

Job Involvement and Organizational Commitment : Are they distinct concepts?

Jin-Kook Tak

Sung Kyun Kwan University

Using a sample of Korean workers, the present study was intended to address the issue of the discriminant validity of measures of job involvement and organizational commitment. First, the LISREL program was used to conduct a confirmatory factor analysis of items from measures of these two variables and to assess relations between a wide variety of variables and the two measures. The results of these analyses indicated that the measures of job involvement and organizational commitment represent distinct constructs. Second, a series of multiple regression analyses were conducted to further understand the difference in constructs between job involvement and organizational commitment. The results of these analyses indicated that the personal variables shared more variance with job involvement than did the situational variables. This was opposite for organizational commitment: the situational variables shared more variance with organizational commitment than did the personal variables. Results of the study are discussed within a context of cross-cultural frame. Generally, many of the findings in this study appear to be explained by a similar logic as has been used to explain the findings for American workers.

The concept of work commitment has received a great deal of attention in industrial and organizational psychology. It has been assumed that employees who show high levels of commitment are likely to be more motivated, more satisfied with their jobs, and more willing to stay with their organizations (Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982). There have been a large number of commitment related concepts and measures, but it has not been clear how the concepts of those measures related to each other (Morrow, 1983).

Recently, Morrow (1983) identified a number of forms of work commitment and grouped similar forms based on the major focus (i.e., personal values, career, job, organization, and union). Among these forms, job involvement (Lodahl & Kejner, 1965) and organizational commitment (Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1979)

are measures representative of categories for job and organization, respectively, and have been heavily used in the literature of work commitment.

Rabinowitz and Hall (1977) identified two classes of definitions of job involvement: (1) job involvement as a performance-self-esteem contingency: the extent to which self-esteem is affected by level of performance; and (2) job involvement as a component of self-image: the degree to which a person psychologically identifies with his or her job. Organizational commitment has been defined as the strength of an individual's identification with and involvement in a particular organization, which is characterized by belief in and acceptance of organizational goals and values, willingness to exert effort on behalf of the organization, and a desire to maintain membership in the organiza-

tion(Mowday, Porter, and Steers, 1982).

Although a great deal of study has been done on conceptualizing each of these two measures of work commitment, little empirical evidence of their discriminant validity has been reported(Morrow, 1983; Morrow & McElroy, 1986). In terms of its focus, organizational commitment concerns the organization as a whole and appears to be conceptually distinct from job involvement which deals with the specific job. However, since the specific job exists within the organization(i, e., a part of the organization), it appears that there could be some conceptual redundancy between job involvement and organizational commitment.

The correlations between the two measures have been reported in a variety of studies and generally a moderate level of relationship has been found: $r = .55$, Brooke, Russell, & Price, 1988; $r = .45$, Morrow & McElroy, 1986; $r = .41$, Morrow & Goetz, 1988; $r = .30$, .54, .55, and .56, Mowday et al., 1979. Since these correlations are not exceptionally high or low, the question of concept redundancy or distinction between the two measures remains unanswered. These correlations suggest that the two measures are, at least, partially redundant(Morrow, 1983).

A few studies have attempted to assess the degree of conceptual redundancy between the two measures using a factor analysis within a single sample. Using a principle component analysis, Morrow and McElroy(1986) and Morrow and Goetz(1988) found that most of the job involvement and organizational commitment items loaded highly on different factors, suggesting nonredundancy between the two measures.

However, these studies used an exploratory factor analysis to distinguish the constructs of the two measures where a confirmatory factor analysis would be a more powerful strategy for assessing the factor structure of the two measures. Brooke et al.(1988)

conducted a confirmatory factor analysis to test the discriminant validity measures of job satisfaction, job involvement, and organizational commitment. They found that the three measures assess empirically distinct concepts.

One of the major problems with the studies reviewed above is that, except for Brooke et al.,(1988), none examined the relationship of the two measures with other variables to test the discriminant validity of these measures. In the Brooke et al. study, however, only a small number of job-related variables were included. Morrow and McElroy(1986) suggested that in order to examine the discriminant validity of work commitment measures, the antecedents and consequences of work commitment should be investigated to see how they are differentially related to the work commitment measures. Many studies have been conducted to examine the antecedents and consequences of job involvement and organizational commitment-(Mowday et al., 1982; Rabinowitz & Hall, 1977). None of those studies, however, included both job involvement and organizational commitment in the same study, or measured them simultaneously within a single sample. It is still not clear whether job involvement and organizational commitment are empirically distinct concepts, and if they are, how they are different and which variables are differentially related to those two constructs.

Another related issue is that little attention has been given to the study of the relationship between job involvement and organizational commitment and other variables in different cultures. It would be interesting and useful to see if any consistent relationships exist across different cultures.

Basically, the purpose of this study was to investigate the discriminant validity of the measures of job involvement and organizational commitment in Korean workers. A number of analyses were conducted

to address this issue.

First, a confirmatory factor analysis(CFA) was conducted to test whether the two measures were assessing conceptually distinct dimensions. Second, relationships between the two measures and a wide variety of predictor and outcome variables were investigated. If the two variables measured distinct constructs, then the two measures were expected to be differentially related to those predictor and outcome variables. Finally, multiple regression analyses were conducted for predictor variables to see which variable in each set, and also which set of variables among a number of sets were more important in explaining job involvement and organizational commitment. Also, it was examined how differently job involvement and organizational commitment predict outcome variables.

In order to conduct the above analyses, a variety of predictor variables needed to be classified into a number of categories. Based on the literature review of multivariate studies on job involvement and organizational commitment, in this research, a wide variety of predictor variables were classified into seven broad categories: (1) personal-demographic characteristics, (2) personal-psychological characteristics, (3) job-related characteristics, (4) role-related characteristics, (5) work experience characteristics, (6) job satisfaction, and (7) organizational structure characteristics.

The personal-demographic characteristics simply represent "personal background" characteristics and included six variables: (a) sex, (b) marital status, (c) age, (d) number of dependents, (e) educational level, and (f) social-economic level. The personal-psychological characteristics included the Protestant work ethic, the Confucianism work ethic, intrinsic motivation, and higher-order needs. This set of variables was characterized as broad "personal" Characteristics by Rabinowitz and Hall(1977). However, Saal(1978)

claimed that those variables are qualitatively different from the personal-demographic characteristics, and labeled them as personal-psychological variables. Saal argued that personal-psychological characteristics represent constructs that are more complex functions of an individual's past experiences.

The job-related characteristics consisted of seven variables: (a) job type, (b) job rank, (c) salary level, (d) job tenure, (e) organization tenure, (f) number of working hours, and (g) past turnover. In this category, job tenure and organizational tenure were grouped to "personal" characteristics in some studies(e. g., Rabinowitz & Hall, 1977; Steers, 1977), while these variables have been grouped to "job or situational" characteristics in other studies(e. g., Kanungo, 1982a; Saal, 1978). Since the two variables are measured within a context of job or organization, they appear to belong to job or situational variables. In this study, the job-related characteristics represent variables that are directly related to job or organization and can be simply measured within a context of job or organization.

The role-related characteristics were related to employee roles and job characteristics. This set included role conflict, role ambiguity, and five dimensions of job characteristics(i. e., skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy, task feedback). This category essentially belongs to broad "situational" characteristics. More specifically, this category concerns the extent to which variations in the task requirements of jobs affect job involvement and organizational commitment(Mowday et al., 1982).

The work experience consisted of six variables: (a) production oriented leadership; (b) consideration oriented leadership; (c) group cohesion; (d) organizational dependability; (e) met expectation; and (f) feelings of personal importance to the organization. These variables were grouped together, based on

Buchanan(1974), Steers(1977), and Morris and Sherman(1981) studies. Steers(1977) viewed work experience as a major socializing force and argued that it plays a major role to influence the degree to which psychological attachments are formed with the organization. He included group cohesion, organizational dependability, personal importance, and met expectation for the work experiences category. Morris and Sherman(1981), based on the Steers(1977)'s categorization, viewed the potential importance of leader behavior as both a component of work experiences and a source of socialization, and included supervisor consideration and initiating structure for the work experience category.

Although job satisfaction has been included for a set of work experience variables in some studies(Flynn & Solomon; Mowday et al., 1982), in this study, it was analyzed as a separate category. A major reason was that job satisfaction represents an affective response to specific facets of the job, and thus appears to be an outcome of work experiences. Five facets of job satisfaction were included in this study: (a) work itself; (b) pay; (c) promotion; (d) supervision; and (e) co-workers.

The organizational structure characteristics represent another unique category, which is distinguished from other characteristics. This category concerns the effects of variation in organizational structure on job attitudes. In this study, based on Morris and Steers(1980)'s study, centralization and formalization were included in this category.

Finally, outcome variables included in this study were self-rated absenteeism, self-rated performance, non-work satisfaction, and intentions to leave.

METHOD

Subjects

Data were collected from 828 Korean employees across six different organizations in Korea. A number of employees from each organization were as follows: (A) a transportation service organization-103; (B) a pottery manufacturing company-350; (C) a construction materials manufacturing company-57; (D) a canning company-58; (E) a farming tools manufacturing company-94; and (F) a construction company-166. A total of 719 subjects were used in this study. Responses from 109 respondents were removed due to incomplete information(they skipped at least one page of the questionnaire or they answered by circling the same number to most of the items). All subjects used in this study were native-speaking Koreans.

Demographically, the overall sample was; 55% male; 45% married; 65% white collar workers; and an average of 28 years in age, ranging from 16 to 64. Organization tenure for the employees with their company ranged from 1 to 22 years, with an average of 4.3 years. The average tenure with current position was 2.9 years. The average of weekly working hours was 55 hours.

Procedures

The whole questionnaire was first translated into Korean by several Korean graduate students, including the author. The draft Korean version was then translated by two fluent bilingual people back to English to evaluate the quality of the translation. The original English version and the English version translated from the Korean version were compared by a couple of American graduate students. There was a very satisfactory agreement between those two versions. A final Korean version was constructed after a

discussion with an English speaking professor.

The final Korean version was distributed to employees by authorized staff members in each organization. Employees were asked to complete the questionnaire either at the company or at home and return it to the staff members who distributed the questionnaire. The time to complete the questionnaire took approximately 40 minutes. Respondents were asked not to write their names on the questionnaire and were promised confidentiality. The overall return rate was 61 percent (a total of 1350 questionnaires were distributed).

Instrument

First, Lodahl and Kejner's (1965) 20-item scale was used to measure job involvement. The reasons for choosing this scale were that first, this scale has been the most widely used in job involvement literature (Kanungo, 1982), and that the reliability and validity of this scale have been demonstrated (Lodahl & Kejner, 1965; Schwyhart & Smith, 1972). Organizational commitment was measured by Porter's et al. (1974) 15-item scale (the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire). This scale was selected because it has been the most frequently used measure of organizational commitment and has been found to have good reliability and validity (Mowdy et al., 1979).

The Protestant work ethic has been characterized by a belief in the importance of hard work and frugality (Mirels and Garrett, 1971). The Protestant work ethic was measured with a 19-item scale developed by Mirels and Garrett (1971). In this study, three items were excluded due to their low item-total correlations. Another work ethic scale was developed for this study. For hundreds of years, Koreans general ethical system has been primarily influenced by Confucianism. Basically, Confucianism is concerned ab-

out the principle of true loyalty to rulers, friends, parents, etc. Although more recently Korea has become westernized, Confucianism still provides Koreans with their major moral and ethical standards. In order to represent this point of view, the Confucianism work ethic scale was developed. Originally, 15 items were developed by the author, based on the above principle of Confucianism, within a context of work situation. Four items were negatively phrased and reverse scored in order to reduce response bias. The response format used a 7-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree). They were then rated by several Korean graduate students in terms of each item's appropriateness. Raters were asked to evaluate the extent to which each item reflected Confucianism, based on a 5-point Likert-type scale (1 = little, 5 = very much). After reviewing the responses, one item was excluded. An internal consistency of reliability of the 14-item scale was .63 for the present study. Preliminary analysis of item-total correlation showed that two items had low item-total correlations, thus decreasing coefficient alpha. Those two items were excluded from the scale. Coefficient alpha of the final 12-item scale was .71.

Higher order needs were measured with Hackman and Lawler's (1971) 12-item scale, which measures the degree to which the employees' have a desire to obtain higher order need satisfactions from their work. Intrinsic motivation was measured using a 3-item scale developed by Hackman and Lawler (1971). Intrinsic motivation refers as the degree to which an individual is motivated to perform well because of some subjective rewards or feelings that he or she expects to experience as a result of performing well.

Perceived job characteristics were measured with Hackman and Lawler's (1971) 15-item scale. This scale measures employees perceptions of five job core characteristics: (1) skill variety; (2) task identity; (3)

task significance; (4) autonomy; and (5) feedback from the job itself. Role conflict and role ambiguity were measured by using eight items (four items of each scale) adopted from Rizzo, House, and Lirtzman(1970). They defined role conflict as the degree to which expectations of a role are incompatible or incongruent with the reality of the role. Role ambiguity was defined as the extent to which an individual is unclear about the role expectations of others, as well as the degree of uncertainty associated with one's role performance. Although it has been reported that the two measures did not assess two distinct constructs(Brooke et. al., 1988), for the present study it was decided to keep the variables separate because of a low intercorrelation($r = .05$) between them.

Centralization was measured with a 5-item scale of perceived participation in decision making, used by Ruh, White, & Wood(1975). Formalization was measured by using a 4-item scale adapted from Oldham and Hackman(1981). Formalization, as defined by Oldham and Hackman, is the extent to which rules, procedures, instructions, and communications are written.

Consideration-oriented leadership was measured with a three-item scale. Production-oriented leadership was also measured using a three-item scale. Four other work experience variables were adopted from an instrument developed by Buchanan(1974). These variables were as follows: (1) met expectation(the extent to which subjects' expectations are met by the realities of the job); (2) personal importance(feelings of perceived personal importance as being dependable in carrying out its commitments to employees); and (5) work group cohesion(the extent to which peer employees are friendly). Each variable consisted of one item.

Job satisfaction was measured with the Job De-

scriptive Index(JDI), which was originally developed by Smith, Kendall, and Hulin(1969) and recently revised(Smith, 1987). The JDI consists of a total of 72 items measuring five different aspects of job satisfaction: (1) work itself-18 items; (2) pay-9 items; (3) promotion-18 items; (4) supervision-18 items; and (5) co-workers-18 items. Each scale consists of a list of adjectives(e. g., stimulating, routine, and etc.) describing various aspects of the dimensions. An individual responds by checking a "yes" if the item describes his or her job, "no" if the item does not describe his or her job, and "?" if he or she can not decide. In this study, "yes" and "no" were replaced by "O" and "X" respectively for translation convenience.

Four outcome variables were included to examine effects of job involvement and organizational commitment. Self-rated job performance was measured with a three-item scale, which measures the degree to which an individual believes he or she is performing well on the job. Self-rated absenteeism was measured with a two-item scale. Responses were scored in such a way that high score indicated more frequent absenteeism. Intention to turnover was measured using a four-item scale adopted from Mobley(1977), which measures the likelihood of leaving the organization in the future. High score on the scale was indicative of higher intention of leaving the organization. Finally, non-work satisfaction was measured with a three-item scale. This scale was a combination of satisfaction with general life, satisfaction with family life, and satisfaction with leisure.

Analysis

First, LISREL VI's(Joreskog & Sorbom, 1986) maximum likelihood estimation procedure was used to assess the discriminant validity between job involvement and organizational commitment. A correlation matrix was used for the input for LISREL

analyses. Pairwise deletion procedure was used to treat missing values. One major advantage of LISREL is that, since it estimates measurement error, it provides a more accurate estimation of the relations between latent constructs of a theoretical model. Another major advantage is that it provides an overall chi-square value, testing the extent to which the hypothesized model explains the relations among measured or manifest variables. One problem with this chi-square statistic in testing the hypothetical model is that it is sensitive to sample size and violations of the assumption of multivariate normality (Bentler, 1983; Joreskog & Sorbom, 1986). As a result, when a sample size is large, even trivial differences between the sample and reproduced covariance matrices are likely to yield a statistically significant chi-square in a hypothesized model. Because of this problem with the chi-square test, other goodness-of-fit indices were calculated in this study. The LISREL program provides three goodness-of-fit indices: (1) the goodness-of-fit index (GFI); (2) the adjusted goodness-of-fit index (AGFI); (3) the root mean square residual (RMSR). GFI is a measure of the relative amount of variance and covariance jointly accounted for by the hypothesized model, ranging from 0 to 1.0. AGFI is GFI adjusted of degree of freedom. High number of these indices are indicative of a better model. RMSR, also ranging from 0 to 1.0, represents a measure of the average residuals left over after the proposed model has been fitted. The smaller this index, the better model (Joreskog & Sorbom, 1986).

Since it has been reported that all the above indices were affected by sample size (Marsh, Balla, & McDonald, 1988), two additional indices (NFI and TLI) were obtained. Bentler and Bonett (1980) developed the normed fit index (NFI), which measures the improvement in fit of a hypothesized model over

a null model (hypothesize complete independence among measured variables). The Tucker-Lewis index (TLI) was developed by Tucker and Lewis (1973). This index also measures the improvement in fit of a hypothesized model to a null model, but controls degrees of freedoms of those models. Values greater than .90 of these indices are considered a good fit (Bentler & Bonett, 1980). TLI is also assumed to be relatively independent of sample size (Marsh et al., 1988). Finally, differences in the chi-square statistics for proposed models were tested. Bentler (1980) suggested that if one can specify an alternative model that is a subset of an initial model, the difference in chi-square values between the two models is distributed as a chi-square with degrees of freedom equal to the difference in degrees of freedom for the models.

The first analysis performed, using LISREL, was a confirmatory factor analysis of the items of job involvement and organizational commitment. Two models were developed for this analysis: (1) an One-factor model, hypothesizing that a single factor represents the two attitudinal measures and (2) a Two-factor model, hypothesizing that two factors represent the attitudinal measures. This analysis compared the fit of the Two factor model to the fit of the One-factor model. If the One-factor model provides better fit to the data than does the Two-factor model, then it can be concluded that job involvement and organizational commitment lack discriminant validity.

The second analysis examined relations between the two measures and each set of variables (i.e., seven sets of predictor variables and one set of outcome variables) using the LISREL program. This analysis tested the hypothesis that correlations between job involvement and each set of variables are the same as the correlations between organizational commitment and a corresponding set of variables. If the two measures are assessing distinct constructs, then mea-

asures of these constructs would be differentially related to each set of variables. In order to provide evidence of discriminant validity, it is necessary to show different patterns of association with measures of each set of variables for each attitudinal measure. In this analysis, two models were developed and compared to test the null hypothesis. In the first model (Unequal Model), the correlations between each set of variables and job involvement and the correlations between those variables and organizational commitment were freely estimated. In the second model (Equal model), those correlations were specified as being equal (e.g., the correlation between age and job involvement was specified as being equal to the correlation between age and organizational commitment). A significant difference in the chi-square statistics between the two models would lead to reject the null hypothesis, indicating discriminant validity between job involvement and organizational commitment.

For the above LISREL analyses, the individual items for each scale (except 1 or 2-item scales and the JDI) were arranged to form three indicators per construct. This procedure was performed to reduce the ratio of the number of subjects to the number of parameters to be estimated by the model. Bentler (1985) has recommended that in order to obtain reliable estimates of the parameters, a ratio of at least five subjects per parameter be maintained. In order to form three indicators for each scale, a principal component analysis was performed for each construct, setting a number of factors as one. Three indicators for each measure were formed in such a way that an item with the highest factor loading was combined with an item with the lowest factor loading for the first indicator, an item with the next highest loading was combined with an item with the next lowest loading for the second indicator, and then an

item with the next highest loading was combined with an item with the next lowest loading for the third indicator for the construct. This procedure continued until all items for each construct had been assigned to one of the three indicators. The mean of scores on relevant items to each indicator was then computed to represent the score for each indicator. All the demographic and job-related variables were treated as manifest variables that were assumed to be measured without measurement error. For the measure of job satisfaction, the five subscales of the JDI served as separate indicators of job satisfaction. Netemeyer, Johnston, and Burton (1990) justified using the five dimensions of the JDI as indicators of a global measure of job satisfaction.

Another way to examine discriminant validity between job involvement and organizational commitment is to conduct multiple regression analysis. Differences in patterns of predictions of each attitudinal measure by a number of variables would demonstrate empirical evidence of discriminant validity of the two attitudinal measures. Multicollinearity problem was not detected (the highest correlation was .75 between age and marital status, and correlations were generally small to moderate) and the ratio of cases to variables was 19.

RESULTS

Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics for the measures used in this study are provided in Table 1. Cronbach's coefficient alphas were computed to measure of reliabilities of those scales. Except for a measure of self-rated absenteeism ($\alpha = .36$), other scales were moderate to high, ranging from .55 to .94.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics

Scale	N	Mean	S.D	N. of items	Reliability
Age	690	28.6	7.5	1	—
Sex	715	1.5	.5	1	—
Marital status	713	1.5	.5	1	—
Number of dependents	546	2.7	1.8	1	—
Educational level	712	3.6	1.2	1	—
Socio-economic level	707	3.0	.7	1	—
Protestant work ethic	719	76.7	12.6	16	.71
confucianism work ethic	719	54.4	10.3	12	.71
Higher-order needs	704	51.3	16.9	12	.94
Intrinsic motivation	708	17.2	3.5	3	.59
Job type	716	1.8	.7	1	—
Job rank	711	1.5	.9	1	—
Salary level	713	3.3	2.2	1	—
Organization tenure	675	4.3	3.6	1	—
Job tenure	666	2.9	2.4	1	—
Working hours	642	55.1	7.6	1	—
Past turnover	535	.9	1.1	1	—
Role conflict	717	15.3	5.0	4	.69
Role ambiguity	718	11.8	4.5	4	.67
Skill Variety	712	12.0	4.4	3	.61
Task Identity	706	13.8	4.0	3	.54
Feedback	701	14.5	3.5	3	.57
Task Significance	709	15.0	3.8	3	.61
Autonomy	703	12.5	4.0	3	.61
Production-oriented leader	719	15.6	4.0	3	.75
Consideration-oriented leader	719	13.5	4.8	3	.85
Group cohesiveness	710	9.8	2.6	2	.71
Organizational dependency	716	3.3	1.7	1	—
Met expectancy	716	3.2	1.6	1	—
Personal importance	717	4.3	1.6	1	—
Centralization	718	20.3	6.8	5	.87
Formalization	718	14.2	5.1	4	.62
Work itself satisfaction	607	21.2	13.8	18	.90
Pay satisfaction	580	12.0	11.0	9	.75
Promotion satsfaction	561	14.2	11.3	9	.72
Supervision satisfaction	570	31.3	12.9	18	.88
Co-workers satisfaction	559	35.9	11.0	18	.88
Self-rated Performance	719	15.2	3.5	3	.78
Self-rated Absenteeism	711	4.6	2.8	2	.36
Non-work satisfaction	718	12.2	3.6	3	.59
Intention to leave	704	12.0	3.6	4	.72
Job involvement	717	88.3	15.2	20	.78
Organizational commitment	716	62.9	12.6	15	.77

Note. Sex(1=male, 2=female): Marital Status(1=married, 2=single): Job Type(1=blue collar, 2=white collar)

Confirmatory Factor Analysis

First, LISREL estimates of factor loadings for the indicators of job involvement and organizational commitment in the One-factor model and the Two-factor model presented in Table 2. For the Two-factor model, each indicator was highly loaded on the factor to which it belongs. Generally, factor loading for the Two-factor model were higher than those for the One-factor model.

Table 3 presents various goodness-of-fit indices for the confirmatory factor models, along with the chi-square values and associated degrees of freedom. The null model provided a poor fit (GFI = .457), indicating that the hypothesis of zero common factor was not appropriate for the data set. The Two-factor model, hypothesizing that two factors underlie the measures of job involvement and organizational com-

mitment, with the factors representing each of the constructs, appeared to provide an excellent fit to the data. Various goodness-of-fit indices were greater than .90 (GFI = .979; AGFI = .945; NFI = .975; TLI = .952). Bentler and Bonett (1980) argued that values greater than .90 of NFI and TLI are considered a good fit. Also RMSR (.03) was small, indicating a good fit to the data.

The One-factor model, hypothesizing that a single factor underlies the measures of job involvement and organizational commitment appeared to provide a moderate fit to the data, with a NFI of .848 and GFI of .865. However, these indices were lower than those for the Two-factor model (difference of .127 and .114, respectively). The TLI and AGFI measures dropped considerably (.205 and .260, respectively). Also, the chi-square difference between the two models was

Table 2. LISREL Estimates of Factor Loadings for the Two Models

Indicator	Factor loadings		
	Two-factor Model		One-factor Model
	JI	COM	JI-COM
JI1	.719	.000	.779
JI2	.815	.000	.704
JI3	.762	.000	.586
COM1	.000	.825	.653
COM2	.000	.796	.726
COM3	.000	.657	.696

Note. JI=Job Involvement; COM=Organizational Commitment. All factor loadings were statistically significant, $p < .001$

Table 3. Goodness-of-fit Indices for Models Tested

Model	df	X ²	GFI	AGFI	NFI	TLI	RMSR
Null	15	1762.35	.457	.240	.000	.000	.412
One-factor	9	267.24	.865	.685	.848	.747	.078
Two-factor	8	44.89	.979	.945	.975	.952	.031

Note. GFI=goodness-of-fit index; AGFI=adjusted goodness-of-fit index; NFI=normed fit index; TLI=Tucker-Lewis index (Tucker & Lewis, 1973); RMSR=root mean square residual

significant, $X^2(1) = 222.35(p < .001)$. That is, the Two-factor model provided a significantly better fit to the data. Thus, the hypothesis that a single factor underlies the measures of job involvement and organizational commitment can be rejected, supporting discriminant validity between job involvement and organizational commitment.

Correlations with Other Sets of Variables

In order to further examine discriminant validity between job involvement and organizational commitment, the correlations between a number of sets of variables and job involvement and organizational commitment were investigated. Table 4 provides the LISREL estimates of the correlations between each

of the eight sets of variables and the measures of job involvement and organizational commitment. Table 5 presents goodness-of-fit indices of the two models for each of the eight sets of variables.

A review of correlations in Table 4 shows differences in relations of each of the eight sets of variables to the measures of job involvement and organizational commitment. First, for the demographic set, sex, marital status, age, and educational level were strongly related to job involvement than to organizational commitment. Social-economic level was negatively correlated with job involvement, but positively with organizational commitment. Among the psychological variables, intrinsic motivation and the Protestant work ethic had stronger relationships with

Table 4. LISREL Estimates of Relations Between Eight Sets of Variables and Job Involvement and Organizational Commitment

Sets of variables	JI	OC
Demographic variable		
Sex	-.373**	-.268**
Marital status	-.310**	-.173**
Age	.383**	.244**
Number of dependents	.079	.090*
Educational level	.272**	.172**
Social-economic level	-.026	.054
Psychological variable		
Protestant work ethic	.511**	.402**
Confucianism work ethic	.732**	.720**
Higher order need	.430**	.404**
Intrinsic motivation	.604**	.311**
Job-related variable		
Job type	.376**	.265**
Job rank	.392**	.251**
Salary	.400**	.278**
Organization tenure	.266**	.204**
Job tenure	.121**	-.021
Work hour	.117**	-.002
Past turnover	.030	-.027

Table 4. (continued)

LISREL Estimates of Relations Between Eight Sets of Variables and Job Involvement and Organizational Commitment

Sets of variables	JI	OC
Role-related variable		
Role conflict	-.205**	-.398**
Role ambiguity	-.355**	-.330**
Variety	.499**	.450**
Identity	.479**	.549**
Feedback	.428**	.315**
Significance	.553**	.444**
Autonomy	.478**	.478**
Work experience variable		
Production oriented leadership	.214**	.102**
Consideration oriented leadership	.377**	.409**
Group cohesion	.326**	.321**
Organization dependency	.299**	.459**
Met expectancy	.301**	.451**
Personal importance	.400**	.388**
Job satisfaction variable		
Work itself	.519**	.543**
Pay	.229**	.418**
Promotion	.421**	.455**
Supervision	.384**	.428**
Co-worker	.267**	.274
Organizational structure variable		
Formalization	.290**	.460**
Centralization	.418**	.435**
Outcome variable		
Performance	.305**	.297**
Absenteeism	-.475**	-.405**
Non-work satisfaction	.329**	.507**
Intention to leave	-.381**	-.507**

Note. JI=Job involvement; OC=Organizational commitment. Sex(1=male, 2=female); Marital Status(1=married, 2=single);

Job Type (1=blue collar, 2=white collar)

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

job involvement. The Confucianism work ethic and higher order needs were related to the two measures to a similar degree. A set of job-related variables also was differently related to the two measures. Overall, all seven variables were more highly correlated with

job involvement. The role-related variables also were differently related to job involvement and organizational commitment. Role conflict had a stronger relation with organizational commitment, whereas feedback and significance were more strongly associ-

Table 5. Goodness-of-fit Indices for Two Different Models Concerning Relations Between Eight Sets of Variables and Job Involvement and Organizational Commitment

Model	df	X ²	GFI	AGFI	NFI	TLI	RMSR
Demographic set							
Null model	66	3571.46	.460	.362	.000	.000	.301
Unequal-relation model	32	93.35	.978	.946	.974	.946	.026
Equal-relation model	38	116.44	.973	.945	.967	.943	.038
Psychological set							
Null model	153	5807.96	.359	.284	.000	.000	.307
Unequal-relation model	120	343.69	.948	.926	.941	.925	.040
Equal-relation model	124	386.37	.942	.920	.934	.919	.046
Job-related set							
Null model	78	4082.54	.460	.370	.000	.000	.289
Unequal-relation model	36	75.80	.983	.957	.981	.960	.022
Equal-relation model	43	118.56	.974	.945	.978	.947	.036
Role-related set							
Null model	351	6023.68	.418	.373	.000	.000	.223
Unequal-relation model	288	1152.31	.884	.848	.809	.767	.058
Equal-relation model	295	1185.35	.882	.849	.803	.766	.059
Work experience set							
Null model	136	4766.83	.424	.352	.000	.000	.275
Unequal-relation model	91	267.73	.958	.929	.944	.916	.044
Equal-relation model	97	302.76	.952	.924	.936	.911	.049
Job satisfaction set							
Null model	210	7168.17	.339	.273	.000	.000	.298
Unequal-relation model	168	497.27	.935	.911	.931	.913	.043
Equal-relation model	173	518.70	.932	.909	.928	.912	.046
Organizational structure set							
Null model	55	3228.57	.435	.322	.000	.000	.329
Unequal-relation model	38	115.79	.971	.950	.964	.948	.031
Equal-relation model	40	129.66	.966	.944	.960	.945	.037
Outcome set							
Null model	136	3871.28	.481	.416	.000	.000	.245
Unequal-relation model	104	334.22	.949	.925	.914	.887	.048
Equal-relation model	108	362.07	.944	.921	.906	.882	.052

Note. Unequal-relation model: the relations between the demographic variables and job involvement and organizational commitment were freely estimated. Equal-relation model: the relations were specified as being equal.

ated with job involvement. Role ambiguity, variety, identity, and autonomy were related to job involvement and organizational commitment to a similar

degree. Among the work experience variables, production-oriented leadership was more highly related to job involvement. Consideration-oriented leadership,

organization dependency, and met expectation had stronger relations with organizational commitment. For the job satisfaction category, pay had a stronger relation with organizational commitment, whereas the remaining four variables were correlated to the two measures to a similar degree. Among the two organizational structure, formalization had a stronger relationship with organizational commitment. Centralization was similarly related to job involvement and organizational commitment. Finally, the outcome variables also were differently related to the two measures. Self-rated absenteeism had a stronger association with job involvement, whereas non-work satisfaction and intentions to leave were more strongly related to organizational commitment.

Next, a statistical test of the difference in relations between each of the eight sets of variables and the two measures was conducted by comparing the fit of the Unequal model to the fit of the Equal model. Table 5 reveals that for all the eight categories, the Unequal model provides an overall better fit to the data than the Equal model. Although the Equal model also fit the data well, the Unequal model had slightly better goodness-of-fit indices. Also, for the demographic variables, a comparison between the Unequal model and the Equal model in terms of chi-square values yielded a $X^2(6, n = 719) = 23.09, p < .001$, indicating that the Unequal model provided a significantly better representation of relations between the demographic variables and job involvement and organizational commitment. As was the case for the demographic category, there was always a significant difference in chi-square values between the Equal model for each of the other categories, suggesting a better representation of the data for the Unequal model. These results indicated that the measures of job involvement and organizational commitment were assessing empirically distinct constructs.

Multiple Regression Analyses

A series of multiple regression analyses were conducted to further understand the difference in constructs between job involvement and organizational commitment. First, stepwise regression analyses were performed between job involvement and organizational commitment as criteria and all the variables included in this study(except for outcome variables) as predictors. For job involvement, among all the predictors, seven variables were entered into the equation, yielding a $\underline{R}^2 = .48$. The Confucianism work ethic accounted for the most of the variance in job involvement(31%). It was followed by work itself satisfaction, task significance, age, intrinsic motivation, personal importance, and job type. Different predictors contributed significantly to the prediction of organizational commitment. Eight variables entered the equation and accounted for about 50% of the total variance in organizational commitment. As was the case for the job involvement equation, the Confucianism work ethic was the first predictor to enter the equation. By itself alone, it accounted for 30% of the total variance in organizational commitment. However, there were some differences in variables entering the equation. Among the eight variables that entered the equation, four variables were identified as the same predictors as included in the job involvement equation(i.e., the Confucianism work ethic, work satisfaction, personal importance, and task significance). The other four variables were organizational dependence, formalization, role conflict, and pay.

In order to examine the relative importance of various sets of predictors in explaining job involvement and organizational commitment, stepwise multiple regression analyses were conducted between each of the seven sets of predictors and the two attitudinal measures. Table 6 presents results of seven stepwise regression analyses that used job involvement as a

Table 6. Results of Stepwise Regression Analyses of Job Involvement on Each of the Seven Sets of Predictors

Variable	Order of entry	R ²
Demographic set		
Age	1	.12
Sex	2	.14
Psychological set		
Confucianism ethic	1	.31
Higher order needs	2	.36
Intrinsic motivation	3	.40
Protestant ethic	4	.40
Job-related set		
Salary	1	.13
Job type	2	.14
Job tenure	3	.16
Role-related set		
Significance	1	.15
Autonomy	2	.20
Role ambiguity	3	.21
Variety	4	.22
Identity	5	.23
Organizational structure set		
Centralization	1	.12
Formalization	2	.14
Work experience set		
Personal importance	1	.14
Consideration leadership	2	.19
Organization dependability	3	.21
Production leadership	4	.22
Job satisfaction set		
Work itself	1	.20
Promotion	2	.22
Supervision	3	.23

criterion. The psychological variables shared the largest common variance with job involvement(40%). The Confucianism work ethic accounted for most of the explained variance(31%). The role-related characteristics, work experience characteristics, and job satisfaction variables accounted for the variance in job involvement to a similar degree(about 23%). They were followed by the organizational structure

variables(14%) and the job-related variables(14%). The demographic variables accounted for the smallest amount of the variance in job involvement(14%).

Table 7 provides the results of seven stepwise regression analyses that used organizational commitment as a criterion. Some differences were identified between these results and the results of regression analyses for job involvement, as shown in Table 6.

Table 7. Results of Stepwise Regression Analyses of Organizational Commitment on Each of the Seven Sets of Predictors

Variable	Order of entry	R ²
Demographic set		
Sex	1	.05
Age	2	.06
Socio-economic level	3	.07
Psychological set		
Confucianism ethic	1	.30
Higher order needs	2	.34
Job-related set		
Salary	1	.06
Job type	2	.07
Organization tenure	3	.08
Job tenure	4	.08
Role-related set		
Autonomy	1	.13
Role conflict	2	.17
Significance	3	.20
Identity	4	.22
Role ambiguity	5	.23
Variety	6	.24
Organizational structure set		
Centralization	1	.13
Formalization	2	.20
Work experience set		
Organization dependability	1	.20
Consideration leadership	2	.25
Personal importance	3	.29
Met expectation	4	.31
Job satisfaction set		
Work itself	1	.22
Pay	2	.26
Supervision	3	.28
Promotion	4	.29

First, in each set, different variables were entered into the regression equation. Also, differences were found in the amount of the variance explained by each of the seven sets of variables. The psychological variables, as was the case in job involvement, accounted for the largest amount of the variance in organization-

al commitment(34%). This set was more strongly related to job involvement.

The demographic and job-related characteristics were not strong predictors in explaining either job involvement or organizational commitment, but they were more important predictors in explaining job

involvement than organizational commitment(explained amount of the variance : 14% and 16% for job involvement, respectively ; 7% and 9% for organizational commitment, respectively). The role-related characteristics explained about the same amount of the variance in job involvement and organizational commitment(23% and 24%, respectively). The organizational structure characteristics, the work experience characteristics, and the job satisfaction variables were more strongly related to organizational commitment than job involvement(explained amount of the variance : 20%, 31%, and 29% for organizational commitment, respectively ; 14%, 22%, and 23% for job involvement, respectively).

Then, job involvement and organizational commitment were served as predictors of a set of outcome variables. in order to examine the relative contribution of the two attitudinal variables in predicting the outcome variables. Table 8 presents results of four stepwise regression analyses that used the four outcome variables as criteria. Depending on the outcome variable to be predicted, there were some differences in amounts of contributions to those outcome vari-

ables by job involvement and organizational commitment. Job involvement accounted for a greater percentage of the variance in self-rated performance and self-rated absenteeism, whereas organizational commitment accounted for a greater percentage of the variance in non-work satisfaction and intention to leave.

In order to further examine differences in predicting job involvement and organizational commitment with a number of sets of predictors, the demographic and psychological variables were grouped into a broad 'personal' characteristics and the other five characteristics(i.e., the job-related, organizational structure, role-related, work experience, and job satisfaction) were grouped into a broad 'situational' characteristics. The results of stepwise regression analyses showed that the whole personal characteristics accounted for 45% of the variance in job involvement and for 35% of the variance in organizational commitment. Also, the whole situational characteristics explained 36% of the variance in job involvement and 43% of the variance in organizational commitment. Thus, the personal characteristics explained more variance in predicting

Table 8. Results of Stepwise Regression Analyses of Outcome Variables on Job Involvement and Organizational Commitment

Variable	Order	R ²
Performance		
Job involvement	1	.05
Organizational commitment	2	.06
Non-work satisfaction		
Organizational commitment	1	.11
Absenteeism		
Job involvement	1	.06
Organizational commitment	2	.07
Intention to leave		
Organizational commitment	1	.20
Job involvement	2	.21

job involvement than in predicting organizational commitment, whereas the situational characteristics explained more variance in predicting organizational commitment than in predicting job involvement.

Then, hierarchical regression analyses were employed to examine if the situational variables explained additional variance in predicting job involvement and organizational commitment after the personal variables were entered. The demographic variables were entered into the equation first. Next, with the demographic variables entered, the psychological variables were added. The third step was to enter the job-related variables to examine if the job-related variables explained additional variance in job involvement and organizational commitment after controlling for the demographic and psychological variables. The organizational structure variables were added for the next step. They were followed by entering the role-related variables and then the work experience variables. Finally, the job satisfaction variables were added to the equation.

Table 9 shows R^2 and increase in R^2 after each step in predicting job involvement and organizational commitment. With respect to the prediction of job involvement, after step 1, with the demographic variables in the equation, $R^2 = .143$, $F(6,419) = 11.6$, $p < .001$. After step 2, addition of the psychological variables to the equation resulted in a significant increment in $R^2(.31)$. Addition of the job-related variables did not significantly improve R^2 . After step 4, the organizational structure variables did not account for any additional variance in job involvement. When the role-related variables were added to the equation, there was a significant increment in R^2 of $.025$, $p < .01$. Addition of the work experience variables and the job satisfaction variables did not yield a significant improvement in R^2 .

In predicting organizational commitment, after step

1, with only the demographic variables entered, $R^2 = .072$, $F(6,419) = 5.39$, $p < .001$. Similar to job involvement, addition of the psychological variables to the equation resulted in a large increment in R^2 of $.29$, $p < .01$. Also, the job-related variables did not account for any additional variance in organizational commitment. Unlike Job Involvement, however, addition of the organizational structure variables to the equation significantly improved $R^2(.045)$, $p < .01$. An additional $.05$ of the variance ($p < .01$) in organizational commitment was explained by addition of the role-related variables to the equation. The work experience variables also explained an additional $.04$ of the variance ($p < .01$). Finally, when the job satisfaction variables were added to the equation, an additional $.03$ of the variance ($p < .01$) in organizational commitment was explained.

In summary, 45% of the variance in job involvement was explained by the personal variables. Any of the situational sets of variables, except for the role-related set, did not account for an additional variance in job involvement. All the situational variables explained only an additional 6% of the variance in job involvement. In organizational commitment, however, the situational variables contributed reliably to predict organizational commitment, explaining an additional 17% of the variance. Also, except for the job-related set, all the other situational sets of variables explained the additional variance in organizational commitment.

Thus, the results of the hierarchical regression analyses clearly showed that the personal variables contributed more variance in predicting job involvement than the situational variables. In explaining organizational commitment, on the contrary, the situational variables were just as important as the personal variables. In conclusion, the results of various multiple regression analyses provided empirical

Table 9. Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis of A Number of Sets of Predictors on Job Involvement and Organizational commitment

	JI		OC	
	R ²	R ²	R ²	R ²
	(increment)		(increment)	
Step 1				
Demographic	.143**		.072**	
Step 2				
Demographic				
Psychological	.449**	.306**	.361**	.290**
Step 3				
Demographic				
Psychological				
Job-related	.462**	.013	.371**	.010
Step 4				
Demographic				
Psychological				
Job-related				
Organizational structure	.467**	.005	.416**	.045**
Step 5				
Demographic				
Psychological				
Job-related				
Organizational structure				
Role-related	.492**	.025**	.465**	.049**
Step 6				
Demographic				
Psychological				
Job-related				
Organizational structure				
Role-related				
Work experience	.502**	.010	.500**	.036**
Step 7				
Demographic				
Psychological				
Job-related				
Organizational structure				
Role-related				
Work experience				
Job satisfaction	.514**	.012	.528**	.028**

NOTE. JI=Job Involvement; OC=Organizational Commitment. ** $p < .01$

evidence of the discriminant validity of the measures of job involvement and organizational commitment.

DISCUSSION

Much research has been conducted on job involvement and organizational commitment because of their importance in predicting key individual work outcomes, such as performance, absenteeism, and turnover. However, the discriminant validity of job involvement and organizational commitment has not been clearly demonstrated. Unlike other studies, this study included a large variety of variables, and then grouped them into the eight categories to provide a clear conceptual difference between job involvement and organizational commitment. More importantly, job involvement and organizational commitment were included in a single study. The present study not only supported the discriminant validity of job involvement and organizational commitment, but indicated how the two measures differed conceptually and empirically.

First, the results of confirmatory factor analyses showed that the Two-factor model yielded higher values on a number of fit indices than did the One-factor model, and that the difference in chi-squares between the two models was significant. This supported the conceptual difference between job involvement and organizational commitment. Second, the relationships between the two attitudinal variables and each of the eight sets of variables were examined. The Unequal model always provided a better fit to the data than the Equal model in terms of the goodness-of-fit indices. Also, the differences in chi-squares between the two models were significant for all eight sets, providing further empirical evidence of the discriminant validity of the measures of job involvement and organizational commitment. Third,

the results of a series of multiple regression analyses also showed that the personal variables were more important to the understanding of job involvement. However, the situational variables were more important to the understanding of organizational commitment.

Before discussing the results, a fundamental question should be asked concerning the adequacy of the translation procedures used in this study. Most of the scales used were originally English versions translated into Korean. This study was not specifically intended to investigate the quality of the translation, and thus no direct effort was made to demonstrate the quality of the translation. A backward translation procedure was used to develop the Korean versions. A very satisfactory degree of agreement was found between the original English versions and the backward translated English versions. It has been shown in a number of cross-cultural studies that use of the backward translation procedure has resulted in good quality of translations (Hulin, Drasgow, Komocar, 1982; Hulin & Mayer, 1980; Katerberg, Smith, & Hoy, 1977; McCabe, Dalessio, Briga, & Sasaki, 1980). Thus, inadequacies in the translation procedures alone appear to be inappropriate to explain the results.

The relationships between job involvement and organizational commitment and a variety of other variables used in this study are discussed, comparing with the results found using groups of American employees. Those correlations reported in this study were generally consistent with those reported for American employees. Most of the findings appeared to be explained by a similar logic used to explain the findings for American employees. One exception was the correlation between sex and organizational commitment. The relationship between the two variables reported in this study was opposite to the result reported in the literature for American workers. Hrebi-

niak and Alutto (1972) claimed that women are more committed to the organization than men because of the perception of higher cost of leaving the organization. This relationship has been supported in a number of studies for American workers (Angle & Perry, 1981; Grusky, 1966; Hrebiniak & Alutto, 1972). However, in this study, women were less committed to the organization than men. A plausible explanation for Korean women having lower commitment scores is that severe discrimination exists against women in terms of promotion, salary, and other benefits in Korean organizations, thus making them less committed to their organization. A second explanation is that most of the women in this study were lower-ranked workers (99.4% of the total women were mere employees), who could be assumed to be less committed to the organization than high-ranked workers. Thus job rank may account for most of the variance in organizational commitment, not sex.

Another interesting finding was that the Confucianism work ethic was the best predictor of both job involvement and organizational commitment. Korean people in the early socialization process learn the value of loyalty to parents, a society, or a country through the influence of the Confucianism. This ethical standard appears to later influence their commitment to a job or organization. Koreans appear to feel that it is morally right to have a strong commitment to their supervisor and organization. Interestingly, unlike in other studies used American samples, in this study the Protestant work ethic did not play an important role in explaining job involvement and organizational commitment. Thus, to Korean workers the value of loyalty appears to be a more important factor than hard work in explaining job involvement and organizational commitment.

Several issues should be noted about the results in this study. First, a cautious approach should be taken

in interpreting the importance of the personal variables in explaining both job involvement and organizational commitment. Although the personal variables explained a large amount of the variance in both job involvement and organizational commitment, most of the explained variance is due to the Confucianism work ethic. When the Confucianism work ethic is excluded from the personal variables, the influence of the personal variables on job involvement and organizational commitment would be weak.

Second, there have been only a few cross-cultural studies on job involvement and organizational commitment (Alvi & Ahmed, 1987; Reitz & Jewell, 1979; Sekaran & Mowday, 1981). These studies reported similar findings to those obtained from American workers. In the present study, cross-cultural differences between Korea and America also appeared not to play a major role in explaining the results. The correlations of job involvement and organizational commitment with a large variety of variables were generally consistent with those reported for American employees. Most of the findings appeared to be explained by a similar logic as used to explain the findings for American employees.

Several limitations of the present study should be noted and considered in future research. First, a large number of variables (more than 40 variables), which consisted of more than 200 questions were used in this study. Since all of those questions reflect verbal self-reports, the effects of common method variance on the results may exist. Although this problem may not be likely to change major findings in this study, future research needs to be designed to minimize the effects of common method variance. As Brooke et al. (1988) indicated, multiple methods of assessment (e.g., behavioral observations, ratings by observers) may provide one way to minimize this problem by measuring more accurate estimates of the relations

among the latent variables in LISREL.

Second, in this study, work outcome variables (performance, absenteeism, and turnover intentions) were measured based on self-rated report. One problem with the self-report methods in this study was low reliability. Although self-rated performance and turnover intentions had moderate reliabilities (.78 and .72), the reliability of self-rated absenteeism was very low (.36). Thus, future study should attempt to include objective data on those variables.

Third, since the present study was not intended to investigate the quality of the translation, only a backward translation procedure was used and no further effort was made to demonstrate the quality of the translation. However, Hulin and Mayer (1986) claimed that even excellent backward translations do not automatically result in the equivalence of two language versions. If two versions are not psychometrically equivalent, of course, no comparison can be made between this study's findings and the findings reported for American workers. Thus, future research needs to examine psychometric equivalence between two language versions of scales. Item Response Theory will be appropriate for a careful item analyses.

The present findings suggest that the measures of job involvement and organizational commitment can be used separately to assess employees' commitment to either a job or an organization. However, these findings imply that when attention is given to increasing level of job involvement and organizational commitment of employees, different strategies need to apply to achieve the goal. Organizational intervention programs generally used in an organization (e.g., reducing role conflict, improving leader-subordinate relationship, or providing employees with more opportunities for participating in decision making) may result in higher organizational commitment but, may not

work well on increasing job involvement levels because of the stronger relations of the situational variables with organizational commitment. Attention also should be given to selection techniques for job applicants because of the importance of personal-psychological factors in job factors in job involvement and organizational commitment. Psychological tests could be carefully designed to assess those psychological factors. Subsequent interventions, without considering selection techniques, may not be effective in increasing job involvement and organizational commitment levels and thus may waste organizational resources.

In conclusion, the present study has demonstrated the potential value of obtaining separate measures of job involvement and organizational commitment. The findings suggest that these two attitudinal measures assess empirically distinct concepts. Future attempts should be directed at further understanding of the processes by which these two measures are developed.

REFERENCES

- Alvi, S. A., & Ahmed, S. W. (1987). Assessing organizational commitment in a developing country: Pakistan, a case study. *Human Relations, 40*, 267-280.
- Angle, H., & Perry, J. (1981). An empirical study of theories of organizational and occupational commitment. *Journal of Social Psychology, 97*, 15-22.
- Bentler, P. M. (1983). Some contributions to efficient statistics in structural models: specification and estimation of moment structures. *Psychometrika, 48*, 493-517.
- Bentler, P. M. (1985). *Theory and implementation of EQS: A structural equations program*. Los

- Angeles, CA : BMDP Statistical Software.
- Bentler, P. M., & Bonett, D. G.(1980). Significance tests and goodness of fit in the analysis of covariance structures. *Psychological Bulletin*, *88*, 588-606.
- Brooke, P. P., Russell, D. W., & Price, J. L.(1988). Discriminant validation of measures of job satisfaction, job involvement, and organizational commitment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *2*, 139-145.
- Buchanan, B.(1974). Building organizational commitment: The socialization of managers in work organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *19*, 533-546.
- Flynn, D. M., & Solomon, E.(1985). Organizational commitment: A multivariate test within the banking industry. *Psychological Reports*, *57*, 119-130.
- Grusky, O.(1966). Career mobility and organizational commitment. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *10*, 488-503.
- Hackman, J. R., & Lawler, E. E.(1971). Employee reactions to job characteristics. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *55*, 259-286.(Monograph).
- Hrebiniak, L. G., & Alutto, J. A.(1972). Personal and role-related factors in the development of organizational commitment. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *17*, 555-572.
- Hulin, C. L., Drasgow, H., & Komocar, J.(1982). Applications of item response theory to analysis of attitude scale translations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *67*, 818-825.
- Hulin, C. L., & Mayer, L. J.(1986). Psychometric equivalence of a translation of the Job Descriptive index into Hebrew. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *71*, 83-94.
- Joreskog, K. G., & Sorbom, D.(1984). *LISREL VI user's guide*. Mooresville, IN : Scientific Software.
- Joreskog, K. G., & Sorbom, D.(1986). *LISREL VI : Analysis of linear structural relationships by maximum likelihood*(4th ed.). Morrisville, IN : Scientific Software.
- Kanungo, R.(1982). *Work alienation: An integrative approach*. New York : Praeger.
- Katerberg, R., Smith, F. J., & Hoy, S.(1977). Language, time, and person effects of attitude scale translations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *62*, 385-391.
- Lodahl, T. M., & Kejner, M.(1965). The definition and measurement of job involvement. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *49*, 24-33.
- Marsh, H. W., Balla, J. R., & McDonald, R. P.(1988). Goodness-of-fit indices in confirmatory factor analysis: The effect of sample size. *Psychological Bulletin*, *103*, 391-410.
- McCabe, D. J., Dalessio, A., Briga, J., & Sasaki, J.(1980). The convergent and discriminant validities between the IOR and the JDI: English and Spanish forms. *Academy of Management Journal*, *23*, 778-786.
- Mirels, H. L., & Garrett, J. B.(1971). The Protestant ethic as a personality variable. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *36*, 40-44.
- Moble, W. H.(1977). Intermediate linkage in the relationship between job satisfaction and employees turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *62*, 237-240.
- Morris, J., & Sherman, J. D.(1981). Generalizability of an organizational commitment model. *Academy of Management Journal*, *24*, 512-526.
- Morris, J., & Steers, R. M.(1980). Structural influences on organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *17*, 50-57.
- Morrow, P. C.(1983). Concept redundancy in organizational research: The case of work commit-

- ment. *Academy of Management Review*, 8, 486-500.
- Morrow, P. C., & Goetz, J. F.(1988). Professionalism as a form of work commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 32, 92-111.
- Morrow, P. C., & McElroy, J. C.(1986). On assessing measures of work commitment. *Journal of Occupational Behavior*, 7, 139-145.
- Mowday, R. T., Porter, L. W., & Steers, R. M.(1982). *Employee-organization linkage: The psychology of commitment, absenteeism, and turnover*. New York: Academic Press.
- Mowday, R. T., Steers, R. M., Porter, L. W.(1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 4, 224-247.
- Netemeyer, R. G., Johnston, M. W., Burton, S.(1990). Analysis of role conflict and role ambiguity in a structural equations framework. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75, 148-157.
- Oldham, G. R., & Hackman, J. R.(1981). Relationships between organizational structure and employee reactions: Comparing alternative frameworks. *Administration Science Quarterly*, 26, 66-83.
- Porter, L. W., Steers, R. M., Mowday, R. T., & Boulian, P. V.(1974). Organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover among psychiatric technicians. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 59, 603-609.
- Rabinowitz, S., & Hall, D. T.(1977). Organizational research on job involvement. *Psychological Bulletin*, 84, 265-288.
- Reitz, H. J., & Jewell, L. N.(1979). Sex, locus of control, and job involvement: A six country investigation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 26, 273-281.
- Rizzo, J. R., House, R. J., & Lirtzman, S. I.(1970). Role conflict and ambiguity in complex organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 15, 150-163.
- Ruh, R. A., White, J. K., & Wood, R. R.(1975). Job involvement, values, personal background, participation in decision making and job attitudes. *Academy of Management Journal*, 18, 300-312.
- Saal, F. E.(1978). Job involvement: A multivariate approach. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 63, 53-61.
- Schwylhart, N. R., & Smith, P. C.(1972). Factors in the job involvement of middle managers. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 56, 227-233.
- Sekaran, U., & Mowday, R. T.(1981). A cross-cultural analysis of the influence of individual and job characteristics on job involvement. *International Review of Applied Psychology*, 30, 51-64.
- Smith, P. C.(1987). The revised JDI: A facelift for an old friend. *The Industrial-Organizational Psychologist*, 24, 31-33.
- Smith, P. C., Kendall, L. M., & Hulin, C. L.(1969). *The measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Steers, R. M.(1977). Antecedents and outcomes of organizational commitment. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 22, 46-56.
- Tucker, L. R., & Lewis, C.(1973). A reliability coefficient for maximum likelihood factor analysis. *Psychometrika*, 38, 1-10.

직무관여와 조직몰입 : 서로 다른 개념?

탁진국

성균관대학교 산업심리학과

본 연구는 한국 종업원들을 대상으로 직무관여와 조직몰입 사이의 변별타당도를 검증하기 위한 것이다. 먼저 LISREL 프로그램을 이용하여 두 변인 사이의 확인적 요인분석을 실시하였고 이 두 변인과 다른 변인들 사이의 관계를 분석하였다. 그 결과 직무관여와 조직몰입은 서로 독립적인 구조를 측정하는 것으로 나타났다. 다음에 이 두 변인 사이의 구조상의 차이를 이해하기 위하여 중다회귀분석을 실시하였다. 그 결과 직무관여를 설명하는 데는 개인적 변인들이 상황적 변인들 보다 더 중요한 것으로 나타났고 반대로 조직몰입을 설명하는 데는 상황적 변인들이 더 중요한 것으로 나타났다. 끝으로 이러한 연구 결과가 비교문화적인 관점에서 논의된다. 일반적으로 이 연구에서 나타난 결과들은 미국 종업원들을 대상으로 한 연구 결과들을 설명하기 위하여 사용하는 논리에 의해서 유사하게 설명될 수 있는 것으로 해석된다.