 12 cells, five have three or fewer indicators. Hence, these results must be read with caution. Regarding relationships with job satisfaction, the confidence intervals range from -.28 to .47. There is not enough evidence to indicate that job satisfaction is positively correlated with work ethic endorsement, Protestant work ethic endorsement, or work involvement, since the confidence intervals include zero. There is evidence to support the positive relationship between job satisfaction and work ethic, since the confidence interval does not include
zero. However, this result must be reviewed with caution, since there are three indicators in the cell.

One of the cells needed to analyze the performance relationships is incomplete. Two of the remaining three provide enough evidence to indicate a positive relationship between performance and work ethic and work involvement, respectively. However, these two cells have only two indicators each. Finally, there is enough evidence to indicate that there is a negative relationship between Protestant work ethic endorsement and performance, since ρ is -.01 and the confidence interval excludes zero. This finding runs counter to the hypothesis. It is important to note here that the true score correlation is not a strong negative correlation.

Of the eight possible cells needed to analyze the relationships between turnover and turnover intent with the work ethic endorsement variables, three of the cells are incomplete. Two of the remaining five cells have two or fewer indicators. Hence, these results must be reviewed with caution. The confidence intervals range from -.56 to .02. There is enough evidence to indicate that there is a negative relationship between turnover (and turnover intent) with Protestant work ethic endorsement and work involvement, respectively. This is because the ρ’s are negative and the confidence intervals do not include zero. There is not enough evidence to indicate a negative relationship between turnover intent and work ethic endorsement, since ρ is -.27, while the confidence interval ranges from -.56 to .02. (Note that .02 just missed the cutoff.)
XVII. Hypothesis 16

Hypothesis 16 states that age will serve as a moderator in the: (a) work ethic endorsement-job satisfaction relationship, such that the relationship will be stronger for older people; (b) work ethic endorsement-job performance relationship, such that the relationship will be stronger for older people; and (c) work ethic endorsement-turnover relationship, such that the relationship will be stronger for younger people. Overall, Hypothesis 16 was not supported. However, this hypothesis was not fully tested. I was unable to test for a moderator effect for the work ethic endorsement-performance relationship. (There were only nine reported correlations in the dataset for the work ethic endorsement-performance relationship. Of these nine correlations, only seven reported an age. Each of the seven ages fall into the “older person” category. Hence, there is no reason to test for a moderator effect here, since there are no correlations with these two variables that fall in the younger age distribution.) Also, as mentioned above, employment commitment was dropped from the analysis and is, therefore, not tested here.

With work ethic endorsement and job satisfaction, the confidence interval for the older distribution ranges from -.22 to .40 while the confidence interval for the younger distribution ranges from -.08 to .58. Since there is overlap among the intervals, there is not enough evidence to support a moderator effect here. With regard to work ethic endorsement and turnover, there are only two correlations that fall in the older distribution and only one correlation that falls in the younger distribution. Hence, these results are to be interpreted with caution. In both instances, the standard deviation of the true score correlation equals zero. So, for the older distribution, the confidence interval for the work
ethic endorsement-turnover relationship does not vary, at -.03. The confidence interval for
the younger distribution does not vary, at -.14. While these results do support the
hypothesis that the relationship between work ethic endorsement and turnover will be
stronger for younger than for older people, these results must be interpreted with caution,
given the reasons stated above.

Regarding the work ethic endorsement-turnover intent relationship, the confidence
interval for the younger distribution varies from -.49 to -.19, while the older distribution
varies from -.36 to -.08. Since there is overlap among the confidence intervals, there is not
enough evidence to support the moderator hypothesis here.

XVIII. Hypothesis 17

Hypothesis 17 states that work ethic endorsement will be positively correlated with
organizational commitment, job involvement, and CPO. (Please refer to Tables 21 and
23.) This hypothesis is only partially supported. In general, work ethic endorsement
variables are positively correlated with organizational commitment and CPO variables.
The relationship between work ethic endorsement variables and job involvement, however,
is inconclusive. The reasons for partial support of the hypothesis are explained below.

Since there are five subdimensions of organizational commitment and three
subdimensions of work ethic endorsement, there are 24 relationships of interest for the
first part of the hypothesis. (Please note that employment commitment has been dropped
from the analysis.) Of these 24 cells, 12 cells are incomplete. Further, eight of the
remaining 12 cells have three or fewer indicators. So, some of these results must be
viewed with caution. The confidence intervals range from .04 to .57. The true score
correlation ($\rho$) varies from .04 (for the calculative organizational commitment-Protestant work ethic endorsement relationship) to .51 (for the affective organizational commitment-work involvement relationship). All of the 12 cells provide evidence in support of the positive relationship between organizational commitment and work ethic endorsement variables, since each credibility interval does not include zero.

The four cells of interest for job involvement and work ethic endorsement variables are available. However, the confidence intervals vary from -.51 to .65. There is enough evidence to indicate that job involvement is correlated with work ethic endorsement ($\rho=.49$) and with Protestant work ethic endorsement ($\rho=.42$), since their confidence intervals do not include zero. On the other hand, there is not enough evidence to indicate that the relationships of job involvement with work ethic or with work involvement are positive, since their respective credibility intervals include zero. Hence, it is unclear whether or not work ethic endorsement, in general, is positively correlated with job involvement.

With regard to CPO and work ethic endorsement terms, 21 out of the 28 cells of interest are incomplete. Further, of the remaining eight cells, five have indicators of three or fewer. These results, therefore, must be interpreted with caution. Of the available cells, all provide evidence of a positive relationship between work ethic endorsement and job involvement. Specifically, work ethic endorsement is significantly related to CPO, career salience, and career involvement, since the confidence intervals exclude zero. Similarly, Protestant work ethic endorsement is positively correlated with CPO and career salience. And, CPO is positively related to work ethic and work involvement.
XIX. Hypothesis 18

Hypothesis 18 states that the subdimensions of union commitment will be positively correlated. This hypothesis is first tested by analyzing the various confidence intervals and then by employing factor analysis. Overall, this hypothesis is generally supported, although there is not enough evidence to indicate that all four variables are positively correlated when testing confidence intervals.

a. Testing of Confidence Intervals

Since there are four subdimensions, there are six correlations of interest here. All of the cells of interest are available. (Please refer to Table 15.) The true score correlations range from .45 (for the loyalty to the union-responsibility to the union relationship) to .66 (for the loyalty to the union-belief in unionism relationship). The confidence intervals range from -.08 to 1.15. There is enough evidence to indicate that union loyalty is correlated with willingness to work for the union and belief in unionism, since the credibility intervals do not include zero. Similarly, there is enough evidence to determine that responsibility to the union is positively correlated with willingness to work for the union and with belief in unionism. However, there is not enough evidence to indicate that either the (1) union loyalty- responsibility to the union correlation or the (2) belief in unionism- willingness to work for the union correlation is positively correlated. This is because their respective credibility intervals include zero. It is important to note that in both cases, though, the lower end of the credibility interval is very weak (i.e., -.08, -.01).
b. Use of Factor Analysis

With the union commitment subdimensions, the first factor explains 67.41% of the variance. The eigenvalue is 2.70. The root mean square residual is .1253. All of the residuals fall between -.21 and -.03. The second and third factors explain 14.26% and 11.90%, respectively. The eigenvalues for these two factors are less than one. Based on these results, there is evidence in support of a one factor model here.

XX. Hypothesis 19

Hypothesis 19 states that union commitment and its subdimensions will be negatively correlated with job satisfaction and will not be significantly correlated with job performance. (Please see Table 19.) The hypothesis is only partially supported, and, even then, the results are rather inconclusive. Details of the analysis are described below.

In the instance of job satisfaction, all of the needed cells are available. The credibility intervals range from -.55 to .31. With the job satisfaction-union commitment relationship as well as with the job satisfaction-belief in unionism relationship, there is not enough evidence to indicate that there is a negative relationship among the variables. There is also not enough evidence to indicate that job satisfaction is positively correlated with either union loyalty or willingness to work for the union, since the credibility intervals include zero in both instances. However, there is enough evidence to provide support for the negative relationship between job satisfaction and responsibility to the union. Since only one of the five cells support the hypothesis, these results are considered inconclusive.

With regard to performance, only two of the five cells are not vacant. And, both of these cells have only one indicator each. Hence, the results must be interpreted with
caution. There is enough evidence to indicate that the job performance-union commitment relationship is positively correlated, since $\rho$ is .22 and since the credibility interval does not include zero. There is also enough evidence to indicate that the job performance-union loyalty relationship is negatively related, since $\rho$ is -.01 and the confidence interval does not include zero. Either way, this portion of the hypothesis is not supported.

XXI. Hypothesis 20

Hypothesis 20 states that type of job (e.g., white-collar versus blue-collar) will serve as a moderator in the (a) union commitment-job satisfaction relationship, such that the relationship is stronger for blue-collar employees and in the (b) union commitment-job performance relationship, such that the relationship will be stronger for blue-collar employees. Hypothesis 20 is not supported.

In the union commitment-job satisfaction relationship, the confidence interval for blue-collared workers ranges from -.24 to .42. The confidence interval for white-collar workers varies from -.49 to .37. Since there is overlap here, there is not enough evidence to support type of job as a moderator. With regard to the union commitment-job performance relationship, type of job was unable to be tested as a moderator since there was only one correlation of interest with these specific variables.

XXII. Hypothesis 21

Hypothesis 21 states that union commitment will be positively correlated with organizational commitment, job involvement, CPO, and work ethic endorsement. (Please refer to Tables 22, 24, and 25.) This hypothesis is only partially supported. In general, union commitment is not positively correlated with organizational commitment or with job
involvement. The relationship between union commitment and work ethic endorsement cannot be tested. However, union commitment is positively correlated with CPO. (Please note that employment commitment was dropped from the analysis.) A detailed description of hypothesis testing is found below:

Organizational commitment has five subdimensions and union commitment has four subdimensions. This means that there are 30 potential relationships of interest here. However, seventeen of the 30 cells of interest are incomplete. Of the 13 remaining cells, eight have indicators of three or fewer. Hence, these results need to be viewed with caution. The credibility intervals for these cells range from -.34 to .62. The true score correlations ($\rho$) range from -.22 (for the normative organizational commitment-union commitment relationship) to .33 (for the affective organizational commitment-union commitment relationship).

There is enough evidence to indicate that there is a positive relationship between affective organizational commitment and union commitment, union loyalty, and willingness to work for the union, respectively. (However, all indicators in these cells are three or fewer. This means that we must interpret the respective results with caution.) Similarly, there is enough evidence to indicate that the following relationships are negatively correlated: (1) affective organizational commitment with responsibility to the union, (2) continuance organizational commitment with union loyalty, responsibility to the union, and willingness to the union, (3) normative organizational commitment with union commitment, and (4) organizational commitment with belief in unionism. But, in each instance (other than with the organizational commitment-belief in unionism relationship),
all cells have three or fewer indicators. Hence, the results depicted here must be interpreted with extreme caution. Finally, there is not enough evidence to indicate that organizational commitment is correlated (either positively or negatively) with union commitment, union loyalty, responsibility to the union, or willingness to work for the union.

With regard to job involvement, one of the needed cells is incomplete. Additionally, three of the remaining four cells have two or fewer indicators. The credibility intervals vary from -1.56 to 1.18. There is not enough evidence to indicate that the relationship between union commitment and job involvement is negatively correlated. Also, there is not enough evidence to indicate that the relationships of job involvement with union loyalty and belief in unionism are positively correlated. Finally, there is enough evidence to indicate that willingness to work for the union is positively correlated with job involvement (ρ=.09). However, there is only one indicator for that cell. Hence, these results must be interpreted with caution.

Of the 35 cells of interest in the CPO-union commitment relationship, 32 are incomplete. Each of the three remaining cells has three or fewer indicators. So, the results must be interpreted with caution. The confidence intervals range from .25 to .87. The true score correlation varies from .35 to .56. There is enough evidence to indicate that the respective correlations between union commitment and CPO are positive, as are the relationships between affective occupational commitment and both union loyalty and willingness to work for the union.
Finally, all cells between work ethic endorsement variables and union commitment variables are incomplete. So, this part of the hypothesis cannot be tested.
CHAPTER V

Discussion

Work commitment is an important area of study in the organizational sciences (Mowday et al., 1982). Researchers have explored a number of related dimensions and subdimensions of work commitment (Morrow, 1983, 1993). Previous studies have examined the impact of various dimensions of work commitment on organizational outcomes (cf. Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Morrow, 1983, 1993). However, much research has not focused on the specific impact of each work commitment concept or on the interrelationships among the various dimensions and subdimensions (cf. Morrow, 1983).

This dissertation meta-analytically examined the expansive material associated with work commitment. The primary purpose of this study was to (1) cumulate the correlations found among each of the dimensions of work commitment to see which, if any, are intercorrelated, and to (2) determine the impact of work commitment dimensions and subdimensions on specific outcome variables (job satisfaction, job performance, and turnover).

A number of interesting results have stemmed from the 213 separate meta-analyses that were conducted. First, the evidence does not indicate that all of the subdimensions for each respective dimension are positively related. Excluding incomplete cells and cells with three or fewer indicators, the only subdimension that is not positively correlated with its other subdimensions is continuance organizational commitment. Future research might consider revamping the work commitment taxonomy so that all subdimensions that fall within a particular dimension are interrelated. It might be appropriate, therefore, to drop
continuance organizational commitment from the work commitment taxonomy. Just from the definition alone, it appears that continuance organizational commitment might be better placed along side variables relating to turnover intent. After all, if one is planning on staying with an organization, then he or she is definitely not planning on leaving the organization! Future researchers might also consider dropping employment commitment from the work commitment taxonomy. This is because the definition deals more with how committed one is to being employed than with how committed one is to his or her job or occupation.

Second, while most of the respective dimensions are interrelated, this is not the case across the board. Disregarding incomplete cells and cells with three or fewer indicators, there is no evidence of a significant positive relationship between organizational commitment and union commitment. In fact, the only significant relationship is negative between organizational commitment and belief in unionism. These findings run counter to the results of the recent meta-analysis on the relationship between union commitment and company commitment by Johnson et al. (1999). They found that there is a positive correlation between the two variables, supporting the notion of dual allegiance (e.g., simultaneous commitment to one's organization and union). It is important to note that while not significant in this dissertation, the magnitude and direction of the respective correlations between organizational commitment and union commitment, union loyalty, and willingness to work for the union are related as hypothesized. These findings should be considered in relation to other findings in this area (i.e., Mellor, 1990).
With regard to the various hypothesized relationships between union commitment and work ethic endorsement variables, all of the cells are incomplete. And, ignoring incomplete cells and cells with three or fewer indicators, there is no evidence of a positive relationship between union commitment and either job involvement or CPO. Overall, these findings support Morrow's (1993) rationale for excluding union commitment from the work commitment taxonomy. Future researchers should develop a new work commitment taxonomy that considers these findings.

Along a similar line, local/cosmopolitanism should be dropped from the taxonomy, since there were only four articles relating this construct to the other dimensions out of all of the articles researched for this dissertation. Further, excluding incomplete cells and cells with three or fewer indicators, there is not enough evidence to indicate that job involvement is positively correlated with affective organizational commitment, continuance organizational commitment, work ethic, or work involvement. Future researchers should look more closely at the relationship between job involvement and organizational commitment and work ethic endorsement.

Additionally, it is interesting to note that the cells for the respective correlations between: (1) attitudinal and affective organizational commitment and (2) calculative and continuance organizational commitment are incomplete and are unable to be tested. This is of particular importance because these subdimensions were left as separate constructs in this dissertation and not combined (i.e., a combination construct of attitudinal and affective organizational commitment) so as to determine their impact on one another. But,
it appears that researchers opt to use one term or the other in their studies, and do not measure both for sake of comparison.

When considering the relationships between attitudinal organizational commitment and the four outcome variables of interest, attitudinal organizational commitment is positively correlated with job satisfaction ($\rho = .70$) and negatively correlated with turnover and turnover intent ($\rho = -.19, -.58$, respectively). When comparing affective organizational commitment with the same outcome variables, the results are quite similar in direction and in magnitude. Specifically, affective organizational commitment is positively correlated with job satisfaction ($\rho = .60$) and is negatively correlated with turnover intent ($\rho = -.58$). However, while the true score correlation between affective organizational commitment and turnover is negative ($\rho = .16$), this relationship is not significant. In both instances, the relationships between attitudinal and affective organizational commitment with performance are positive, but they are not significant.

Overall, it appears that the terms attitudinal and affective organizational commitment might be measuring the same construct. However, this is not the case with calculative and continuance organizational commitment. Calculative organizational commitment is significantly correlated with job satisfaction ($\rho = .37$) but continuance organizational commitment is not significantly correlated with this outcome variable ($\rho = .13$). Additionally, while the correlations with the remaining outcome variables are not significant for either calculative or continuance organizational commitment, the relationships differ in magnitude and in direction for the two subdimensions. For instance, while not significantly related, calculative organizational commitment is positively
correlated with performance ($\rho = .17$). Continuance organizational commitment is negatively correlated with performance ($\rho = -.18$). And, although also not significant, the relationship between calculative organizational commitment and turnover intent is strong ($\rho = -.38$), while it is weaker between continuance organizational commitment and turnover intent ($\rho = -.20$). It seems that the terms calculative and continuance organizational commitment might be measuring different constructs. Future research might benefit from a more clear distinction between these respective terms.

With regard to additional relationships with outcome variables, some of the results for job involvement were not fully in-line with Brown’s (1996) recent meta-analysis on the construct. Brown (1996) indicated that job involvement was significantly correlated with job satisfaction. With 450 indicators and a sample size of 131,246, there was not enough evidence to support a positive relationship between the two variables in this study. Interestingly, there was also (unexpected) evidence of a significant negative relationship between job involvement and turnover intent.

Another surprising result was that there was, in general, not enough evidence to support the hypothesized positive relationship between organizational commitment (and its respective subdimensions) and job performance. The only significant positive relationship (i.e., normative organizational commitment-job performance) reported a low $\rho$ of .07. Also, it is interesting to note that continuance organizational commitment was not significantly related (either positively or negatively) to any of the outcome variables.

Ignoring indicators with three or fewer variables, work ethic endorsement and its subdimensions were not significantly related to job satisfaction. And, aside from the
relationship between job satisfaction and responsibility to the union, there was no support for the hypothesis that the union commitment dimension and its subdimensions would be negatively related to job satisfaction.

Regarding moderator effects, virtually all of the hypothesized moderator effects were not supported. This is surprising, since the hypotheses were formed based on prior findings from other studies (i.e., Colarelli & Bishop, 1990; Cohen, 1993a; Cohen & Hudecek, 1993). There was evidence in support of age as a moderator in the work ethic endorsement-turnover relationship. However, there were only two indicators for the older-aged subgroup and only one indicator for the younger-aged subgroup. So, these results must be viewed with caution.

All moderators were tested at the 95% level since that is the conventional standard. However, I also retested for moderator effects by applying a less rigorous standard (i.e., an 80% confidence interval). Interestingly, the results changed for only one relationship at this relaxed level. Specifically, when applying an 80% confidence interval, there was evidence in support of age as a moderator of the CPO-performance relationship. However, contrary to the related hypothesis (Hypothesis 12), the correlation between CPO and performance was stronger for younger employees than for older employees.

Given my dataset, I was able to test two alternate models. First, I ran a factor analysis with job involvement, CPO, and the organizational commitment subdimensions. The first factor explained 40.46% of the variance and had an eigenvalue of 2.83. The root mean square residual was .1987. All residuals were between -.37 and .30. The second factor had an eigenvalue of 1.56 and explained 22.21% of the variance. The remaining
four factors had eigenvalues less than one. So, there is evidence in support of a two factor model here. Interestingly, attitudinal organizational commitment, affective organizational commitment, normative organizational commitment, job involvement, and CPO all had high loadings on the first factor. Calculative and continuance organizational commitment had high loadings on the second factor. The results of this two factor model further emphasize the need to clarify the relationship between calculative and continuance organizational commitment. Further, additional research on organizational commitment and its relationship to job involvement and CPO might prove fruitful.

The other alternate model that I tested looked at the relationship between job involvement, CPO, and the work ethic endorsement subdimensions. The first factor explained 51.56% of the variance and had an eigenvalue of 2.58. The root mean square residual was .1676. All residuals were between -.31 and .07. The second factor explained 20.82% of the variance and had an eigenvalue of 1.04. The remaining two factors had eigenvalues less than one. Hence, there is evidence in support of a two factor model here. Interestingly, Protestant Work Ethic endorsement, work ethic, work involvement, and job involvement each had high loadings on the first factor. CPO had a high loading on the second factor. Based on these results, it appears that future research should further investigate the relationship between job involvement and work ethic endorsement variables.

There were several limitations in this dissertation, the first of which was that most of the tagged studies were cross-sectional. This meant that we were only given a static snapshot of the relationship between the variables of interest. Longitudinal studies, on the
other hand, present a dynamic view of how relationships between variables change. Additionally, most of the studies included no experimental manipulation. Hence, that precluded inferences concerning cause-and-effect relationships among the variables.

The generalizability of the results across cultures was also bounded, because of a majority of North American samples. Very few studies encompassed people from other continents. Research shows that people from different cultures might express different perspectives on the same topic (cf. Silverthorne, 2001). Hence, North American findings might not be generalizable to other cultures (Randall, 1993). Future research should take a cross-cultural look at work commitment.

Finally, the 14 tables representing meta-analytic results show that the number of correlations between the five types of work commitment and the outcome variables was robust. However, there were numerous cells with three or fewer indicators used in the analyses. While they were included in this dissertation for sake of thoroughness, in no way should their results be considered without caution. For instance, most of the correlations between organizational commitment (and its subdimensions) and CPO (and its subdimensions) had three or fewer indicators. Future researchers should conduct more research on the respective relationships between these variables.

These findings have several implications for science and practice. By testing different models, we are now more aware of the role that work commitment plays in the workforce. It is apparent that the work commitment taxonomy needs to be revamped, as explained above. From a practical standpoint, it seems that various dimensions of work commitment do have a strong impact on important organizational outcome variables.
Employers should focus on maintaining and enhancing the work commitment of employees, since their level of commitment greatly impacts their job satisfaction, performance, and turnover.

In conclusion, the results reported here highlight the importance of work commitment and the need to further investigate the work commitment taxonomy. Continued study should facilitate the construction of workplace theories that explain and guide interventions aimed at improving employee commitment and productivity.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIMENSIONS</th>
<th>SUBDIMENSIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work Commitment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Ethic Endorsement</td>
<td>Protestant Work Ethic endorsement, work ethic, work involvement, employment commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career/Professional Commitment</td>
<td>Career salience, career involvement, local/cosmopolitanism, professionalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Involvement</td>
<td>Job commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Commitment</td>
<td>Calculative commitment, attitudinal commitment, continuance commitment, affective commitment, normative commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Commitment</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 2
Additional Work Commitment Terms from the Literature (new terms *italicized*)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIMENSIONS</th>
<th>SUBDIMENSIONS</th>
<th>CITE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career/Professional/Occupational Commitment</td>
<td>Affective occupational commitment, continuance occupational commitment, normative occupational commitment</td>
<td>Lee, Carswell, &amp; Allen, 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Commitment</td>
<td>Union loyalty, responsibility to the union, willingness to work for the union, belief in unionism</td>
<td>Gordon, Philpot, Burt, Thompson, &amp; Spiller, 1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIMENSIONS</td>
<td>SUBDIMENSIONS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Commitment</td>
<td>Calculative organizational commitment, attitudinal organizational commitment,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>continuance organizational commitment, affective organizational commitment,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>normative organizational commitment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Involvement</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career/Professional/Occupational Commitment</td>
<td>Career salience, career involvement, professionalism, affective occupational commitment, continuance occupational commitment, normative occupational commitment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Ethic Endorsement</td>
<td>Protestant Work Ethic endorsement, work ethic, work involvement, employment commitment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Commitment</td>
<td>Union loyalty, responsibility to the union, willingness to work for the union, belief in unionism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 4
Levels of Moderators Used in Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MODERATOR</th>
<th>LEVELS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Older (≥ 35.7 years),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Younger (≤ 35.6 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>More Tenured (≥ 7.24 years),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less Tenured (≤ 7.23 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Organization</td>
<td>Private, Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Job</td>
<td>Blue-Collar, White-Collar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locus of Control</td>
<td>Internal Locus of Control, External Locus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIMENSION/SUBDIMENSION</td>
<td>MEASURES (frequency in dataset)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT | Mowday et al., 1979 (429)  
Porter et al., 1974 (216)  
Porter & Smith, 1970 (100)  
Mowday et al, 1982 (55)  
O’Reilly & Chatman, 1986 (20)  
Cook & Wall, 1980 (18)  
Porter et al., 1976 (17)  
Hrebinak & Alutto, 1972 (15)  
Mael, 1988 (9)  
Mael & Ashforth, 1992 (9)  
Meyer & Allen, 1991 (6)  
Alutto et al., 1993 (6)  
DeCotiis & Summers, 1987 (6)  
Jorde-Bloom, 1985 (5)  
Steers, 1977 (5) |
| CALCULATIVE ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT | Hrebinak & Alutto, 1972 (11)  
Alutto et al., 1973 (7) |
| ATTITUDINAL ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT | Mowday et al., 1979 (9) |
| CONTINUANCE ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT | Meyer & Allen, 1984 (54)  
Allen & Meyer, 1990 (47)  
Meyer & Allen, 1991 (15)  
Meyer et al., 1993 (9) |
| AFFECTIVE ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT | Meyer & Allen, 1984 (74)  
Allen & Meyer, 1990 (50)  
Meyer et al., 1993 (15)  
O’Reilly & Chatman, 1986 (11)  
Meyer & Allen, 1991 (10)  
Mowday et al., 1979 (9)  
Mowday et al., 1982 (7)  
Becker et al., 1996 (5) |
| NORMATIVE ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT | Allen & Meyer, 1990 (48)  
Meyer & Allen, 1991 (10)  
Wiener & Vardi, 1980 (6)  
Meyer et al., 1993 (6) |
### TABLE 6
Top Measures of Job Involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIMENSION</th>
<th>MEASURES (frequency in dataset)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JOB INVOLVEMENT</td>
<td>Lodahl &amp; Kejner, 1965 (304)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kanungo, 1982 (144)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Patchen, 1970 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lawler &amp; Hall, 1970 (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saleh &amp; Hosek, 1976 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kanungo, 1979 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cook et al., 1981 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIMENSION/SUBDIMENSION</td>
<td>MEASURES (frequency in dataset)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPO</td>
<td>Blau, 1985 (28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blau, 1984 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blau, 1988 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mowday et al., 1979 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alutto et al., 1973 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DeGroot, 1996 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hall, 1968 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regoli &amp; Poole, 1980 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAREER SALIENCE</td>
<td>Greenhaus, 1971 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAREER INVOLVEMENT</td>
<td>Gould, 1979 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROFESSIONALISM</td>
<td>Hall, 1968 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFFECTIVE OCCUPATIONAL COMMITMENT</td>
<td>Blau, 1988 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTINUANCE OCCUPATIONAL COMMITMENT</td>
<td>Adapted from Meyer et al., 1993 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORMATIVE OCCUPATIONAL COMMITMENT</td>
<td>Adapted from Meyer et al., 1993 (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 8
Top Measures of Work Ethic Endorsement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIMENSION/SUBDIMENSION</th>
<th>MEASURES (frequency in dataset)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WORK ETHIC ENDORSEMENT</td>
<td>Dubin, 1956 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cook et al., 1981 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROTESTANT WORK ETHIC</td>
<td>Blood, 1969 (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENDORSEMENT</td>
<td>Mirels &amp; Garrett, 1971 (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORK ETHIC</td>
<td>Buchholz, 1977 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORK INVOLVEMENT</td>
<td>Kanungo, 1982 (16)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 9
Top Measures of Union Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIMENSION/SUBDIMENSION</th>
<th>MEASURES (frequency in dataset)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNION COMMITMENT</td>
<td>Gordon et al., 1980 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gordon et al., 1990 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNION LOYALTY</td>
<td>Gordon et al., 1980 (33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESPONSIBILITY TO THE UNION</td>
<td>Gordon et al., 1980 (20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLINGNESS TO WORK FOR THE UNION</td>
<td>Gordon et al., 1980 (20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BELIEF IN UNIONISM</td>
<td>Gordon et al., 1980 (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUTCOME VARIABLE</td>
<td>MEASURES (frequency in dataset)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOB SATISFACTION</td>
<td>Smith et al., 1969 (273)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weiss et al., 1967 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hackman &amp; Oldham, 1975 (68)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hackman &amp; Oldham, 1980 (32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brayfield &amp; Rothe, 1951 (30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Warr et al., 1979 (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quinn &amp; Staines, 1979 (20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hackman &amp; Lawler, 1971 (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hatfield et al., 1985 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kunin, 1955 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cammann et al, 1983 (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dunham et al., 1977 (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Andrews &amp; Withey, 1976 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heneman &amp; Schwab, 1985 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ironson et al., 1989 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kanungo et al., 1975, 1976 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pestonjee, 1973 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roznowski, 1989 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Taylor &amp; Bowers, 1972 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Churchill et al., 1974 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greenhaus et al., 1990 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cammann et al., 1979 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cook et al., 1981 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>McNichols et al., 1978 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quinn &amp; Shepard, 1974 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seashore et al., 1982 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jorde-Bloom, 1985 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOB PERFORMANCE</td>
<td>Behrman &amp; Perreault, 1982 (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TURNOVER INTENT</td>
<td>Bluedorn, 1982 (24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cammann et al., 1983 (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cammann et al., 1979 (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colarelli, 1984 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mobley, 1977 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mobley et al., 1979 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mobley et al., 1978 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Landau &amp; Hammer, 1986 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lyons, 1971 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seashore et al., 1982 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hanisch &amp; Hulin, 1990, 1991 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Commitment</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC</td>
<td>873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudinal OC</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calculative OC</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective OC</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuance OC</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative OC</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Involvement</td>
<td>455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPO</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Salience</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Involvement</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Occ.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuance Occ.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative Occ.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE Endorsement</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWE</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Involvement</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Commitment</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyalty</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in Unionism</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover Intent</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. K, number of reliability estimates used in meta-analysis; N, total sample size; Sq. Root, square root of reliability estimates; Frequency, frequency-weighted; Sample Size, sample size-weighted; SD, standard deviation; OC, organizational commitment; CPO, career/professional/occupational commitment; Prof., professionalism; Occ., occupational commitment; WE, work ethic; PWE, Protestant work ethic endorsement.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OC</th>
<th>Attitudinal OC</th>
<th>Calculative OC</th>
<th>Affective OC</th>
<th>Continuance OC</th>
<th>Normative OC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudinal OC</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calculative OC</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>k=1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=533</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RBAR=.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SDr= -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p=.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SDp= -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective OC</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>k=3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=1,072</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RBAR=.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SDr=.2793</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p=.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SDp=.3269</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuance OC</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>k=97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=27,569</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RBAR=.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SDr=.1694</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p=.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SDp=.1959</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative OC</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>k=3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=432</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RBAR=.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SDr=.0535</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p=.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SDp=0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>k=34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=11,846</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RBAR=.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SDr=.1174</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p=.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SDp=.1333</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>k=33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=11,788</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RBAR=.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SDr=.1079</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p=.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SDp=.1234</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. OC, organizational commitment; K, number of correlations included in the analysis; N, total sample size; RBAR, sample size weighted mean observed correlation; SDr, sample size weighted standard deviation of mean observed correlation; p, RBAR corrected for unreliability; SDp, standard deviation of p; I, incomplete cell.
TABLE 13

Meta-Analytic Results, Job Involvement and CPO Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Involvement (Inv.)</th>
<th>CPO</th>
<th>Career Salience</th>
<th>Career Involvement</th>
<th>Prof.</th>
<th>Affective Occ.</th>
<th>Continuance Occ.</th>
<th>Normative Occ.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Inv.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPO</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k=53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=14,158</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBAR=.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDr=.1901</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p=.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDp=.2248</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Salience</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k=10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=2,274</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBAR=.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDr=.1358</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p=.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDp=.1579</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Involvement</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k=2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=912</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBAR=.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDr=.0398</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p=.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDp=0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k=1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=325</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBAR=.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDr= -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p=.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDp= -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Occ.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k=2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=348</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBAR=.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDr=.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p=.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDp=0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuance Occ.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k=3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=9,875</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBAR=.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDr=.1411</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p=.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDp=.1643</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative Occ.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k=2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=835</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBAR=.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDr=.1209</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p=.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDp=.1326</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Please see other tables for descriptions of symbols used.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>WE Endorsement</th>
<th>Protestant WE Endorsement</th>
<th>WE</th>
<th>Work Involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WE Endorsement</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant WE Endorsement</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>k=4</td>
<td>N=641</td>
<td>RBAR=.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Involvement</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>k=9</td>
<td>N=3,436</td>
<td>RBAR=.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. WE, work ethic; K, number of correlations included in the analysis; N, total sample size; RBAR, sample size weighted mean observed correlation; SDr, sample size weighted standard deviation of mean observed correlation; p, RBAR corrected for unreliability; SDp, standard deviation of p; I, incomplete cell.
TABLE 15
Meta-Analytic Results, Union Commitment Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Union Commitment</th>
<th>Loyalty</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Willingness</th>
<th>Belief in Unionism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Union Commitment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyalty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>k=25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=10,799</td>
<td></td>
<td>RBAR=.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SDr=.2239</td>
<td></td>
<td>ρ=.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SDp=.2724</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>k=25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=9,150</td>
<td></td>
<td>RBAR=.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SDr=.2290</td>
<td></td>
<td>ρ=.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SDp=.2690</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in Unionism</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>k=25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=12,300</td>
<td></td>
<td>RBAR=.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SDr=.1905</td>
<td></td>
<td>ρ=.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SDp=.2181</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. K, number of correlations included in the analysis; N, total sample size; RBAR, sample size weighted mean observed correlation; SDr, sample size weighted standard deviation of mean observed correlation; ρ, RBAR corrected for unreliability; SDp, standard deviation of ρ; I, incomplete cell.
**TABLE 16**

Meta-Analytic Results of Work and Organizational Com. Variables with Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Turnover</th>
<th>Turnover Intent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work Commitment</strong></td>
<td>k=9</td>
<td>N=2,001</td>
<td>RBAR=.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>k=776</td>
<td>N=452,688</td>
<td>RBAR=.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>k=1</td>
<td>N=141</td>
<td>RBAR=.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OC</strong></td>
<td>k=99</td>
<td>N=38,360</td>
<td>RBAR=.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>k=316</td>
<td>N=127,243</td>
<td>RBAR=.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attitudinal OC</strong></td>
<td>k=1</td>
<td>N=4,535</td>
<td>RBAR=.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>k=2</td>
<td>N=574</td>
<td>RBAR=.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>k=3</td>
<td>N=781</td>
<td>RBAR=.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Calculative OC</strong></td>
<td>k=9</td>
<td>N=2,298</td>
<td>RBAR=.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>k=3</td>
<td>N=835</td>
<td>RBAR=.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>k=6</td>
<td>N=3,320</td>
<td>RBAR=.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affective OC</strong></td>
<td>k=85</td>
<td>N=26,318</td>
<td>RBAR=.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>k=43</td>
<td>N=8,633</td>
<td>RBAR=.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>k=10</td>
<td>N=3,644</td>
<td>RBAR=.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Continuance OC</strong></td>
<td>k=57</td>
<td>N=22,716</td>
<td>RBAR=.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>k=26</td>
<td>N=4,642</td>
<td>RBAR=.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>k=10</td>
<td>N=2,730</td>
<td>RBAR=.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Normative OC</strong></td>
<td>k=32</td>
<td>N=13,254</td>
<td>RBAR=.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>k=14</td>
<td>N=3,175</td>
<td>RBAR=.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>k=3</td>
<td>N=1,430</td>
<td>RBAR=.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>k=23</td>
<td>N=9,902</td>
<td>RBAR=.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. OC, organizational commitment; K, number of correlations included in the analysis; N, total sample size; RBAR, sample size weighted mean observed correlation; SDr, sample size weighted standard deviation of mean observed correlation; p, RBAR corrected for unreliability; SDp , standard deviation of p; I, incomplete cell.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Turnover</th>
<th>Turnover Intent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Involvement</strong></td>
<td>k=450, N=131,246, RBAR=.28, SD=.2102, p=.34, SDp=.2493</td>
<td>k=83, N=21,264, RBAR=.14, SD=.1498, p=.18, SDp=.1658</td>
<td>k=26, N=8,713, RBAR=.13, SD=.0964, p=.16, SDp=.0973</td>
<td>k=102, N=40,054, RBAR=.24, SD=.1179, p=.30, SDp=.1318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CPO</strong></td>
<td>k=100, N=29,138, RBAR=.33, SD=.1799, p=.40, SDp=.2054</td>
<td>k=16, N=3,226, RBAR=.16, SD=.0488, p=.19, SDp=0</td>
<td>k=16, N=3,676, RBAR=.05, SD=.1274, p=.06, SDp=.1303</td>
<td>k=48, N=14,860, RBAR=.23, SD=.2219, p=.29, SDp=.2604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Career Salience</strong></td>
<td>k=5, N=869, RBAR=.22, SD=.0818, p=.29, SDp=.0429</td>
<td>k=3, N=446, RBAR=.01, SD=.1046, p=.01, SDp=.0821</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>k=1, N=195, RBAR=.02, SD=.03, p=-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Career Involvement</strong></td>
<td>k=7, N=2,829, RBAR=.21, SD=.1535, p=.27, SDp=.1842</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>k=2, N=912, RBAR=.16, SD=.0, p=.21, SDp=0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professionalism</strong></td>
<td>k=7, N=1,332, RBAR=.18, SD=.1053, p=.24, SDp=.0991</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>k=2, N=607, RBAR=.03, SD=0, p=.04, SDp=0</td>
<td>k=2, N=607, RBAR=.04, SD=.1300, p=.05, SDp=.1499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affective Occ.</strong></td>
<td>k=6, N=1,441, RBAR=.50, SD=.1773, p=.59, SDp=.1982</td>
<td>k=2, N=1,206, RBAR=.06, SD=.0100, p=.07, SDp=0</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>k=6, N=1,755, RBAR=.39, SD=.1858, p=.47, SDp=.2101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Continuance Occ.</strong></td>
<td>k=2, N=835, RBAR=.13, SD=.0224, p=.15, SDp=0</td>
<td>k=2, N=1,206, RBAR=.09, SD=.0200, p=.11, SDp=0</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>k=4, N=1,497, RBAR=.01, SD=.1678, p=.01, SDp=.1917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Normative Occ.</strong></td>
<td>k=2, N=835, RBAR=.23, SD=.0314, p=.28, SDp=0</td>
<td>k=2, N=1,206, RBAR=.04, SD=.0150, p=.04, SDp=0</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>k=4, N=1,497, RBAR=.22, SD=.1067, p=.27, SDp=.1125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Please see other tables for descriptions of symbols used.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Turnover</th>
<th>Turnover Intent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>WE Endorsement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k=16</td>
<td>N=48,867</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBAR=.11</td>
<td>SDr=.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p=.15</td>
<td>SDp=.1129</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k=6</td>
<td>N=4,478</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBAR=.21</td>
<td>SDr=.1230</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p=.27</td>
<td>SDp=.1503</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Protestant WE Endorsement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k=23</td>
<td>N=2,940</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBAR=.17</td>
<td>SDr=.1278</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p=.23</td>
<td>SDp=.1207</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k=5</td>
<td>N=856</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBAR=-.01</td>
<td>SDr=.0504</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p=-.01</td>
<td>SDp=0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k=1</td>
<td>N=145</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBAR=-.11</td>
<td>SDr= -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p=-.14</td>
<td>SDp= -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k=5</td>
<td>N=860</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBAR=-.08</td>
<td>SDr=.0742</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p=-.10</td>
<td>SDp=0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k=3</td>
<td>N=1,081</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBAR=.15</td>
<td>SDr=.0234</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p=.19</td>
<td>SDp=0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k=2</td>
<td>N=60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBAR=.38</td>
<td>SDr=.2150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p=.47</td>
<td>SDp=.1755</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work Involvement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k=36</td>
<td>N=15,932</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBAR=.07</td>
<td>SDr=.1577</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p=.08</td>
<td>SDp=.1858</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k=2</td>
<td>N=461</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBAR=.06</td>
<td>SDr=0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p=.07</td>
<td>SDp=0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k=2</td>
<td>N=566</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBAR=.02</td>
<td>SDr=0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p=.02</td>
<td>SDp=0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k=7</td>
<td>N=3,191</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBAR=.17</td>
<td>SDr=.0568</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p=.21</td>
<td>SDp=.0389</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. WE, work ethic; K, number of correlations included in the analysis; N, total sample size; RBAR, sample size weighted mean observed correlation; SDr, sample size weighted standard deviation of mean observed correlation; p, RBAR corrected for unreliability; SDp, standard deviation of p; I, incomplete cell.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Union Commitment</th>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Turnover</th>
<th>Turnover Intent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>k=24</td>
<td>N=5,649</td>
<td>k=1</td>
<td>N=114</td>
<td>k=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBAR=.04</td>
<td>SDr=.2300</td>
<td>RBAR=.19</td>
<td>SDr= -</td>
<td>RBAR=.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ρ=.05</td>
<td>SDp=.2569</td>
<td>ρ=.22</td>
<td>ρ= -</td>
<td>ρ=.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyalty</td>
<td>k=30</td>
<td>k=1</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>k=3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=15,552</td>
<td>RBAR=.10</td>
<td>N=74</td>
<td>RBAR=.01</td>
<td>RBAR=.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDr=.0944</td>
<td>SDr= -</td>
<td>ρ=.01</td>
<td>SDr= -</td>
<td>ρ= -.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ρ=.12</td>
<td>SDp=.0969</td>
<td>ρ= -</td>
<td>SDp= -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>k=8</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>k=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=1,852</td>
<td>RBAR=.13</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>RBAR=.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDr=.0584</td>
<td>SDr= -</td>
<td>ρ= -.17</td>
<td>SDr= -</td>
<td>ρ= .10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ρ=.17</td>
<td>SDp= 0</td>
<td>ρ= -</td>
<td>SDp= -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness</td>
<td>k=12</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>k=2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=3,277</td>
<td>RBAR=.02</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>RBAR=.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDr=.0811</td>
<td>SDr= -</td>
<td>ρ=.03</td>
<td>SDr= -</td>
<td>ρ= -.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ρ=.03</td>
<td>SDp=.0667</td>
<td>ρ= -</td>
<td>SDp= -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in</td>
<td>k=8</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unionism</td>
<td>N=1,765</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBAR=.11</td>
<td>SDr=.1304</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ρ=.14</td>
<td>SDp=.1365</td>
<td>ρ= -</td>
<td>SDp= -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. K, number of correlations included in the analysis; N, total sample size; RBAR, sample size weighted mean observed correlation; SDr, sample size weighted standard deviation of mean observed correlation; ρ, RBAR corrected for unreliability; SDp, standard deviation of ρ; I, incomplete cell.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OC</th>
<th>Attitudinal OC</th>
<th>Calculative OC</th>
<th>Affective OC</th>
<th>Continuance OC</th>
<th>Normative OC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Involvement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K=137</td>
<td>k=4</td>
<td>k=5</td>
<td>k=19</td>
<td>k=8</td>
<td>k=4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=45,934</td>
<td>N=2,417</td>
<td>N=842</td>
<td>N=5,286</td>
<td>N=1,556</td>
<td>N=510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBAR=.42</td>
<td>RBAR=.30</td>
<td>RBAR=.11</td>
<td>RBAR=.39</td>
<td>RBAR=.15</td>
<td>RBAR=.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDr=.1679</td>
<td>SDr=.1394</td>
<td>SDr=.0860</td>
<td>SDr=.2945</td>
<td>SDr=.1209</td>
<td>SDr=.0391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \rho = .51 )</td>
<td>( \rho = .37 )</td>
<td>( \rho = .13 )</td>
<td>( \rho = .49 )</td>
<td>( \rho = .19 )</td>
<td>( \rho = .52 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDp=.1938</td>
<td>Sdp=.1621</td>
<td>Sdp=.0480</td>
<td>Sdp=.3547</td>
<td>Sdp=.1255</td>
<td>Sdp=0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CPO</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K=80</td>
<td>k=1</td>
<td>k=3</td>
<td>k=14</td>
<td>k=6</td>
<td>k=3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=27,351</td>
<td>N=122</td>
<td>N=666</td>
<td>N=5,120</td>
<td>N=1,528</td>
<td>N=972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBAR=.35</td>
<td>RBAR=.45</td>
<td>RBAR=.05</td>
<td>RBAR=.39</td>
<td>RBAR=.07</td>
<td>RBAR=.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDr=.1596</td>
<td>SDr=.2626</td>
<td>SDr=.07</td>
<td>SDr=.1381</td>
<td>SDr=.1073</td>
<td>SDr=.0582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \rho = .42 )</td>
<td>( \rho = .54 )</td>
<td>( \rho = .07 )</td>
<td>( \rho = .47 )</td>
<td>( \rho = .09 )</td>
<td>( \rho = .24 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDp=.1,791</td>
<td>Sdp=.3080</td>
<td>Sdp=.1537</td>
<td>Sdp=.1095</td>
<td>Sdp=.0217</td>
<td>Sdp=0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Career Salience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K=4</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=1,662</td>
<td>N=141</td>
<td>N=141</td>
<td>N=141</td>
<td>N=141</td>
<td>N=141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBAR=.30</td>
<td>RBAR=.04</td>
<td>RBAR=.04</td>
<td>RBAR=.36</td>
<td>RBAR=.09</td>
<td>RBAR=.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDr=.1237</td>
<td>SDr=.0734</td>
<td>SDr=.0734</td>
<td>SDr=.0734</td>
<td>SDr=.1859</td>
<td>SDr=.1859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \rho = .38 )</td>
<td>( \rho = .54 )</td>
<td>( \rho = .07 )</td>
<td>( \rho = .1859 )</td>
<td>( \rho = .1859 )</td>
<td>( \rho = .1859 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDp=.1,440</td>
<td>Sdp=0</td>
<td>Sdp=.1537</td>
<td>Sdp=.1095</td>
<td>Sdp=.0217</td>
<td>Sdp=0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Career Involvement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K=2</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=912</td>
<td>N=912</td>
<td>N=305</td>
<td>N=603</td>
<td>N=603</td>
<td>N=603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBAR=.40</td>
<td>RBAR=.03</td>
<td>RBAR=.03</td>
<td>RBAR=.36</td>
<td>RBAR=.36</td>
<td>RBAR=.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDr=.0946</td>
<td>SDr=.04</td>
<td>SDr=.04</td>
<td>SDr=.0734</td>
<td>SDr=.0734</td>
<td>SDr=.0734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \rho = .51 )</td>
<td>( \rho = .54 )</td>
<td>( \rho = .07 )</td>
<td>( \rho = .07 )</td>
<td>( \rho = .15 )</td>
<td>( \rho = .15 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDp=.1,440</td>
<td>Sdp=.0849</td>
<td>Sdp=.0849</td>
<td>Sdp=.0849</td>
<td>Sdp=.0849</td>
<td>Sdp=.0849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affective Occ.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=1,779</td>
<td>N=603</td>
<td>N=603</td>
<td>N=603</td>
<td>N=603</td>
<td>N=603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBAR=.51</td>
<td>RBAR=.20</td>
<td>RBAR=.20</td>
<td>RBAR=.36</td>
<td>RBAR=.36</td>
<td>RBAR=.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDr=.0883</td>
<td>SDr=.0831</td>
<td>SDr=.0831</td>
<td>SDr=.0831</td>
<td>SDr=.0831</td>
<td>SDr=.0831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \rho = .61 )</td>
<td>( \rho = .99 )</td>
<td>( \rho = .99 )</td>
<td>( \rho = .99 )</td>
<td>( \rho = .99 )</td>
<td>( \rho = .99 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDp=.0849</td>
<td>Sdp=.0849</td>
<td>Sdp=.0849</td>
<td>Sdp=.0849</td>
<td>Sdp=.0849</td>
<td>Sdp=.0849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Continuance Occ.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=603</td>
<td>N=603</td>
<td>N=603</td>
<td>N=603</td>
<td>N=603</td>
<td>N=603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBAR=.03</td>
<td>RBAR=.03</td>
<td>RBAR=.03</td>
<td>RBAR=.03</td>
<td>RBAR=.03</td>
<td>RBAR=.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDr=.04</td>
<td>SDr=.04</td>
<td>SDr=.04</td>
<td>SDr=.04</td>
<td>SDr=.04</td>
<td>SDr=.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \rho = .40 )</td>
<td>( \rho = .40 )</td>
<td>( \rho = .40 )</td>
<td>( \rho = .40 )</td>
<td>( \rho = .40 )</td>
<td>( \rho = .40 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDp=0</td>
<td>Sdp=.0849</td>
<td>Sdp=.0849</td>
<td>Sdp=.0849</td>
<td>Sdp=.0849</td>
<td>Sdp=.0849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Normative Occ.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=603</td>
<td>N=603</td>
<td>N=603</td>
<td>N=603</td>
<td>N=603</td>
<td>N=603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBAR=.33</td>
<td>RBAR=.15</td>
<td>RBAR=.15</td>
<td>RBAR=.36</td>
<td>RBAR=.36</td>
<td>RBAR=.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDr=.40</td>
<td>SDr=.19</td>
<td>SDr=.19</td>
<td>SDr=.19</td>
<td>SDr=.19</td>
<td>SDr=.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \rho = .76 )</td>
<td>( \rho = .76 )</td>
<td>( \rho = .76 )</td>
<td>( \rho = .76 )</td>
<td>( \rho = .76 )</td>
<td>( \rho = .76 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDp=.1,731</td>
<td>Sdp=.1,731</td>
<td>Sdp=.1,731</td>
<td>Sdp=.1,731</td>
<td>Sdp=.1,731</td>
<td>Sdp=.1,731</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Please see other tables for descriptions of symbols used.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>OC</th>
<th>Attitudinal OC</th>
<th>Calcutative OC</th>
<th>Affective OC</th>
<th>Continuance OC</th>
<th>Normative OC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WE Endorsement</td>
<td>k=4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=3,586</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RBAR=33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SDr=.0658</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p=.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SDp=.0670</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant WE Endorsement</td>
<td>k=13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=3,093</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RBAR=.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SDr=.1099</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p=.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SDp=.1125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE</td>
<td>k=3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=969</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RBAR=.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SDr=.0736</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p=.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SDp=.0617</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Involvement</td>
<td>k=16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=5,458</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RBAR=.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SDr=.0832</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p=.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SDp=.0774</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. OC, organizational commitment; WE, work ethic; K, number of correlations included in the analysis; N, total sample size; RBAR, sample size weighted mean observed correlation; SDr, sample size weighted standard deviation of mean observed correlation; p, RBAR corrected for unreliability; SDp, standard deviation of p; I, incomplete cell.
TABLE 22  
Meta-Analytic Results: Organizational Commitment and Union Commitment Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OC</th>
<th>Attitudinal OC</th>
<th>Calculative OC</th>
<th>Affective OC</th>
<th>Continuance OC</th>
<th>Normative OC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Union Commitment** | k=21  
N=5,093  
RBAR=.12  
SDr=.2234  
ρ=.14  
SDp=.2469 | I | I | k=2  
N=542  
RBAR=.28  
SDr=.0150  
ρ=.33  
SDp=0 | I | k=1  
N=176  
RBAR=.18  
SDr= -  
ρ=.22  
SDp= - |
| **Loyalty** | k=18  
N=8,881  
RBAR=.15  
SDr=.1305  
ρ=.18  
SDp=.1405 | I | I | k=3  
N=2,466  
RBAR=.21  
SDr=.0418  
ρ=.24  
SDp=.0271 | I | k=1  
N=48  
RBAR=.13  
SDr= -  
ρ=.16  
SDp= - |
| **Responsibility** | k=9  
N=11,670  
RBAR=.03  
SDr=.0381  
ρ=.04  
SDp=.0352 | I | I | k=2  
N=2,337  
RBAR=.11  
SDr=.0255  
ρ=.14  
SDp=0 | I | k=1  
N=48  
RBAR=.04  
SDr= -  
ρ=.05  
SDp= - |
| **Willingness** | k=7  
N=1,278  
RBAR=.06  
SDr=.0949  
ρ=.07  
SDp=.0728 | I | I | k=2  
N=177  
RBAR=.26  
SDr=.0758  
ρ=.32  
SDp=0 | I | k=1  
N=48  
RBAR=.13  
SDr= -  
ρ=.17  
SDp= - |
| **Belief in Unionism** | k=7  
N=1,210  
RBAR= -.10  
SDr= .0435  
ρ= -.12  
SDp= 0 | I | I | I | I |

Note: OC, organizational commitment; K, number of correlations included in the analysis; N, total sample size; RBAR, sample size weighted mean observed correlation; SDr, sample size weighted standard deviation of mean observed correlation; ρ, RBAR corrected for unreliability; SDp, standard deviation of ρ; I, incomplete cell.
### TABLE 23
Meta-Analytic Results: Job Involvement, CPO, and Work Ethic Endorsement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>WE Endorsement</th>
<th>Protestant WE Endorsement</th>
<th>WE</th>
<th>Work Involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Involvement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k=7</td>
<td></td>
<td>k=31</td>
<td>k=6</td>
<td>k=40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=4,602</td>
<td></td>
<td>N=7,663</td>
<td>N=1,385</td>
<td>N=22,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBAR=.37</td>
<td></td>
<td>RBAR=.30</td>
<td>RBAR=.23</td>
<td>RBAR=.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDr=.0619</td>
<td></td>
<td>SDr=.1061</td>
<td>SDr=.1532</td>
<td>SDr=.3093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ρ=.49</td>
<td></td>
<td>ρ=.42</td>
<td>ρ=.30</td>
<td>ρ=.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDp=.0548</td>
<td></td>
<td>SDr=.1104</td>
<td>SDr=.1807</td>
<td>SDr=.3916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CPO</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k=3</td>
<td></td>
<td>k=5</td>
<td>k=1</td>
<td>k=6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=1,165</td>
<td></td>
<td>N=1,037</td>
<td>N=389</td>
<td>N=1,998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBAR=.28</td>
<td></td>
<td>RBAR=.18</td>
<td>RBAR=.10</td>
<td>RBAR=.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDr=.0545</td>
<td></td>
<td>SDr=.0634</td>
<td>SDr= -</td>
<td>SDr=.0847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ρ=.36</td>
<td></td>
<td>ρ=.25</td>
<td>ρ=.13</td>
<td>ρ=.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDp=.0165</td>
<td></td>
<td>SDp=0</td>
<td>SDp= -</td>
<td>SDp=.0792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Career Salience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k=1</td>
<td></td>
<td>N=563</td>
<td>N=1,467</td>
<td>N=1,998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=563</td>
<td></td>
<td>RBAR=.46</td>
<td>RBAR=.36</td>
<td>RBAR=.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDr= -</td>
<td></td>
<td>SDr=.1158</td>
<td>SDr= -</td>
<td>SDr=.0847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ρ=.65</td>
<td></td>
<td>ρ=.51</td>
<td>ρ=.13</td>
<td>ρ=.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDp= -</td>
<td></td>
<td>SDp=.1413</td>
<td>SDp= -</td>
<td>SDp=.0792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Career Involvement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k=1</td>
<td></td>
<td>N=498</td>
<td>N=1,467</td>
<td>N=1,998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=498</td>
<td></td>
<td>RBAR=.21</td>
<td>RBAR=.36</td>
<td>RBAR=.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDr= -</td>
<td></td>
<td>SDr=.1158</td>
<td>SDr= -</td>
<td>SDr=.0847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ρ=.29</td>
<td></td>
<td>ρ=.51</td>
<td>ρ=.13</td>
<td>ρ=.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDp= -</td>
<td></td>
<td>SDp=.1413</td>
<td>SDp= -</td>
<td>SDp=.0792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professionalism</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affective Occ.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Continuance Occ.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Normative Occ.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. CPO, career/professional/occupational commitment; Occ., occupational commitment; WE, work ethic; K, number of correlations included in the analysis; N, total sample size; RBAR, sample size weighted mean observed correlation; SDr, sample size weighted standard deviation of mean observed correlation; ρ, RBAR corrected for unreliability; SDp, standard deviation of ρ; I, incomplete cell.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 24</th>
<th>Meta-Analytic Results: Job Involvement, CPO, and Union Commitment Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Union Commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Involvement</td>
<td>k=2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>k=4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPO</td>
<td>k=3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Salience</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Involvement</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionalism</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Occ.</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuance Occ.</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative Occ.</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. CPO, career/professional/occupational commitment; Occ., occupational commitment; K, number of correlations included in the analysis; N, total sample size; RBAR, sample size weighted mean observed correlation; SDr, sample size weighted standard deviation of mean observed correlation; p, RBAR corrected for unreliability; SDp, standard deviation of p; I, incomplete cell.
TABLE 25
Meta-Analytic Results: Work Ethic Endorsement and Union Commitment Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>WE Endorsement</th>
<th>Protestant WE Endorsement</th>
<th>WE</th>
<th>Work Involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Union Commitment</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyalty</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in Unionism</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. WE, work ethic; I, incomplete cell.
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APPENDIX A

Potential Moderators Worth Exploring

While there is no strong theoretical proof for the following moderator effects, I believe that these are potential moderators worth exploring:

In the CPO dimension, it appears that self-esteem might serve as a moderator between CPO and outcome variables (Gould, 1979).

*Potential Hypothesis 1:* Self-esteem (e.g., high versus low) will serve as a moderator in the: (a) CPO-job satisfaction relationship, such that the relationship will be stronger for employees with high self-esteem; (b) CPO-job performance relationship, such that the relationship will be stronger for employees with high self-esteem; and (c) CPO-turnover relationship, such that the relationship will be stronger for employees with low self-esteem.

In the job involvement dimension, it appears that locus of control might serve as a moderator between job involvement dimensions and outcome variables (Morrow, 1983).

*Potential Hypothesis 2:* Locus of control (e.g., internal versus external) will serve as a moderator in the: (a) job involvement-job satisfaction relationship, such that the relationship will be stronger for employees with high internal locus of control; (b) job involvement-job performance relationship, such that the relationship will be stronger for employees with a high internal locus of control; (c) job involvement-turnover relationship, such that the relationship will be stronger for employees with high external locus of control.
Finally, age of employee might also serve as a moderator with job involvement and various outcome variables (cf. Cohen, 1991; Morrow, 1983).

Potential Hypothesis 3: Age of employee will serve as a moderator in the:
(a) job involvement-job satisfaction relationship, such that the relationship will be stronger for older employees; (b) job involvement-job performance relationship, such that the relationship will be stronger for older employees; (c) job involvement-turnover relationship, such that the relationship will be stronger for younger employees.

As mentioned at the beginning of Chapter IV, all of the analyses with self-esteem and locus of control were dropped from the analysis. Hence, the only potential hypothesis that could be tested was Potential Hypothesis 3, stated above. This potential hypothesis was not supported.

With the job involvement-job satisfaction relationship, the confidence interval for the older distribution varied from -.28 to .86. The confidence interval for the younger distribution ranged from -.19 to .89. Since there is overlap among the confidence intervals, there is not enough evidence to support a moderator effect here. Similarly, there is overlap among the confidence intervals for the other relationships of interest. With job involvement-job performance, the older distribution has a confidence interval of -.09 to .33, while the younger distribution has a confidence interval of -.05 to .67. The job involvement-turnover relationship has a confidence interval of -.42 to .04 for the older distribution, while it has a confidence interval of -.25 to -.07 for the younger distribution. Finally, in the job involvement-turnover intent relationship, the older distribution’s
confidence interval ranged from -.53 to -.03. The confidence interval for the younger distribution varies from -.61 to -.05. In each of these instances, there is overlap among the respective confidence intervals, indicating lack of support for a moderator effect.
APPENDIX B

Articles Used in Meta-Analysis
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