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Introduction

Over the years it has become apparent that our world has changed from a more structured and predictable environment to one that is forever changing. Employees are required to continuously update their skills and knowledge if they want to keep up with these turbulent times, as a stable and progressive career path is no longer the norm (Collin, 1998). As the term career is continuously under discussion, prior to investigating career commitment, career salience and job involvement, this research aimed to define the term career in relation to the changing nature of the work environment. Therefore an attempt was made to answer the question of what currently defines a career by applying it in a cross sectional manner through the application of previous research and literature on the topic, and then by applying the term career to a specific organisational setting.

This research was particularly interested in the Career Commitment Scale, the Career Salience Scale and the Job involvement Questionnaire and how each of these outdated scales may confound the concepts of career commitment, career salience, and job involvement. Career development theories such as Super are relevant here, however the focus of this study was to explore one’s commitment to and the importance one places on their career as well as how involved one is in their job. Thus emphasis was not placed on a person’s development throughout their career.

An example of how career commitment, career salience, and job involvement are unique, yet related concepts may be explained as follows: If an employee is committed to their career one may assume that they regard it as salient. However if an
individual experiences a career as important (i.e. career salience), they may not necessarily be committed to that particular career. Therefore career commitment and career salience cannot be seen as identical concepts yet there is clearly a relationship between these variables.

Job involvement, which was the third factor under consideration, may also be viewed as a related yet separate construct to career commitment and career salience. Take for example an employee who is highly involved in their current job. This could be related to the fact that they are committed to their career and find their career to be important or it may be related to a specific job. Each of these three concepts will impact on each other, however one is still able to consider them as separate and possessing unique characteristics.
1.1 The Meaning of Career

One of the most fundamental issues in organisational and occupational psychology in the last decade has been that of the current and future status of a career. Many profound changes have happened to impact on careers causing a change in both the realisation and the management of a career. The demise of the traditional career has been due to major organisational changes such as downsizing, re-structuring, structural changes, and new practices as well as the broader society’s understanding of the meaning of a career. These have all resulted in different opportunities in terms of career development and advancement. Individuals and companies alike are thus faced with mixed messages and many new and challenging issues. This is all happening in a field that, broadly speaking, is core to both personal and organisational identity (Doherty, 2000).

From the start of the industrial era through to the late 1980’s, the term career was viewed in two similar ways. Firstly, as a property or quality of an occupation or an organisation where a career was seen as a sequence of positions held by the employee in a single organisation and secondly as a property or quality of an individual whereby each individual could pursue a unique career (Greenhaus, 1987). For example a person may be involved in a profession such as that of an accountant or doctor. Three themes arise in the second approach namely, advancement, a career as a profession, and a career as a source of stability (Greenhaus, 1987).
More recent research has identified a movement away from the traditional concept of a ‘career for life’, which was directly related to the rapid rate of social, economic and technological change that encouraged the development of successive or multiple careers (Holmes & Cartwright, 1993). Thus, in today’s society there are obvious flaws with Greenhaus’ (1987) definitions of a career as employees may choose or have to start a new line of work and break the sequence of positions.

Take, for example, someone who loses his or her job. They now have to re-evaluate their situation and may choose to start afresh with a new career or might even have to disrupt their current career path and accept a lower position in another company. Another example may be someone who decides to engage in a line management position whereas previously they were pursuing a particular profession. Finally one must also consider the possibility of women who choose to stop working for a while so that they can stay at home and raise their children. Thus from these examples it is clear that a career may be a disruptive process that does not guarantee stability and advancement opportunities. This raises questions about Greenhaus’ (1987) notion of a career involving advancement, stability, and a single profession.

From this, one realises that Greenhaus’ (1987) definition of a career is no longer wholly applicable. Holmes and Cartwright (1993) developed a slightly more advanced definition and identified a common theme, which runs through many notions of what defines a career. They concluded that a “career is a sequential, predictable, organised path through which individuals pass at various stages of their working lives” (Holmes & Cartwright, 1993, p38). One of the pertinent questions that Holmes and Cartwright (1993) raise is that while the issue of a career is re-appraised
and revived at an organisational level, to what extent has any recognised change been fostered amongst individuals who by necessity or desire seek to change careers? This relates to this particular research as it aims to address the issue of careers from an individualistic perspective in terms of approaching employees and attempting to understand their views on careers.

However, there are some issues that must be raised regarding Holmes and Cartwright’s (1993) definition of a career. For instance, over the years scholars have realised that a career is no longer seen as a static initial job choice that involves a predictable sequence of a person’s work experience over time (Yarnall, 1998). This is largely due to the fact that an increasing number of employees do not remain with one organisation for the duration of their working life and thus do not pursue a natural progression through the organisation’s hierarchical system. The basic assumption here is that individuals have the potential to change throughout their lives and that individual development occurs in multiple dimensions and potentially in multiple directions (Schreuder & Theron, 2001).

Holmes and Cartwright’s (1993) view of a career as a sequential, predictable, organised path may be further critiqued. For example a sequential path implies that the individual progresses in an organisation in a successive and hierarchical manner. However this may not be the case if one takes the example of horizontal movements such as transfers, downward movements such as demotions, and even a complete change due to a dismissal, retrenchment, or resignation (Schreuder & Theron, 2001). In other words a career path should not only be regarded as a constant upward movement involving a sequence of promotions.
When Holmes and Cartwright (1993) define a career as predictable, there are further problematic issues that may be raised. An obvious question to ask is how a person is able to predict what their future career path will look like? In today’s day-and-age, companies are continuously restructuring, merging, and downsizing, all of which impact on issues such as job security and promotional opportunities. Such organisational changes may thus result in some of the movements that have been previously discussed, which include demotions, retrenchments, and lateral movements. In today’s turbulent times, organisations are required to be flexible and adapt to change in order to remain competitive. Therefore if a person decides to work for a particular company, there are no guarantees as to whether their current structures will still be in place in the future, or even if the company will still exist a number of years down the line. So when Holmes and Cartwright (1993) view a career as predictable, one may clearly see that this is no longer the case.

The final adjective that Holmes and Cartwright (1993) use to explain his definition of a career is ‘organised’. As one may already be able to identify, if a career is now viewed as being non-sequential and unpredictable, then how can it possibly be organised? In other words a person may be able to organise their ideal career path, but there is no guarantee that it will come to fruition because the individual will not be able to predict their future sequential path within the organisation due to the continuous changing nature of work. Hence, from what has been addressed thus far, Holmes and Cartwright’s (1993) definition does not appear to still hold true.

Following on from such flaws with Holmes and Cartwright’s (1993) definition of a career, the more current notion of a career has thus moved from a career as being an
objective, sequential approach to one that views a career as a more subjective experience linked to internal matters such as image of self-identity, where an individual may experience a number of different careers within their lifetime within the same or different organisations (Holmes & Cartwright, 1993). This leads to the understanding of a career being “boundaryless” and encompassing movements between organisations as well as in flexible, non hierarchical organisations, where there are few or no observable pathways, and no norms of objectively observable progress or success (Collin, 1998). For example, personal experiences, such as perceived growth adapted to the individual’s needs at his/her particular life stage, may be considered as a measure of success (Holmes & Cartwright, 1993). Therefore careers arise from the interaction of individuals with organisations and society, and it is not only the development of one’s work but also one’s life work (Collin, 1998).

Career decisions are therefore influenced by the social context in which one finds themselves as results show that beyond individual factors such as demographics and work history, individuals’ decisions to change careers are also socially embedded. Findings suggest that the greater the diversity of an individual’s network of advisors, the greater the likelihood that an individual will change jobs (Higgins, 2001). From this one may deduce that the organisation, the individual, and one’s social context all impact on a person’s decision to change jobs. Therefore, even though this research approached individuals in order to conduct this study, the organisation as well as the broader social context in terms of South Africa and the world at large, must also be taken into account in order to fully understand the factors that impact on careers.
Furthermore two of the three instruments that were administered, namely the Career Commitment Scale and the Career Salience Scale, are both over a decade old and what is evident from the above discussion is that the term career has evolved since then. Hence, one may suggest that according to the theory surrounding the definition of a career, these two scales are no longer accurate measures of what defines a career.

For instance, the Career Salience Scale is based on Greenhaus’ (1971) definition of career salience, which is “the perceived importance of work and a career in one’s total life” (Greenhaus, 1971, p209). As for the Career Commitment Scale, Blau (1985) defined career commitment as one’s attitude towards one’s profession or vocation (Blau, 1985). Firstly, work, career, profession, and vocation are all different concepts that are used interchangeably, even though each scale aims to measure a single construct. This may create confusion as to which construct is actually under assessment.

Secondly, in both definitions it is evident that the scales are based on an individual’s subjective interpretation of the various constructs. Therefore if the Career Salience Scale and the Career Commitment Scale are both over a decade old, then they are based on people’s outdated perceptions of what was then viewed a career. As previously discussed up until the late 1980’s the term career was viewed as a sequence of positions held by the employee in a single organisation (Greenhaus, 1987). Thus the Career Salience Scale and the Career Commitment Scale were most probably both based on this outdated, yet at the time, popular definition of a career.
1.2 Careers and the Changing Nature of Work

From what has been mentioned above, a career has already been defined as ‘boundaryless’ and flexible, and considers not only the development of one’s work but also one’s life work (Collin, 1998). This definition illustrates a general trend in the working world whereby a persistence of unemployment, retrenchments and downsizing appear to be the norm, and technology is considered a substitution for people (Herr, 2001). Such changes have resulted in a more prominent focus on the internal, subjective elements of how the individual views his or her career as uncertainties within the workplace have led to each employee relying on themselves instead of the organisation for security (Yarnall, 1998).

For many, the increased insecurity of jobs in organisations, coupled with fewer opportunities, longer hours of work and demands for more flexible working, has signalled a change in the psychological contract (Yarnall, 1998). A psychological contract is an unwritten, implied agreement that exists between employees and their employer and focuses on the mutual behavioural expectations surrounding each role. This may be termed a promissory contract as promises are perceived, payment in a manner consistent with promises is evident, and there is an acceptance of obligations (Robbins, 2001). After entering the company, members feel whether the company has fulfilled this contract, which affects their behaviours or attitudes towards the company. That is, when employees feel that their employers have failed to fulfil their obligations, the employees tend to reduce their obligations by showing absenteeism, a decreased level of commitment, and by leaving the organisation (Chang, 1999).
Traditionally the psychological contract emphasised that the company would provide job security and advancement opportunities if the employee remained with the company and maintained a high level of job performance. However, with what has been discussed thus far in terms of the changing nature of work, it is apparent that the stability and security associated with traditional psychological contracts are reduced.

Therefore there has been a shift away from the traditional psychological contract as employees no longer trust in their future with an employer and yet are being expected to give higher levels of performance in empowered positions. In an effort to provide a more favourable scenario for employees, organisations are now moving towards the concept of ensuring employability, by offering greater opportunities for development and continuous learning to keep skills current in the marketplace, in return for high performance and productivity (Yarnall, 1998).

The movement towards self-development and self-responsibility for careers, with appropriate mechanisms from organisations, has gained in popularity in recent years. This has been due to the increase of voluntary self developed styled career initiatives such as personal development plans, learning resource centres, career workshops and career guides (Hirsch & Jackson, 1996). These in turn have aided employees by expanding their range of competencies and assisted organisations in meeting what Hirsch and Jackson (1996) identify as the four key drivers for organisations.

The first driver is the increased need to build a skill base within the organisation, which can respond swiftly and flexibly to changing business needs. Secondly, the move towards more customer-oriented and quality driven cultures, which demand
higher levels of performance and motivation. Thirdly, the fear of losing key staff, and finally concerns about succession planning to ensure the delivery of a long term business strategy. In turn, as the organisation invests in their employees through development opportunities, the employees remain marketable and employable (Hirsch & Jackson, 1996).

In line with this particular study the large retail company, which is under investigation has the continuous pressure of remaining ahead of its competitors. Self-development and training initiatives could provide the employees with the necessary skills to ensure that there is a competitive edge and that the workforce is flexible and motivated. Furthermore the retail industry is highly customer oriented, which relates back to the driver which emphasises a quality driven culture. Hence the four key drivers put forward by Hirsch and Jackson (1996) reflect the needs of the organisation under discussion in this particular research.

1.3 Protean Careers

As the nature of work changes and impacts on the traditional psychological contract, one begins to realise that over time the definition of a career, as well as the employee-employer relationship, are indeed continuously evolving. As peoples’ careers increasingly become a succession of short learning cycles and as individuals move in and out of various product areas, technologies, functions, organisations, and other work environments, there has been a natural movement to the establishment of what Hall (1976) labelled the ‘protean career’. According to this almost thirty year old
definition, a protean career is based on personal career choices and a search for self-fulfilment as these are the integrative and unifying elements in life (Hall, 1976).

A protean career is thus a career that is frequently changing based on both changes in the person’s interests, abilities, and values and changes in the work environment. Compared to the traditional career, employees take major responsibility for managing their own careers. In line with Collin’s (1998) definition of a career, protean careers involve horizontal growth, expanding one’s range of competencies, whereby the goals are learning, the expansion of identity, and psychological success (Herr, 2001).

Psychological success is defined as the feeling of pride and accomplishment that comes from achieving life goals that are not limited to achievements at work (e.g. raising a family, good physical health) and may result in a stress free environment. This type of success is more under the control of the employees and is self determined rather than solely determined through signals the employee receives from the company (e.g. promotion, pay increase) (Noe et al, 2000). This reiterates the move away from the organisation taking responsibility for their employees’ job security, to emphasis being placed on the individual and their role in remaining employable.

As the changes in the world of work persist, more and more people are becoming self-employed and organisations and employees are highlighting the need for lifelong learning and appropriate strategies for career guidance and support. People need to know how to adapt to change, accept ambiguity and uncertainty, and negotiate job or career changes multiple times in their working lifetimes. People must also be able to plan and act on shifting career opportunities, develop technical and social skills,
possess the ability to understand how and why such skills are used, modified, and supplemented, as well as have the motivation to be career resilient (Herr, 2001).

This emphasis on continuous learning and learning beyond knowing how to do something, in conjunction with the changes in the psychological contract, are altering the direction and frequency of movement within careers. Traditionally, career patterns consisted of a series of steps arranged in a linear hierarchy, which are related to an increase in authority, responsibility, and compensation (Noe et al, 2000). These traditional career patterns have not disappeared, rather career patterns involving movement across specialisations, have become more prevalent. In order to develop employees for these new career patterns, they will need the opportunity to determine their interests and their skills’ strengths and weaknesses. Based on this information, employees will need to seek out appropriate development experiences that will likely involve job experiences and relationships as well as formal courses (Noe et al, 2000).

1.4 Career Development

According to Herr (2001) such changes in careers and work may have a direct negative impact on an individual’s self-worth, personal identity, and dignity. For instance, as job security is no longer guaranteed, an individual may ask ‘why me’ and question their competence when they have been retrenched or demoted, whilst their colleagues have the privilege of continued employment. The practice of career development is thus one important tool that may be implemented in an organisation as it aims to minimise these negative feelings associated with organisational and environmental changes. This is done by assisting people in identifying and learning
skills, by which they can be more effective in planning for and choosing jobs, in making and managing effective transitions and adjustments to work, and in working cross-culturally and cross-nationally (Herr, 2001).

Career development describes both the factors and processes that influence an individual’s career behaviour. Factors include the constellation of psychological, sociological, educational, physical, economic, and chance factors that combine to shape an individual’s career behaviour over their lifespan. On the other hand, processes are the interventions or practices that are used to enhance a person’s career development or enable the person to make more effective career decisions (Herr, 2001). Thus, inherent in this definition are two theories of career development, namely a lifespan approach, which follows the likes of Ginsburg and Super, and an approach that identifies how career behaviour is changed by particular interventions, which includes the ideas put forward by Ann Roe and Bordin (Herr, 2001).

However, some of the complex and interrelated changes, which are taking place may have deep-seated and long-term elements that are difficult to identify, unravel and assess. Managers, counsellors, and employees still have to pick their way forward in this uncertain field. They may no longer be able to rely on past experiences as a guide to the future, but have to find new ways to frame their understanding of what is happening and to facilitate their practice. Their needs are now, as perhaps never before, creating a demand for career scholarship, for concepts, definitions, theories and methodologies with rigour, relevance and utility (Collin, 1998).
Thus for individuals operating in this new employment context, change in one’s career may be experienced in a multitude of ways. It may yield a sense of renewal and personal growth, or alternatively, a sense of inconsistency and even confusion regarding one’s own goals and work values (Higgins, 2001).

This all relates back to why this particular research was conducted. The three scales under investigation as well as the meanings associated with what defines a career are all under examination in an attempt to provide a more modern and in depth re-evaluation of these concepts and instruments.

From what has been discussed thus far, it becomes evident that the definition of a career has definitely evolved over the years. What is also apparent is that there is a change in nature of the employment relationship whereby job security is no longer a guarantee. This thought leads onto a discussion addressing the impact that such changes have had on the importance that people place on their careers.

1.5 Career Salience

Greenhaus was one of the first people to research and define the concepts of career salience and career commitment, which according to him, were both identified as the “perceived importance of work and a career in one’s total life” (Greenhaus, 1971, p209).

Greenhaus (1971) further clarified career salience and argued that it consisted of three dimensions, all of which refer to specific items in the scale. 1) Relative importance of
work and a career, for example one item states “I intend to pursue the job of my choice even if it cuts deeply into the time I have for my family.” 2) General attitude toward work, whereby one item mentions that “Work is one of the few areas in life where I can gain real satisfaction.” 3) Concern for planning and advancement, for example one item points out that “I enjoy thinking about and making plans about my future career” (See Appendix B).

However, even though Greenhaus (1971) defined three sub-components of career salience, he and many other researchers have used the term interchangeably with career commitment (Greenhaus, 1971; Weiner & Vardi, 1980). This may be considered problematic because the Career Salience Scale and the Career Commitment Scale are supposed to be measuring two separate constructs however they were initially based on the same definitions. Career salience is aimed at measuring the importance one places on one’s career whilst career commitment is supposed to measure one’s level of attachment to or identification with a career.

Furthermore, Greenhaus’ (1971) definition of career salience comes across as quite vague and does not adequately define the complexities surrounding the notion of career salience. This may be illustrated in the use of various terms such as ‘work’ and ‘job’ in most of the items of the scale, when the scale only aims to measure career salience. Following on from such a flaw, researchers today still use Greenhaus’ (1971) definition of career salience, which states that career salience is the “perceived importance of work and a career in one’s total life” (Greenhaus, 1971, p209). An alternative and less popular definition of career salience has been developed by Stumpf and Lockhart (1987), who state that career salience is the “perceived
importance of work in occupational choice and satisfaction (Stumpf & Lockhart, 1987, p260). In Stumpf and Lockhart’s (1987) definition of career salience different constructs, such as ‘work’ and ‘occupation’, are also present and therefore most researchers appear to opt for Greenhaus’ (1971) definition, as he provided the first research on the topic career salience.

1.6 Previous Research on Greenhaus’ Career Salience Scale

As previously noted there was an initial overlap in the definitions of career salience and career commitment for a number of years. Even to this day some researchers continue to opt for Greenhaus’ (1971) definition and scale when measuring career commitment and generally published articles have struggled to distinguish between career commitment and career salience (Greenhaus, 1971; Weiner & Vardi, 1980).

This review has also noted that the definition of a career has changed over the years and therefore this construct will need to be revisited. Such a view is supported by numerous authors who have criticised the operationalisations of career salience and the lack of congruence between the definition of career salience and the items of the Career Salience Scale, indicating poor construct validity (Blau, 1985; Morrow, 1983, 1993; Morrow, Eastman & McElroy, 1991).

It is also important to note that in Greenhaus’ first article that introduced the concept of career salience, no factor analysis was conducted in an attempt to identify whether the three dimensions of his scale loaded onto the three different factors that he later defined as 1) Relative importance of work and career, 2) General attitude toward
work, and 3) Concern for planning and advancement. Therefore at this initial stage it was unclear as to whether or not these may be viewed as three distinct sub-components of career salience (Allen, 1999).

However, two years later Greenhaus did conduct a factor analysis which identified three factors that accounted for a total of 27% of the variance explained, all of which confirmed the initial three dimensions of career salience (Greenhaus, 1973). As items with a higher variance convey more meaningful information, a variance of 27% is considered quite poor, especially for psychological research, which usually considers a variance of between 40%-60% as reasonable (Royce, 1973). Therefore one may question the initial construction of the CSS and its three dimensions and the reliability of these three dimensions?

In conjunction with this, it is evident that the first sub-scale of the CSS, known as “one’s relative importance of work and a career”, mixes and makes inappropriate reference to different experiences, namely work and career, that may inspire different attitudes. In addition, 11 items include the term ‘job’, two items refer solely to the construct ‘work’, eight items use the term “career”, and five items incorporate a combination of job, work, and/or career in a single statement (See Appendix B). These may all be viewed as different areas in one’s occupational life and the incorrect use of these referents may elicit an inappropriate response, which may partly explain the lack of internal reliability and discriminant validity that has been found in the CSS (Allen, 1999).
Since 1971, career salience has been extensively applied to numerous work related variables. For example Greenhaus’ (1971) Career Salience Scale was used to measure career salience as a moderator of the relationship between satisfaction with occupational preference and satisfaction with life in general (Greenhaus, 1974). Possible links between career salience, vocational indecision and work values (Greenhaus & Simon, 1977), as well as between career salience, close relationships, and gender, have also been reported (Moya, Exposito, & Ruiz, 2000).

In a study conducted by Greenhaus and Simon (1976), they identified that a positive relationship between career salience and the tendency to choose an ideal occupation would be especially strong for high self-esteem persons. Whilst among low self-esteem people, whose feelings of competence are weak and social influences are strong, the degree of career salience should not greatly affect the tendency to choose an occupation they consider ideal (Greenhaus & Simon, 1976).

Following on from Greenhaus and Simon’s (1976) investigation of career salience Illfelder (1980) stated that while situational factors did not seem to explain career salience, intra-psychic factors, such as self-esteem, psychological success on the job, the need for competence, and job involvement, could perhaps be useful in explaining higher amounts of variance. Unless one feels competent, involved, and/or successful in what one is doing in one’s career, feelings of worthwhileness of the career and the satisfactions derived therefrom would be minimal, making one’s career far from salient (Illfelder, 1980).
On the other hand, when one has high self-esteem and confidence in one’s own competence, which are reinforced by the daily successes experienced at the workplace, then one identifies with the job and gets involved with the work. Thus job involvement would tend to further heighten the perceived salience in one’s career (Sekeran, 1982).

Greenhaus’ Career Salience Scale has received further criticism over the years from Morrow who published numerous articles on the topic of work commitment, which consists of five foci namely the Protestant work ethic, career salience, job involvement (central life interest), organisational commitment, and union commitment (Morrow, 1983; Morrow & McElroy, 1986; Morrow & Goetz, 1988; Morrow & Worth, 1989; Morrow, Eastman, & McElroy, 1991).

A study conducted by Morrow and McElroy (1986) found career salience to be positively related to work ethic endorsement, work as a central life interest, organisational commitment, and job involvement. The correlation between career salience and job involvement \( r = .62 \) was so strong that Morrow and McElroy (1986) suggested that the discriminant validity of these two measures might be called into question. Such a strong relationship may not actually be so surprising when one takes into account the fact that the Career Salience Scale makes numerous references to the term ‘job’ rather than ‘career’.

Further evidence has also established an overlap between the items of Greenhaus’ Career Salience Scale and other work commitment scales and constructs such as job involvement and organisational commitment (Morrow, 1983; 1993). Furthermore the
definition of career salience, which Greenhaus (1971) also uses to define career
commitment, does not appear to match the scale’s content affecting its construct
validity (Morrow, 1993). Hence, Morrow (1993) does not recommend using career
salience for work commitment research as her research depicted a low reliability
measure and has found little evidence to support Greenhaus’ (1971) Career Salience
Scale’s convergent and discriminant validity.

1.6.1 Greenhaus’ Career Salience Scale, Gender and Family Issues

Sekaran (1982) also identified two additional variables that would also seem
important for the enhancement of career salience, namely the extent to which
individuals have prepared themselves educationally for specific careers and the extent
to which they have consciously planned for a dual career family lifestyle. These two
factors would seem important since they view a career as an integral part of one’s life
and highlight the necessary planning and investments that must be undertaken to link
work life to other aspects of one’s life.

Sekaran’s (1982) investigation of the career salience of men and women in dual
career families was one of the earliest attempts to apply career salience to a more
modern outlook of the working relationship, which entails increasing numbers of
women entering the workforce. Career salience, when applied to gender, has been
defined as the extent to which individuals actually plan to participate in the labour
force. In other words, according to findings from research conducted by Almquist and
Angrist (1970), work is a female’s preferred adult role alternative, and their
motivation to work is even higher when children are born.
Thus if organisations perceive that females have lower levels of career salience than their male counterparts, then they may hesitate to expend resources hiring them and training them for lateral and upward mobility (Sekaran, 1982). However, from the study, it was concluded that there were no significant differences in terms of the perceived career salience of men and women. Thus, if indeed in the past women did not see their careers as central to their lives that may not still be an accurate reflection, according to Sekaran’s (1982) study. From this study one is able to identify that gender issues and career salience may also be related to how an individual perceives and interprets a career.

Chi-Chang (1995) researched the variations in career salience and how they affect a person’s perception of his/her non-work life roles. More specifically, he wanted to know to what extent men and women with different career orientations differ in their perceptions of and commitment to the family roles. In this particular study, men were reported to be more career-oriented than their female counterparts.

A more recent study conducted by Moya, Exposito, & Ruiz (2000) further delved into the topic of gender and career salience. They identified that despite the extent of women’s occupational involvement and the indication that women’s aspirations have substantially increased over the past decades, men’s goals and aspirations still exceed those of women. According to this particular study, the researchers identified many factors contributing to the gendered pattern of career salience and educational and occupational choices, ranging from those of societal nature to those of psychological or social-psychological character (Moya, Exposito, & Ruiz, 2000).
The findings from this research showed that men and women place the same importance on their career. Results concluded that personal variables related to career salience in women (high educational attainment, equalitarian gender ideology) differed from those related to career salience in men (high instrumentality, sexist gender ideology, and not having a job). Furthermore, having children and being dependant in their relationship were related to lower career salience in women but these factors did not affect the career salience of men (Moya, Exposito, & Ruiz, 2000).

1.7 Career Commitment

Career commitment, when compared to career salience, has however been defined a number of times. Blau’s (1985) re-conceptualisation of career commitment is to date the most commonly recognised definition. He included Greenhaus’ (1971) definition in his operationalisation of career commitment, which he defined as “one’s attitude towards one’s profession or vocation” (Blau, 1985 p278). According to Blau (1985), although the referent’s ‘profession’ and ‘vocation’ are somewhat restrictive, they are necessary as they anchor career commitment concepts in more specific terminology than ‘work in general’ whilst also using broader referents than ‘job’ and ‘organisation’. This was an attempt to minimise the redundancy of career commitment with other concepts, such as job involvement and organisational commitment (Blau, 1985).

This definition does however isolate an individual’s attitudes towards a current, specific career. Career commitment is thus seen as an affective concept which
represents identification with a series of related jobs in a specific field of work and is behaviourally expressed in an ability to cope with disappointments in the pursuit of career goals (Aryee & Tan, 1992). From such a definition it is once again evident that even Blau’s (1985) view of career commitment needs some re-adjustments, as a career may no longer be a concrete construct. Careers were defined by Blau (1985), as “boundaryless” and unpredictable; a person may even change their profession or vocation a number of times in their lifetime (Collin, 1998). So the question arises, if an individual’s career is so vague and unknown, then what is the individual actually committed to?

Some researchers (Carson & Bedeian, 1994; Ayree & Tan, 1992; Chang, 1999) have attempted to answer this question and further development and refinement of the concept of career commitment has taken place. A more recent and applicable definition is that a career is the development of personal goals, as well as attachment to, identification with, and involvement in those goals (Corarelli & Bishop, 1997). From this definition one may once again identify how careers and career commitment transcend occupations and jobs, how a career may involve several jobs, and that career commitment takes on a longitudinal perspective (Corarelli & Bishop, 1997). This definition of career commitment thus appears to be a more recent illustration of the construct and will therefore be applied throughout this research in relation to discussions on career commitment, with the exception of Blau’s Career Commitment Scale.
1.8 Previous Research on Blau’s Career Commitment Scale

Career commitment has managed to attract many researchers’ interest over the years. One reason for this may be because the working world is continuously changing, which in turn affects the idea of what defines a career. For example, nowadays a career provides a significant source of occupational meaning and continuity even when organisations have become unable to provide employment security (Aryee, Chay, & Chew, 1994). However, operationalising career commitment has also been found to be problematic because of its vague boundaries. This vagueness seems to result, in part, from a lack of agreement about what constitutes a career (Carson & Bedeian, 1994).

Another reason for there being a larger interest in career commitment is due to Blau’s (1989) Career Commitment Scale, which more researchers are using. This is due to its impressive psychometric properties, including an alpha reliability for the items of 0.76, factor analyses which have shown the differentiation of career commitment from job involvement and organisational commitment, and its distinctiveness from Greenhaus’ (1971) Career Salience Scale (Blau, 1985, 1988, 1989).

Blau’s (1989) Career Commitment Scale was used in one particularly interesting study that was conducted by Chang (1999). According to Chang (1999) individuals enter a company with their own career plans and are attracted to the company if it satisfies their career needs. He implied that the attitudes of individuals toward their career might affect their attitudes toward their company because individuals are pursuing their careers in their current organisation, and because their company is not
the only one they will be working for in the future. Chang (1999, p1258) then went on to define career commitment as “an individual’s attitude toward a career”. This may be regarded as quite a brief and vague definition for such a complex construct. However it becomes apparent how Chang’s (1999) definition of career commitment may be related to Sekeran’s (1982) views on gender and career salience, as both ideas are based on an individual’s subjective interpretation of what defines a career.

Chang’s (1999) research then went on to further explore some of the properties pertaining to career commitment. In the study he stated that individuals with a strong degree of career commitment might show higher levels of expectations and requirements from the organisation with which they have forged relationships. Here the idea of career commitment as a complex moderator of organisational commitment and turnover intention was researched. The findings showed that career commitment moderated only the effect of supervisors’ support on affective commitment and in general career commitment did not strongly moderate the effect of an employee’s perception of company practices on organisational commitment. Career commitment was however stronger at predicting turnover intentions (Chang, 1999).

A key variable in several integrative models of organisational behaviour, career commitment has been related to various work-related outcomes. For example, it has been positively associated with both skill development and job performance and negatively correlated with actual turnover. (Carson & Bedeian, 1994).

Other researchers who have also used Blau’s (1989) Career Commitment Scale have found that individuals who are highly committed to their careers spend more time
developing skills, and are less likely to withdraw from their career and jobs (Ayree & Tan, 1992; Blau, 1989). According to Bedeian, Kemery, and Pizzolatto (1991) employees with high career commitment are however more likely to leave their current organisation when other career opportunities arise outside of the organisation.

As previously mentioned, Blau’s Career Commitment Scale defines career commitment as “one’s attitude towards one’s profession or vocation”. Items such as “I would take another job that paid the same” and “If I could do it all over, I would not choose this vocation” seemingly investigate the importance of being in a specific profession or vocation (Blau, 1985) (See Appendix C). Therefore, unlike Greenhaus’ Career Salience Scale, which looks at the importance of a career in a broader life perspective where the nature or type of career is not specified, Blau’s Career Commitment Scale considers a commitment to a specific profession or vocation. Although, these are not indicative of what defines a career (Allen, 1999).

However, there is a similarity between the two scales as they both use different constructs interchangeably to define a single concept. For example, in Blau’s Career Commitment Scale, the term “vocation” appears in six items, whilst “job” appears once. Only one item, which states “I want a career in this vocation” applies the concept of a career, however it also incorporates the idea of a vocation (See Appendix C). Furthermore, Blau’s 1985) definition of career commitment involves two distinctly different terms, namely a profession and a vocation, the former of which is not even mentioned in the items pertaining to scale.
Overall, there appears to be clear distinctions in the definitions of career salience and career commitment as each scale illustrates how these two concepts may be viewed as representing different perspectives in relation to careers. For example career salience refers to the importance one places on a career when viewed as being part of one’s broader life, whilst career commitment relates to a person’s level of commitment to a specific profession or vocation (Allen, 1999).

This research thus aims to further investigate such findings by focusing on whether or not there truly is an overlap in what the Career Salience Scale and the Career Commitment Scale each claim to measure.

### 1.8.1 Career Commitment and Withdrawal Cognitions

Certain concerns remain with Blau’s (1985) measure. This includes the high correspondence reported by Blau (1989) between career commitment and career withdrawal cognitions, which may be due to items in his measure emphasising intention-to-remain in one’s vocation. Two example items from the measure are, “I would take a different job that paid the same” and “I enjoy my vocation too much to give it up” (Blau, 1989) (See Appendix C).

This overlap of intention-to-remain and career commitment items illustrates a concern involving construct contamination. Thus research is needed to determine the degree to which career commitment and career withdrawal cognitions can be distinguished empirically, as well as conceptually. Such research was carried out by Jauch, Osborn, and Terpening (1980) who suggested that an individual’s attachment to a specific organisation may result not only from identification with that organisation, but also
from identification with either a specific career or a particular set of peers. Thus, if individuals are committed to a specific career, but not a specific organisation or peer group, these latter orientations may be comparatively unimportant in predicting either turnover or turnover intentions, as long as the organisation provides career opportunities.

According to Bedeian, Kemery, and Pizzolatto (1991), career commitment might interact with the expected utility of one’s present job for attaining valued career outcomes to predict an individual’s decision to remain with or leave an organisation. Thus it would be expected that individuals with both higher levels of career commitment and anticipated career growth opportunities would be less likely to express intentions to quit and, ultimately, turnover than individuals with lower levels (Bedeian, Kemery, & Pizzolatto, 1991).

Further explanation for the usefulness of career commitment in predicting an individual’s decision to remain with or leave an organisation, or the intention to do so, was provided by Carson and Bedeian (1994). Results from their research found evidence of a correspondence between Blau’s (1985) career commitment measure and career withdrawal cognitions. According to their research it could be suggested that the two constructs should be inversely related and this would therefore support the validity of Blau’s (1985) measure.

From what has been mentioned thus far, it is evident that the measurements of career commitment and career salience must be re-examined in line with the definition of a career. Following on from this, one of the rationales for this study was to incorporate
job involvement into the study. The following sections will further explain how a construct such as job involvement is linked to career commitment and career salience.

1.9 **Job Involvement**

In Lodahl and Kejner’s (1965) well-documented research on job involvement they appeared to have succeeded in defining and measuring the construct. They defined job involvement as the “degree to which a person has identified psychologically with his work” (Lodahl & Kejner, 1965, p24). Job involvement looks at the internalisation of values about the goodness of work or the importance of work in the worth of the person, and also considers the degree to which a person’s work performance affects the employee’s self esteem (Lodahl & Kejner, 1965). Throughout Lodahl and Kejner’s (1965) definition of job involvement it is evident that the term “work” is used instead of “job”. Thus as for the definitions of career salience and career commitment, job involvement, as defined here, also applies a construct that holds a different meaning in its explanation.

Following on from this, subsequent research regarding job involvement has identified such conceptual ambiguities with Lodahl and Kejner’s (1965) view. For instance Kanungo (1982) stated that Lodahl and Kejner’s (1965) definition failed to distinguish between two different contexts in which an individual can show personal involvement, namely the work context and the job context. Job involvement is more a function of how much the job can satisfy one’s salient needs whereas work involvement in general is considered a normative belief about the value of work in one’s life and is more a function of one’s past cultural conditioning and socialisation.
(Elloy, Everett, & Flynn, 1991). This lack of distinction between job and work involvement is apparent in some items of the scale that represent a personal psychological identification with the job and a person’s intrinsic motivation at work as a means for fulfilling self-esteem needs (Kanungo, 1982).

Ramsey, Lassk, and Marshall (1995) also illustrated some of the ambiguities in terms of job and work involvement as the Lodahl and Kejner’s (1965) definition contained four categories: 1) Work as a central life interest, 2) Active participation in the job, 3) Performance as central to self-esteem, and 4) Performance consistent with self-concept. They went on to explain some further problems with job involvement and stated that too many other constructs have been incorporated into the definition of job involvement and concluded, as did Kanungo (1982), that job involvement has been made ambiguous due to its multiple meanings (Ramsey, Lassk, & Marshall, 1995). Furthermore by including work centrality in the definition of job involvement it is evident that Lodahl and Kejner (1965) once again use the terms job and work interchangeably, and it may be unclear whether a respondent of their questionnaire would view the two concepts as synonymous (Reeve & Smith, 2001).

In general, earlier conceptualisations of job involvement have thus failed to distinguish two different contexts in which an individual can show personal involvement, namely in a specific job and in a generalised work context. Accordingly, job involvement should be viewed as a generalised cognitive state of psychological identification with the job (Ellroy, Everett, & Flynn, 1991). Involvement in a job is more a function of how much the job can satisfy one’s salient needs. Likewise, work involvement is viewed as a ‘generalised cognitive state of psychological identification
with work’. Involvement with work in general is considered a normative belief about the value of work in one’s life and is more a function of one’s past cultural conditioning and socialisation (Ellroy, Everett, & Flynn, 1991).

Job involvement is thus somewhat different to an individual’s involvement with work in general. As job involvement is dependent upon the extent to which the job satisfies a person’s salient needs, it is more situationally based whereas work involvement is considered a more stable psychological characteristic.

1.10 Previous Research on Kanungo’s Job Involvement Questionnaire

Due to the above-mentioned problems, Gorn and Kanungo’s (1980) research criticised the fact that job involvement is related to the satisfaction of intrinsic rather than extrinsic needs on the grounds that satisfaction of intrinsic needs on the job may be a sufficient but not a necessary condition of job involvement. Thus the satisfaction of intrinsic needs might increase the likelihood of job involvement, but it is not a definition of job involvement itself. Furthermore, Gorn and Kanungo (1980) went on to argue that job involvement is a cognitive state of psychological identification with the job and depends on the degree to which the job is perceived to meet one’s salient needs, be they intrinsic or extrinsic.

Following on from this Kanungo (1982, p342) developed a more refined definition for job involvement, “an individual’s psychological identification or commitment to his/her job”. Kanungo further went on to state, that involvement in a job is more a function of how much the job can satisfy one’s salient needs (Kanungo, 1982 in Elloy,
Everett, & Flynn, 1991). Kanungo also developed the Job Involvement Scale, which is still widely used today.

Research, using Kanungo’s (1982) Job Involvement Scale has found that job involvement has a positive relationship with organisational commitment and professional commitment (Parasuraman & Nachman, 1987; Leong, Huang, & Hsu, 2003), and that job involvement is a useful predictor of organisational citizenship behaviour (Diefendorff, Brown, Kamin, & Lord, 2002). Furthermore, perceived organisational support and satisfaction with rewards have been found to be strong predictors of job involvement. In fact intrinsic rewards made significant positive contributions to job involvement (O’Driscoll & Randall, 1999).

Research has also explained that employees who display high involvement in their jobs consider their work to be an important part of their lives and it is thus potentially important to organisational success (Rabinowitz & Hall, 1981). However, other studies have shown that job involvement is different from other related constructs, such as intrinsic motivation, job satisfaction, and organisational commitment (Blau, 1985).

Blau (1988, 1989) has found evidence to suggest that job involvement is independent of career commitment. This evaluation of career commitment suggests that Blau’s career commitment measure has more and stronger evidence of independence with job involvement and organisational commitment and is therefore preferable to Greenhaus’ career salience measure (Morrow, 1993). Factor analytic examinations are also generally supportive of the instruments reliability as the Job Involvement
Questionnaire has been analysed with other work commitments, including career salience and has been found to be factorially independent of these constructs (Kanungo, 1982; Misra, Kanungo, von Rosenstiel, & Stuhler, 1985). Taken together, these rather extensive results provide convincing evidence for Kanungo’s Job Involvement Questionnaire’s reliability and validity.

A study conducted by Ellroy, Everett, & Flynn (1991) found that job involved individuals differ from their less involved colleagues in several significant ways. For instance, they are more likely to feel their jobs are more stimulating in terms of variety, autonomy, task identity, and feedback. Furthermore, they are more likely to feel that their talents are being used and they see themselves as having greater opportunities to interact with other people. There was also evidence to suggest that there is a negative relationship between job involvement and role conflict and role ambiguity (Ellroy, Everett, & Flynn, 1991).

The research further illustrated that job involvement is positively related to personal satisfaction with security, pay, co-workers, supervisor, growth, and organisational commitment. On the other hand, job involvement was negatively related to desire to leave and burnout (Elloy, Everett, & Flynn, 1991). The researchers stated that their particular research contributed to the understanding of predicting the very complex relationships that exist between job involvement and certain selected personal and job-related variables.
1.11 **Job Involvement, Career Commitment and Career Salience**

The link between job involvement, career commitment and career salience is firstly apparent in the definitions of job involvement and what defines a career. According to Kanungo (1982) job involvement examines how much the job can satisfy one’s salient needs whilst according to Collin (1998) a career is linked to subjective and internal matters such as image of self-identity. Both job involvement and the idea of a career consider the importance of a job and a career as being personal experiences, which involve satisfying internal needs such as image of self or felt identity.

Following on from this, job involvement looks at satisfying salient needs whilst career commitment transcends that of a job and considers the development of personal goals, as well as attachment to, identification with, and involvement in those goals (Corarelli & Bishop, 1997). Therefore being involved in your job is a basis for being committed to your career. Finally career salience is defined as the “perceived importance of work and a career in one’s total life” (Greenhaus, 1971). With this definition there is an obvious link back to the definition of career commitment, as someone with high career salience should experience higher levels of career commitment. In terms of job involvement, if a job is the basis for career commitment then career salience should also share some aspects of job involvement.

From the above mentioned distinctions between what constitutes a job or a career, it is evident that a career within an organisation will frequently imply a longer time frame than will a job and a person may experience more than one career within several
organisations in the same or different jobs. Thus a career can be based on one or more of the significant roles which a person plays over their lifespan (Jans, 1988).

In terms of Greenhaus’ (1971) Career Salience Scale, Blau’s (1989) Career Commitment Scale and Kanungo’s (1982) Job Involvement Questionnaire it is evident why the career salience scale has been used to measure career commitment. For example Blau’s scale only relies upon seven questions to measure the complex construct of career commitment. The career salience scale goes on to include questions that are also relevant to career commitment such as “I don’t think too much about what type of job I’ll be in ten years from now” and “I would move to another part of the country if I thought that it would help advance my career” (See Appendix B). As for the job involvement questionnaire one example of how career commitment and career salience may be linked to job involvement is “Most of my personal life goals are job oriented” (See Appendix D).

This particular research focussed on career commitment, career salience, and job involvement. A similar study conducted by Shore, Thornton, and Shore (1990) looked at the distinctiveness of three work attitudes: career salience, job involvement, and organisational commitment. The findings from the study carried out by Shore, Thornton, and Shore (1990) concluded that career salience and organisational commitment were clearer to distinguish. On the other hand, job involvement and career salience appeared to be less clear to distinguish and employees did not distinguish between the two.
Overall, the three work commitment attitudes, namely career salience, organisational commitment, and job involvement, were found to be significantly inter-related (Shore, Thornton, & Shore, 1990). Thus, according to this study, career salience and job involvement were not clearly distinct from one another, relating to the current research, which aims to identify whether career salience and job involvement, as well as career commitment, are distinct from one another.

Morrow and McElroy (1986) conducted research regarding concept redundancy, amongst various work commitments. According to the researchers, concept redundancy will arise whenever the link between a conceptual definition and measurement procedure is less than perfect. In their study there was evidence of concept redundancy among career salience, job involvement, and work ethic endorsement. The idea of concept redundancy is also under discussion in the current research as it aims to establish whether or not there is a link between the conceptual definitions and measurement procedures of the Career Commitment Scale, the Career Salience Scale, and the Job Involvement Questionnaire.

A work commitment study, which was based on Morrow and McElroy’s (1986) study, was conducted by Blau, Paul, and St. John (1993). A set of different scales were used to test for work commitment redundancy across four facets – career, job, value, and organisation. The career facet measure included Blau’s Career Commitment Scale and Greenhaus’ Career Salience Scale, whilst the job facet applied Kanungo’s Job Involvement Questionnaire. The survey was administered to two different samples, namely part-time MBA students and full-time registered nurses. In the factor analyses that were conducted, it was evident that the career facet measures were weakened by
conceptual confusion and measurement problems, as there were item inconsistencies and construct contamination. In terms of job involvement, three items out of the ten-item scale loaded cleanly on a single factor (Blau, Paul, & St. John, 1993). Further analyses included descriptive statistics and correlations.

One important conclusion that was drawn from this study was that individuals make consistent distinctions between their job, organisation, occupation, and work in general (Blau, Paul, & St. John, 1993). Such a finding is applicable to the current research, as the three instruments under investigation tend to use such terms interchangeably even though they aim to measure a single construct. However, this research is different from Blau, Paul, and St. John’s (1993) study as it exclusively focuses on career commitment, career salience, and job involvement, without placing them in the context of work commitment. Furthermore, this review is largely based on the theoretical underpinnings of the construction of the scales pertaining to these three constructs in order to clarify their distinction from one another and their applicability in today’s society. Therefore, this research appears to explore the basic notions that were put forward in Blau, Paul and St. John’s (1993) research more critically and in more detail.

From the above mentioned examples it is clear that career salience, career commitment and job involvement may be viewed as unique, yet related constructs. Furthermore, there is evidence to suggest that little and perhaps even no research has been conducted regarding the exclusive examination of career commitment, career salience, and job involvement in a single study. Such issues lead to the rationale for conducting this research.
Rationale for Research

The primary aim of this study was to investigate the inter-relationships of career commitment, career salience and job involvement as mentioned by particular scales. In order to carry out this study a closer examination of the definition ‘career’ was undertaken, as evidence has shown that this concept has evolved over the years. Following on from this, this research aimed to determine whether existing career measurement tools have also changed in the interim so as to accurately measure the changing nature of career commitment, career salience and job involvement.

The purpose for researching this particular area was threefold. Firstly, it appeared that previous research has not fully examined career commitment, career salience, and job involvement together in one study. The most applicable research conducted by Blau, Paul and St. John (1993), assessed career commitment, career salience, and job involvement in conjunction with other facets of work commitment, such as organisational commitment and the Protestant work ethic. Hence there appears to be a lack of research pertaining specifically to the Career Salience Scale, the Career Commitment Scale, and the Job Involvement Questionnaire.

The second reason for engaging in this research was that career commitment and career salience are still used interchangeably even though theoretical and empirical evidence has demonstrated that these concepts are unique (Blau, 1985; Corarelli & Bishop, 1997; Collin, 1998). This research therefore aimed to clarify this distinction by critically assessing the term ‘career’ and its applicability to the instruments under discussion.
This leads onto the final reason for conducting this research as evidence has shown that term ‘career’ appears to be one that requires continuous re-evaluation, as its definition should change as the nature of work changes. This study therefore aimed to determine whether commonly used definitions of career are still applicable to the Career Salience Scale, the Career Commitment Scale, and the Job Involvement Questionnaire.

Therefore based on the issues that have been raised thus far regarding the three instruments under investigation, three research questions arise that appear applicable to this study:

1) Is there a distinction between career commitment and career salience?

2) Is there a distinction between career commitment and job involvement?

3) Is there a distinction between career salience and job involvement?
Methodology

A number of methodological issues are discussed in this chapter. Firstly one critically assessed the research design and the procedure that was used. Following on from this the sample that was selected for this particular research was identified. The three instruments, namely the Career Salience Scale (CSS), the Career Commitment Scale (CCS), and the Job Involvement Questionnaire (JIQ) and their psychometric properties are also discussed. The ethical considerations pertaining to this particular study are then addressed, followed by the various methods of analyses that were conducted. These included internal reliability and item analyses, as well as ANOVA’s, correlations and partial correlations, and finally a principal components factor analysis.

2.1 Research Design

A non-probability sampling technique, namely purposive sampling, was used, as it was more convenient and economical than a probability sample. The sample had to have certain characteristics, such as being full time employees who were based in actual stores, and this provided additional information for the purpose of this study.

One must take into account that when a non-probability sampling technique is used the generalisability of the sample is affected as there is no way to estimate the probability of each element being included in the sample, and whether each element has some chance of being included. This usually impacts on the external validity of studies, which looks at population and ecological validity.
Population validity refers to the subjective characteristics of the sample, relative to the population they are drawn from. This study therefore ensured that the sample used was representative of the entire population, which has been defined as Gauteng store level employees who are from a large retail organisation.

Ecological validity establishes whether one is able to generalise from one context to another. Factors to consider here include socio-economic status, the setting, the time at which the research is conducted, and the fact that different subjects react to different investigators in different ways. As eight stores, each from a different area within the Gauteng region, were approached the contexts might differ slightly. However all the employees do work for the same organisation and therefore should follow the same policies and procedures. Thus as the sample consisted of a relatively large proportion of the total number of full-time employees within the Gauteng region, one may assume that this study may be generalised to other stores across South Africa. However, as the retail industry is quite a unique one, it is advised that further research be conducted to assess the applicability of this study’s findings to other organisational settings.

2.2 Procedure

Correspondence, with the Human Resource Manager, took place and permission to conduct this research was granted for the organisation as a whole. The relevant store managers were contacted telephonically and asked whether their store would be willing to participate in this study and if so, to establish a suitable date for administering the questionnaires. It was decided that, due to various resource
constraints such as time and money, only the large flagship stores were approached. These stores were also found to be most applicable as they had the largest number of employees and were located in all of the major areas around Gauteng. Thus eight stores in total were approached, all of which chose to participate in this study.

The researcher distributed the questionnaires to each store, in their morning meeting, and allowed half an hour for the completion of the questionnaires. According to all of the store managers, this was the most appropriate time to distribute the questionnaires, as most of the employees were present at this time. The purposes of the study as well as the ethical considerations were explained to the employees prior to them completing the questionnaires (see Appendix A for covering letter). The potential participants were informed that this was a voluntary process and they should not feel obligated to participate. Those who choose to respond were therefore included in the voluntary sample. The completed questionnaires were placed in envelopes and then put in a sealed box that only the researcher had access to. The distribution and collection of the questionnaires took place on the same day so as to ensure confidentiality and anonymity.

Only full-time store level employees were approached because flexi-time employees do not receive the same benefits, and it was felt that this might have an impact on the results of this study. One of the limitations of this particular sample included the fact that a retail organisation works according to a seven-day week and therefore all staff members were not present on a single day, as different employees were awarded different days off work.
The voluntary sample therefore comprised of the number of responses gained. According to the regional manager of this organisation there are approximately 955 full-time employees across the country, with an estimate of 230 of these being employed in the Gauteng region. As the eight largest stores in Gauteng were approached the final sample, which consisted of 145 employees, was viewed as being representative of the population of Gauteng store-level employees.

2.3 Sample

The sample was selected from a population of Gauteng store-level employees who work for a large South African retail organisation. One hundred and fifty questionnaires were distributed at morning staff meetings. One hundred and forty five completed questionnaires were returned representing a response rate of 97%.

Eight stores were included in this study. The percentage and number of respondents per store may be found in Table 1. The sample included employees between the ages of 20-59 years. As age had quite a large range, this variable was divided into four categories. Forty-six (32%) out of the 145 respondents chose not to reply to this question. One reason for this relatively poor response rate may be due to the fact that the respondents considered their age to be a private issue, as South African legislation does not force an employee to disclose their personal information. However, according to legislation, an employee is not required to disclose their gender or race and there were good response rates for both of these. Therefore it appears that age may be a particularly sensitive issue in this organisation, especially for female employees as they consisted of the majority of the outstanding responses. Overall,
there were 37 employees (26%) aged 20-29 years, 32 (22%) between 30-39 years, 22 (15%) aged 40-49 years, and eight employees (5%) between the ages of 50-59 years of age.

Out of the 145 employees, 2 (2%) did not answer the question relating to race. Out of the remaining sample, 105 (72%) were Black, 16 (11%) were White, nine (6%) were Indian, and 13 (9%) were Coloured. Tenure was divided into five categories and 18 (12%) of the employees did not respond to this question. There were 78 employees (54%) who had been working for the organisation for up to five years, 17 (12%) between 6-10 years, 16 (11%) between 11-15 years, 11 (8%) who had been working between 16-20 years, and five employees (3%) had between 21-25 years working experience with this organisation.

Job grade was separated into six categories, and 32 (22%) of the employees did not reply to this question. Sales assistants, who consisted of 64 employees (44%), were defined as those employees who worked in the various clothing and shoe departments throughout the store. There were 21 employees (14%) who were admin consultants and worked at the cash desks. A further seven employees (5%) were beauty and fragrance consultants. Eight employees (6%) were stockroom clerks, two (1%) were display merchandisers, and 11 (8%) were supervisors.

The participants were also asked whether or not they had children. Two people (1%) chose not to answer this question. Ninety-nine employees (68%) had children whilst the remaining 44 (31%) did not have children. In terms of gender, the sample
consisted of only one (1%) person who chose not to answer this question and included 36 males (25%) and 108 females (74%).

The final demographic variable was marital status and there was one (1%) person who did not answer this question. Out of the remaining 144 responses, 70 (48%) were married, 59 (41%) were single, ten (7%) were divorced, and five (3%) were in a relationship.

Table 1: Demographic Composition of the Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Children</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Coloured</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Job Grade</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Store</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Sales Assist</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Fourways</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Sandton</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Beauty</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Cresta</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Stockroom</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Westgate</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Display</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Eastgate</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Centurion</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Eastrand</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pretoria</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.4 Instruments

2.4.1 Career Salience Scale

The first instrument that was administered was Greenhaus’ (1971) 27-item Career Salience Scale (CSS). This scale consisted of three sub-components, namely the relative importance of work compared to other sources of life satisfaction, the amount of career thought and planning an individual puts into their career, and finally the general attitudes towards work (Lock, 1995). The aim of this scale was to measure “the importance of work in one’s total life” (Greenhaus, 1971). The CSS uses a 5-point likert scale to measure career salience and scores range from 5 to 135. The following items have reverse scoring: Item 2; Item 3; Item 6; Item 9; Item 11; Item 17; Item 21; Item 24; Item 25; and Item 27. The Career Salience Scale has been used in a South African context and appears to be psychometrically sound and possess appropriate reliability scores, which fall within .72 and .90 (Distiller, 2003; Allen, 1999; Lock, 1995; Greenhaus, 1973).

As for the validity of the CSS, evidence has shown that this instrument does not measure a homogenous construct and possesses low discriminant and construct validity. This is according to Blau, Paul and St. John (1993) who conducted a factor analysis on the CSS and found that the items loaded onto a single factor, which explained 18% of the variance. The study showed that the items of the CSS therefore loaded onto factors that they should have, but in most cases the items loaded weakly on these factors or loaded almost equally onto multiple factors (Blau, Paul, & St John, 1993).
In the South African context, research pertaining to an exploratory examination, re-conceptualisation, and classification of work commitment, has been conducted (Distiller, 2003). The findings of the factor analysis that was carried out concluded that career salience, affective commitment, and the perceived utility of a present job possessed common elements as they all loaded onto a single factor (Distiller, 2003). Thus, according to such findings it appears that there is concept redundancy in terms of career salience and other work commitment variables.

2.4.2 Career Commitment Scale

Blau’s (1989) 7-item Career Commitment Scale (CCS) was also administered. Career Commitment is defined here as “one’s attitude towards one’s profession or vocation” (Blau, 1985). This 5-point likert scale has scores that range from 5 to 35 and Item 1, Item 3, and Item 7 all have reverse scoring. The CCS has a reported reliability of alpha between .76 and .84, an internal consistency, which has ranged from .87 and .85, and a test-retest reliability of .67 (Bedeian, Kemery, & Pizzolatto, 1991; Blau, 1985).

The Career Commitment Scale has not been widely used in a South African setting. This may be due to the fact that researchers, both in South Africa and abroad, generally chose the Career Salience Scale as a measure for career commitment (Greenhaus, 1971; Bashaw & Grant, 1994). For instance in a study on work commitment one of the constructs under investigation was career commitment (Distiller, 2003). However the researcher claimed that the operationalisation of career commitment has proven problematic because of its vagueness in terms of what constitutes a career. Therefore Greenhaus’ Career Salience Scale was administered
instead (Distiller, 2003). The current research was thus considered useful in examining how applicable the CCS is, in such a context.

### 2.4.3 Job Involvement Questionnaire

The final measurement instrument will be Kanungo’s (1982) 10-item Job Involvement Questionnaire (JIQ). Responses were recorded on a 5-point likert scale and the scores were summed to give an overall job involvement measure. Scores for the JIQ range from 10 to 50 and Item 2 and Item 7 are reverse score items. It has been reported that the internal consistency and test-retest reliability of the scale are .87 and .85 respectively (Ellroy, Everett, & Flynn, 1991; Kanungo, 1982). Blau, Paul and St. John (1993) have reported sound alphas of approximately .78 as well as satisfactory levels of convergent and discriminant validity.

Blau (1985) conducted a factor analysis to determine the discriminant validity between the CCS and the JIQ. To demonstrate discriminant validity, career commitment items should load on a different factor than the job involvement items. The results showed career commitment to be operationally distinguishable from job involvement. In addition a factor congruency co-efficient of .80 was found, further indicating that the factor structure of the CCS and the JIQ remained stable over time.

In terms of the South African context, the Job Involvement Scale has proven psychometrically sound and Cronbach alpha coefficients as high as .84 have been reported (Allen, 1999). Generally, research that has been conducted in the South African environment recommend that Greenhaus’ (1971) Career Commitment Scale and Kanungo’s (1982) Job Involvement Scale both need to be applied to a broader
population group, which includes blue collar and professionals as well as multi-racial groups (Allen, 1999; Distiller, 2003).

2.5 Ethics

Participants’ confidentiality was further ensured, as they were not asked to write their names on the questionnaire and results were given in the form of group responses. Ethical considerations, such as informed consent from each participant, conveying the purpose of the study to them, providing copies of the outcomes of the research to the organisation, and informing everyone that debriefing was available if they feel it was necessary, were taken into account.

2.6 Method of Analysis

2.6.1 Internal Reliability

Reliability considers how much random error was in the measurements and generalised findings from one set of measures to another set of plausible measures.

Internal reliability is one method of estimating reliability and focuses on the number of items in the test, the average inter-correlation among test items, and the item-total correlations (Murphy & Davidshofer, 1998).

Cronbach’s coefficient alpha was used as a way to measure the internal reliability of the Career Salience Scale, the Career Commitment Scale, and the Job Involvement Questionnaire. An alpha value below .60 would be considered low and would indicate
that scores on the tests are not highly consistent. Alpha values above .60 are therefore considered adequate and would indicate that scores are consistent (Cronbach, 1984).

The three instruments were also combined in pairs (i.e. the CSS with the CCS, the CSS with the JIQ, and the CCS with the JIQ). This was to assess the internal reliability of each of these combinations when they are presented as one scale. Ideally, what one would expect is that the alpha values would decrease when the scales are combined, because different constructs or scales are being combined. By combining the three instruments one is referring to the three research questions as they too combine the instruments in order to determine whether or not they are distinguishable from one another.

2.6.2 Means and Standard Deviations

Means and standard deviations were used to report information about the Career Salience Scale, the Career Commitment Scale, and the Job Involvement Questionnaire.

The mean depicts the average response to an item (Mimmack, Meyer, & Manas, 1996). The measure of the average of the deviations of each score from the mean is the standard deviation (Howell, 1999). The means and standard deviations will be used to test the normality of the distribution. As parametric tests are being used, the assumption of normality must be met.
2.6.3 Item Analyses

In addition to analysing the Career Salience Scale, the Career Commitment Scale, and the Job Involvement Scale in their entirety, the following aspects of the items of each of the three scales were assessed.

**Item-total Correlations:** A positive item-total correlation indicates that the item measures the same thing as the rest of the test whilst a negative item-total correlation means that the respondents scores on the test and the score on the item disagree. An item-total correlation of .30 and below was considered to be weak (Murphy & Davidshofer, 1994).

**Skewness:** This refers to the property of a distribution of scores that reflects the degree to which individuals disappropriately fall either at the low or high end of the scale. In a positively skewed distribution the long ‘tail’ of the distribution points toward the higher score values and there are more low scorers. Whereas in a negatively skewed distribution the long ‘tail’ of the distribution points towards the smaller score values and there are more high score values (Ghiselli, Campbell & Zedeck, 1981). Values below –1.0 and above +1.0 are considered extreme and these items should be assessed in further detail as highly skewed distributions do not represent a normal graph, which is a pre-requisite for the parametric tests used throughout this research (Ghiselli, Campbell & Zedeck, 1981).

**Kurtosis:** The property of a distribution of scores that reflects the degree to which individuals’ scores pile up in one region of the scale. Kurtosis may be classified as leptokurtic or platykurtic. The former refers to a heavy piling up of scores in one
region of the scale causing a peaked appearance whilst the latter refers to a more evenly distributed appearance of scores (Ghiselli, Campbell & Zedeck, 1981). Values below \(-1.0\) and above \(+1.0\) are considered extreme items and these scores should be assessed in further detail (Ghiselli, Campbell & Zedeck, 1981).

**2.6.4 Correlations**

The three research questions asked whether there was a distinction between two variables. In order to measure this distinction, the relationship that occurred was firstly assessed by conducting correlation analyses using Pearson’s product-moment correlation coefficient \((r)\), which measures the strength of the relationship (Howell, 1999). When using Pearson’s correlation coefficient it was important to take into account that the results may have been affected by characteristics of the sample. These characteristics include restriction of range (or variance), non-linearity of the relationship, and the use of a heterogeneous sub-sample (Howell, 1999).

Pearson’s correlation coefficient ranges from \(-1.0\) to \(1.0\). It is incorrect to interpret a high correlation as showing that one variable causes the other, as there are three possible explanations for high correlations. Variable A may cause or influence the size of variable B, B may cause A, or both A and B may be influenced by some common factor or factors (Anastasi, 1982).

Pearson’s correlation coefficient also has the potential of assessing each instruments’ convergent and discriminant validities. Convergent validity occurs when measures of the same or closely related constructs are strongly correlated and therefore converge on similar results. On the other hand discriminant validity occurs when measures of
unrelated constructs are not strongly correlated and the measures effectively discriminate between unrelated constructs (Anastasi, 1982).

The literature review has already established that career commitment, career salience, and job involvement are related constructs and therefore one would expect their correlations to converge. However the three constructs also display unique characteristics and therefore one would also expect the instruments to posses an element of discriminant validity. The aim of this analysis was therefore to establish whether the instruments actually reflect what the literature says. The challenge of this task was to determine at what point one would classify the three instruments as convergent or discriminant from one another.

As the three research questions are asking whether there is a distinction between career commitment, career salience, and job involvement, one must establish a point that measures such a distinction. In practice, most validity coefficients tend to be fairly small. When using a carefully chosen test it is not likely that it will show a correlation greater than .5 and generally validity coefficients are no greater than .3 (Murphy & Davidshofer, 1998). Therefore a correlation coefficient close to or greater than .3 may be used to represent convergent validity and thus the constructs will not be distinct from one another. On the other hand a correlation coefficient below .3 would illustrate that the constructs possess discriminant validity and will therefore be distinct from one another.
2.6.5 Partial Correlations

From a simple correlation one knows the relationship between two variables. If a third variable is added, one may then ask what contribution does this make to the criterion explanation? To determine the response, one can look at the relationship in terms of holding the third variable constant while examining the relationship between the other two variables. In other words, the process of partialing out the third variable takes place in order to eliminate the effects and variations that the third variable has on the other two variables (Ghiselli, Campbell & Zedeck, 1981).

Partial correlations are used to answer the three research questions, which ask whether there is a distinction between each of the three combinations of scales. By partialing out the effects of the third instrument, one is able to assess whether or not this instrument is independent of the other two scales. In other words, if the correlation was drastically reduced by partialing out the third instrument, then the relationship was affected, with the third instrument technically connecting the two other instruments. However if the correlation remained fairly stable, then the two instruments were unaffected by their relationship with the third variable, which is then technically independent of the other two instruments.

2.6.6 Factor Analysis

A factor analysis explains why two instruments are correlated. This statistical technique was used to identify a relatively small number of factors that can be used to represent a relationship among sets of many interrelated variables. Factor analyses usually involve three steps 1) computing the inter-correlations between the variables,
2) extracting initial factors, and 3) rotating the factors to obtain a clearer picture of the factors (Murphy & Davidhoffer, 1994).

For the purposes of this research, a principal components factor analysis was conducted. This illustrated how the first factors tended to explain far more of the variance than any other factors, which made interpretation difficult (Kline, 1994). Therefore the factors were rotated using an orthogonal varimax procedure, which sought out factors that were uncorrelated with each other. A major goal of such a rotation is to obtain meaningful factors that are as consistent as possible from analysis to analysis (Fruchter, 1954).

The following aspects were considered when using factor analysis: scree diagrams, hierarchical factor loadings, eigen values, and as previously mentioned, correlations (Myers, 1998).

**2.6.7 Analysis of Variance**

The demographic characteristics of the sample were then analysed in relation to the CSS, CCS, and JIQ. In order for an ANOVA to be carried out, two main assumptions must be met. Firstly, the assumption of normality states that the scores of the population are normally distributed and secondly we consider the assumption of homogeneity of variance, which takes into account the fact that each population of scores must have the same variance. Levene’s test is a suitable approach to use to determine the homogeneity of variance (Rosental & Rosnow, 1991).
Once the assumptions were met, a one-way ANOVA was conducted, which identified whether there were significant differences, which was evident when the p-value was below .05. If significant results were noted a post hoc test using Fisher’s LSD (Least Square Differences) test, which compared the various mean scores and identified where significant mean differences could be found (Howell, 1999). The ANOVA’s therefore provided information about the significant and non-significant results that could be found between the demographic variables and each of the three scales.

2.7 Summary of Methodology Chapter

This chapter has taken into account the methodological issues pertaining to this particular study. The appropriate research design has been identified and the procedure and characteristics of the sample have both been addressed. The Career Salience Scale, Career Commitment Scale, and the Job Involvement Questionnaire have all been analysed in terms of their psychometric properties. Ethical considerations have been taken into account and finally the various methods of analyses, discussed.

Following on from the method of analysis section, the next chapter will refer to the results obtained in this study.
Results

This section describes the findings from the analyses that were conducted. Firstly the reliability, means and standard deviation scores for the CSS, CCS, and JIQ were identified. Following on from this correlations and first-order partial correlations of the three instruments were then analysed. A principal components factor analysis of the three instruments was assessed to identify the item loadings and correlation matrixes were then included to identify the relationships between those demographic variables with two levels and the three instruments. Finally, a number of ANOVAs were then carried out to determine whether there were statistically significant results between the three scales and each demographic variable. Where there were statistically significant results, Fisher’s LSD post hoc test was carried out to determine where the differences lay.

3.1 Internal Reliability

Cronbach’s alpha assessed the individual internal reliability of the three instruments as well as the various combinations (CSS and CCS; CSS and JIQ; CCS and JIQ) of the instruments. The Career Salience Scale has three components and these were also assessed.

From Table 2 it is evident that the overall Career Salience Scale, the Job Involvement Questionnaire, and the various combinations of the scales all possessed reasonable internal reliability measures. The results that were in question were those pertaining to the three components of the Career Salience Scale as well as the Career Commitment
Scale as the components of the CSS all had alphas below .60, with the CCS possessing an alpha score of only .61. The reasoning behind the lower results for the components of the Career Salience Scale may lie in the fact that each component only has between seven and nine items and internal reliability usually increases as the number of items increases. Another reason may be that because only some of the items are included in the component breakdown, the ones that were left out may have possessed higher internal reliabilities. As with the reliability measure of the Career Commitment Scale, the scale only possesses seven items, which may have influenced this result.

Table 2: Cronbach’s Coefficient Alpha

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instruments</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career Salience Scale</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Relative importance of work and career</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Planning and thinking about career</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• General Attitudes toward work</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Commitment Scale</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Involvement Questionnaire</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Salience Scale and Career Commitment Scale</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Salience Scale and Job Involvement Questionnaire</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Commitment Scale &amp; Job Involvement Questionnaire</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reliability measures of the various combinations of the scales were used in conjunction with the first-order partial correlations. It was proposed that when combined, the scales’ reliability measures would increase, as there may be an overlap in some of the items. From Table 2 it appears that this was the case, as each
combination possessed an alpha coefficient above .70. This is the first indication that the three scales may be measuring similar constructs.

3.2 Means and Standard Deviations

Table 3: Means and Standard Deviations of Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career Salience Scale</td>
<td>66.69</td>
<td>9.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Relative importance of work and career</td>
<td>20.08</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Planning and thinking about career</td>
<td>17.57</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• General attitudes toward work</td>
<td>22.03</td>
<td>4.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Commitment Scale</td>
<td>19.90</td>
<td>4.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Involvement Questionnaire</td>
<td>27.89</td>
<td>5.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The highest score that one could attain on the CSS was 135 and therefore scores that lay above 67.5 represented an above average level of career salience. From Table 1 it is thus evident that the sample generally agreed with the statement and possessed a slightly above average level of career salience. In terms of the three components, the employees placed relative importance on their work and career, however there was a lack of planning and thinking about one’s career and general attitudes towards work were also found to be relatively low.

The mean score for the CCS was slightly above the average score of 17.5, which showed that participants generally agreed with the statements that were made and therefore displayed an above average level of career commitment.
The JIQ had an average score of 25. Once again the mean score was slightly above average, which showed that the respondents were generally involved in their jobs.

As for the standard deviation scores, they all lay within the highest and lowest obtainable scores and therefore according to Table 3 the scales may be considered relatively normally distributed, which is an assumption that must be met in order to carry out parametric tests.

When assessing the means, standard deviations, and item-total correlations, one must keep in mind that the sample mainly consisted of Black employees, whose first language was not likely to be English. Therefore some of the lower scores may be attributed to the phrasing of the statements, which may have come across as confusing and were thus misinterpreted.

### 3.3 Item Analyses

#### 3.3.1 Item-total Correlations

An item-total correlation of .30 and below was considered to be weak (Murphy & Davidshofer, 1994).

In the Career Salience Scale Item 17, which formed part of the component entitled ‘ones general attitude towards work’ had a negative item-total correlation. This particular item stated “I want to be able to pretty much forget my job when I leave work in the evenings” (See Appendix B). One should also take into account that this item displayed the lowest item-total correlation, which was only .05. It is interesting
to note that this was a reverse scored item that still displayed a negative correlation. As the aim of this research was to examine each scale in its entirety, it was decided that Item 17 would remain in the CSS.

The following items from the relative importance to work and career component of the Career Salience Scale had item-total correlations below .30: (See Appendix B)

- Item 2: “It is important to have some leisure time after work than to have a job in my chosen career, be devoted to it, and to be a success at it.”
- Item 5: “I intend to pursue the job of my choice, even if it limits my personal freedom to enjoy life.”
- Item 16: “I intend to pursue the job of my choice, even if it allows only very little opportunity to enjoy my friends.”
- Item 19: “I intend to pursue the job of my choice, even if it leaves me little time for my religious activities.”

All the items, with the exception of Item 25, from the planning and thinking about one’s career component, possessed item-total correlations below .30. These items were: (See Appendix B)

- Item 7: “I enjoy thinking about and making plans about my future career.”
- Item 10: “Deciding on a career is just about the most important decision a young person makes.”
- Item 11: “I don’t think much about what type of job I’ll be in ten years from now.”
• Item 18: “I started thinking about jobs and careers when I was young.”
• Item 22: “Planning for and succeeding in a career is my primary concern.”
• Item 23: “I often find myself thinking about whether I enjoy my chosen field.”
• Item 27: “I never really thought about these types of questions very much.”

From the general attitude towards work component the following items had weak item-total correlations: (See Appendix B)

• Items 6: “To me, a job should be viewed primarily as a way of making good money.”
• Item 17: “I want to be able to pretty much forget my job when I leave work in the evenings.”

Items 3, 12, and 26, which were the outstanding items, all possessed item-total correlations below .30 (See Appendix B). Therefore 16 out of 27 items had weak item-total correlations.

• Item 3: “If I work very hard on my job, I can’t enjoy the better things in life.”
• Item 12: “I am ready to make sacrifices to get ahead in my job.”
• Item 26: “I would move to another part of the country if I thought it would help advance my chosen career.”

Item 3 and Item 7 from the Career Commitment Scale had item-total correlations below .30 (See Appendix C). If these items were removed from the CCS it would impact on the scale’s overall alpha score. However, the CCS only has 7-items and the
purpose of this research was to examine each instrument in its original format. Therefore no items from the CCS were removed although there is significant evidence for not using this scale in the future.

As for the Job Involvement Questionnaire, items two and seven had negative item-total correlations, even though these were both reverse score items which had been reversed (See Appendix D). Furthermore, Item 2 was the only item with an item-total correlation below .30 and if this item was deleted its scale’s alpha value would have a dramatic increase. However, as previously noted, the aim of this research was to examine each scale in its entirety and therefore no items from the JIQ were removed.

### 3.3.2 Skewness and Kurtosis

Tables 4 through to 6 represent the actual statements that correspond to each of the following items that possess problems in terms of skewness and kurtosis.

As discussed in the methodology chapter, scores that were above positive 1 or below negative 1 were considered problematic in terms of skewness and kurtosis. In terms of skewness the following items from the Career Salience Scale were problematically skewed: Item 7; Item 10; Item 12; Item 13; and Item 15; Item 18; Item 22; and Item 26 (See Appendix B).

In terms of kurtosis the following items were either above positive 1 or below negative 1:
• From the Career Salience Scale: Item 3; Item 6; Item 7; Item 9; Item 10; Item 12; Item 13; Item 15; Item 18; Item 20; Item 25 (See Appendix B).

• From the Career Commitment Scale: Item 4; Item 5; Item 7 (See Appendix C).

• From the Job Involvement Questionnaire: Item 2; Item 4; Item 6 (See Appendix D).

Tables 4 through to 6 may also be applied to the three research questions that ask whether or not the CSS, CCS, and JIQ are distinguishable from one another. Highlighting problematic items in terms of their skewness, kurtosis, item total correlations, and their alpha if deleted scores may assess this. Such items must be kept in mind when conducting the remaining analyses so that one may identify whether there is a pattern amongst these items. From what has been presented thus far, it appears that there are problems with nearly every item in the CSS and CCS.
Table 4a: Descriptive Statistics for the Relative Importance of Work and Career Component of the Career Salience Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>Item-total corr.</th>
<th>Alpha if deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I intend to pursue the job of my choice even if it cuts deeply into the time I have for my family.</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>-.63</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>It is more important to have some leisure time after work than to have a job in my chosen career, be devoted to it, and to be a success at it.</td>
<td>-.94</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I intend to pursue the job of my choice, even if it limits my personal freedom to enjoy life.</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>-.81</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>I intend to pursue the job of my choice, even if it allows only very little opportunity to enjoy my friends.</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>I intend to pursue the job of my choice, even if it leaves me little time for my religious activities</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>-.90</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>It is more important to have a job in my chosen field of interest, be devoted to it and be a success than to have a family that is closely knit and that shares many experiences.</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td><strong>-1.07</strong></td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>It is more important to be liked by my fellow man, devote my energies for the betterment of man, and be at least some help to someone than to have a job in my chosen career, be devoted to it, and be a success at it.</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.75</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Skewness</td>
<td>Kurtosis</td>
<td>Item-total corr.</td>
<td>Alpha if deleted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I enjoy thinking about and making plans about my future career.</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Deciding on a career is just about the most important decision a young person makes.</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I don’t think too much about what type of job I’ll be in ten years from now.</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>-.99</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>I started thinking about jobs and careers when I was young.</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Planning for and succeeding in a career is my primary concern.</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>I often find myself thinking about whether I will enjoy my chosen career.</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Planning for a specific career usually is not worth the effort; it doesn’t matter too much what I do.</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>-1.24</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>I never really thought about these types of questions much.</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.97</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4 c: Descriptive Statistics for the General Attitudes toward Work Component of the Career Salience Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>Item-total corr.</th>
<th>Alpha if deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Work is one of the few areas in life where I can gain real satisfaction.</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>-.58</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>To me, a job should be viewed primarily as a way of making money.</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>-1.27</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>It is difficult to find satisfaction in life unless I enjoy my job.</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Work is one of those necessary evils.</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-1.25</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>I look at a career as a means of expressing myself.</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>I would consider myself extremely “career minded”.</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>I could never be truly happy in life unless I achieve success in my job or career.</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>I want to be able to pretty much forget my job when I leave work in the evenings.</td>
<td>-.48</td>
<td>-.67</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>The whole idea of working and holding a job is kind of distasteful to me.</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>-.53</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4 d: Descriptive Statistics for Remaining Items of the Career Salience Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>Item-total corr.</th>
<th>Alpha if deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>If I work hard on my job, I can’t enjoy the better things in life.</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-1.38</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I’m ready to make many sacrifices to get ahead in my job.</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>I would move to another part of the country if I thought it would help me advance my career.</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Descriptive Statistics for the 7 Career Commitment Scale Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>Item-total Corr.</th>
<th>Alpha if deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I would take a different job that paid the same.</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>-.60</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I want a career in this vocation.</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>If I could do it all over, I would not choose this vocation.</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.99</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>If I had all the money I needed, I would still want to be in this vocation.</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-1.22</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I enjoy my vocation too much to give it up.</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-1.05</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>This is my ideal vocation for my life work.</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.93</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I’ve been very disappointed ever since I entered this vocation.</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>-1.01</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Skewness</td>
<td>Kurtosis</td>
<td>Item-total Corr.</td>
<td>Alpha if deleted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The most important things that happen to me involve my present job.</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>-.74</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>To me my job is only a small part of who I am.</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td><strong>-1.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>-.14</strong></td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I am very much involved personally in my job.</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I live, eat, and breathe my job.</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td><strong>-1.23</strong></td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Most of my interests are centred around my job.</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.97</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I have very strong ties with my present job, which would be very difficult to break.</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td><strong>-1.07</strong></td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Usually I feel detached from my job.</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.96</td>
<td>-.43</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Most of my personal life goals are job oriented.</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>-.49</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I consider my job to be very central to my existence.</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I like to be absorbed in my job most of the time.</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>-.53</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3.4 Correlations for Scales

Table 7: Correlations for Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CSS</th>
<th>CCS</th>
<th>JIQ</th>
<th>Relative Importance</th>
<th>Planning &amp; Thinking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JIQ</td>
<td>**.30</td>
<td>**.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative Importance</td>
<td>**.55</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>**.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning &amp; Thinking</td>
<td>**.67</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>**.73</td>
<td>**.27</td>
<td>**.31</td>
<td>*.18</td>
<td>**.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05  
** p < .01

The overall CSS was significantly correlated with each of its components. Such results were likely to occur because the items in the components could be found in the overall scale as they combined to make up the scale. CSS as well as the CCS were both significantly correlated with the JIQ. The correlations with the components of the CSS were not under discussion as both the CCS and the JIQ were significantly correlated to the overall CSS. However it was interesting to note that there was no significant correlation between the relative importance and planning and thinking components of the CSS, especially when there are significant correlations with the CCS and the JIQ scales.
3.5 First-Order Partial Correlations for Scales

Table 8: Correlations and First-Order Partial Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlation Variables</th>
<th>Pearson</th>
<th>After Partialling Out</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career Salience Scale and Career Commitment Scale</td>
<td>**.18</td>
<td>-.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Salience Scale and Job Involvement Questionnaire</td>
<td>**.30</td>
<td>**.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Commitment Scale and Job Involvement Questionnaire</td>
<td>**.55</td>
<td>**.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05  
** p < .01

Figure 1: Correlations and First Order Partial Correlations

![Correlation Diagram](image)

Note: Figure 1 provides a visual representation of the relationship between the three instruments, with the correlations in brackets depicting the strength of the relationship after partialing out the third instrument.
From Table 8 and Figure 1 it is evident that the correlation between the CCS and the JIQ with the CSS partialed out, remained fairly stable. Thus the CSS is independent of the relationship that occurred between the CCS and the JIQ. As this correlation remained above .3 it was considered to be highly significant and an important finding for this particular study.

The correlation between the CSS and the JIQ with the CCS partialed out also remained fairly constant. Therefore the relationship between the CSS and the JIQ remained essentially equivalent and therefore the CCS was considered to be independent of the CSS and the JIQ. However, the correlation in this case was below .3 so even though it was significant it was considered to be statistically less significant finding in comparison to the correlation between the CCS and the JIQ.

In terms of the correlation between the CSS and the CCS, there was quite a decrease in the correlation when the JIQ was partialed out. Therefore one could say that the JIQ is the connector for the CCS and the CSS.

3.6 Principal Components Factor Analysis

A principal components factor analysis was conducted in order to determine whether items from the same scales and sub-scales loaded on the same factors. Kaiser’s criterion was used to assess the number of factors that should be included. From Table 9 eigenvalues greater than one were included and therefore according to this criteria 13 factors should be used. Eigenvalues identify how much information is in each new variable however what is evident here is that Kaiser’s criterion over estimates the number of factors that should be
used (Royce, 1973). Therefore the proportion of variance explained is used in conjunction with Kaiser’s criterion.

In Table 9 the cumulative column is used instead and placed on a skree plot. From this one can see that either a five or six-factor principal components factor analysis should be used as the graph flattens out at this point and the cumulative frequency is above the recommended 40% (Royce, 1973). It was decided that five factors should be used, as the CSS’s three components and the two other scales were taken into account. The following were based on the results from the orthogonal varimax rotation that was used to assess the five factors as this procedure maximises the variance of the squared loadings (Cureton & D’Agostino, 1983).

Table 9: Eigenvalues for the Principal Components Factor Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Variance Explained</th>
<th>Eigenvalue</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
<th>Cumulative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.41</td>
<td>8.41</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td><strong>1.07</strong></td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.6.1 Factor 1

From the five factor principal components factor analysis found in Tables 11 and 12 it is evident that most items from the CCS and the JIQ load on Factor 1. This reiterates the findings from the partial correlations, which stated that one should use either the CCS or the CSS to predict job involvement as they measure fairly the same construct. Other items that also loaded on Factor 1 were IMP7 (Table 15a) and ATT1 (Table 11c). However if one looks at these two items, IMP7 states: “It is more important to be liked by my fellow man, devote my energies for the betterment of man, and be at least some help to someone than to have my job in my chosen career, be devoted to it, and be a success at it”.

Figure 2: Skree Plot
3.6.2 Factor 2
Most of the items from the component entitled ‘General attitudes towards work’ and the three remaining items (CSS3, CSS12, and CSS26) from the Career Salience Scale, loaded on Factor 2. These results may be found in Table 11c. Other items from the Career Salience Scale that loaded on Factor 2 were: IMP3; IMP4 (Table 11a); P&T2; and P&T5 (Table 11b).

3.6.3 Factor 3
In Table 12 the following items from the Career Commitment Scale and the Job Involvement Questionnaire loaded on Factor 3: CCS1; CCS3; CCS7; JIQ2; JIQ7. It was interesting to note that all of these items were reversed scored and all had loadings ranging from .44 to .64, which was quite high. The following items from the Career Salience Scale also loaded on Factor 3: P&T6; P&T8 (Table 11b); and ATT9 (Table 11c).

3.6.4 Factor 4
Most of the items from the component entitled ‘Relative importance of work and career’ as well as P&T7 (Table 11b) and ATT3 (Table 11c) from the Career Salience Scale loaded on Factor 4.

3.6.5 Factor 5
In Table 12 the only other item from the JIQ that did not load on Factor 1 was JIQ8. This item loaded on Factor 5 and stated “Most of my personal life goals are job orientated”. The following items from the Career Salience Scale also loaded on Factor 5: P&T1; P&T3; P&T4 (Table 15b); and ATT2 (Table 11c).
Table 10: Factor Analysis with Five Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variance Explained by Each Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11 a: Rotated Factor Pattern for the Relative Importance of Work and Career component of the Career Salience Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IMP 1</td>
<td>I intend to pursue the job of my choice even if it cuts deeply into the time I have for my family.</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMP 2</td>
<td>It is more important to have some leisure time after work than to have a job in my chosen career, be devoted to it, and to be a success at it.</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMP 3</td>
<td>I intend to pursue the job of my choice, even if it limits my personal freedom to enjoy life.</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMP 4</td>
<td>I intend to pursue the job of my choice, even if it allows only very little opportunity to enjoy my friends.</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMP 5</td>
<td>I intend to pursue the job of my choice, even if it leaves me little time for my religious activities</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMP 6</td>
<td>It is more important to have a job in my chosen field of interest, be devoted to it and be a success than to have a family that is closely knit and that shares many experiences.</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMP 7</td>
<td>It is more important to be liked by my fellow man, devote my energies for the betterment of man, and be at least some help to someone than to have a job in my chosen career, be devoted to it, and be a success at it.</td>
<td>-0.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11 b: Rotated Factor Pattern for the Planning and Thinking about Career component of the Career Salience Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;T 1</td>
<td>I enjoy thinking about and making plans about my future career.</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;T 2</td>
<td>Deciding on a career is just about the most important decision a young person makes.</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;T 3</td>
<td>I don’t think too much about what type of job I’ll be in ten years from now.</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;T 4</td>
<td>I started thinking about jobs and careers when I was young.</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;T 5</td>
<td>Planning for and succeeding in a career is my primary concern.</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;T 6</td>
<td>I often find myself thinking about whether I will enjoy my chosen career.</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;T 7</td>
<td>Planning for a specific career usually is not worth the effort; it doesn’t matter too much what I do.</td>
<td>-0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;T 8</td>
<td>I never really thought about these types of questions much.</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11 c: Rotated Factor Pattern for the General Attitudes toward Work component and Remaining Items of the Career Salience Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATT 1</td>
<td>Work is one of the few areas in life where I can gain real satisfaction.</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATT 2</td>
<td>To me, a job should be viewed primarily as a way of making money.</td>
<td>-0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATT 3</td>
<td>It is difficult to find satisfaction in life unless I enjoy my job.</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATT 4</td>
<td>Work is one of those necessary evils.</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATT 5</td>
<td>I look at a career as a means of expressing myself.</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATT 6</td>
<td>I would consider myself extremely “career minded”.</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATT 7</td>
<td>I could never be truly happy in life unless I achieve success in my job or career.</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATT 8</td>
<td>I want to be able to pretty much forget my job when I leave work in the evenings.</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATT 9</td>
<td>The whole idea of working and holding a job is kind of distasteful to me.</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSS 3</td>
<td>If I work hard on my job, I can’t enjoy the better things in life.</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSS 12</td>
<td>I’m ready to make many sacrifices to get ahead in my job.</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSS 26</td>
<td>I would move to another part of the country if I thought it would help me advance my career.</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12: Rotated Factor Pattern for the Career Commitment Scale and the Job Involvement Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCS 1</td>
<td>I would take a different job that paid the same.</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCS 2</td>
<td>I want a career in this vocation.</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCS 3</td>
<td>If I could do it all over, I would not choose this vocation.</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCS 4</td>
<td>If I had all the money I needed, I would still want to be in this vocation.</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCS 5</td>
<td>I enjoy my vocation too much to give it up.</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCS 6</td>
<td>This is my ideal vocation for my life work.</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCS 7</td>
<td>I’ve been very disappointed ever since I entered this vocation.</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JIQ 1</td>
<td>The most important things that happen to me involve my present job.</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JIQ 2</td>
<td>To me my job is only a small part of who I am.</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JIQ 3</td>
<td>I am very much involved personally in my job.</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JIQ 4</td>
<td>I live, eat, and breathe my job.</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JIQ 5</td>
<td>Most of my interests are centred around my job.</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JIQ 6</td>
<td>I have very strong ties with my present job, which would be very difficult to break.</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JIQ 7</td>
<td>Usually I feel detached from my job.</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JIQ 8</td>
<td>Most of my personal life goals are job oriented.</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JIQ 9</td>
<td>I consider my job to be very central to my existence.</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JIQ 10</td>
<td>I like to be absorbed in my job most of the time.</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.7 Correlations for Demographic Variables

Correlations were conducted for those demographic variables that only had two levels. Therefore the questions pertaining to children and gender were assessed.

### 3.7.1 Children

Table 13: Correlations for participants who had Children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CSS</th>
<th>CCS</th>
<th>JIQ</th>
<th>Relative Importance</th>
<th>Planning &amp; Thinking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>**.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JIQ</td>
<td>**.39</td>
<td></td>
<td>**.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative Importance</td>
<td>**.49</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>**.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning &amp; Thinking</td>
<td>**.72</td>
<td>**.25</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>**.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Attitude</td>
<td>**.71</td>
<td>**.21</td>
<td>**.29</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>**.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05
** p < .01

From Table 13 it is evident that those participants who had children displayed significant relationships in terms of the Career Salience Scale with the Career Commitment Scale and Job Involvement Questionnaire, as well as a significant relationship between the Career Commitment Scale and the Career Salience Scale. Thus the various combinations of the three scales were all found to be significantly related to one another.
The Career Commitment scale was significantly related to the planning and thinking and the general attitude components of the Career Salience Scale whilst the Job Involvement Questionnaire was significantly related to the relative importance and general attitude components. The Career Salience Scale had a significant relationship with its three components, which would be expected considering the three components were combined to form the overall scale. However, it was interesting to note that there was not a significant correlation between the relative importance component and the planning and thinking and general attitude components of the CSS for those participants who had children.

Table 14: Correlations for participants who did not have Children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CSS</th>
<th>CCS</th>
<th>JIQ</th>
<th>Relative Importance</th>
<th>Planning &amp; Thinking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCS</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JIQ</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative Importance</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning &amp; Thinking</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Attitude</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05  
** P < .01

Participants who did not have children were found to have fewer significant results. From Table 14 it is evident that the CCS was significantly related to the JIQ and both
of these scales were significantly correlated with the general attitude component of the CSS. Once again the components of the CSS were significantly related to the overall scale. Unlike those participants who had children, those that did not were found to have no significant correlation in terms of the CSS and the CCS and JIQ.

### 3.7.2 Gender

Table 15: Correlations for Male participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CSS</th>
<th>CCS</th>
<th>JIQ</th>
<th>Relative Importance</th>
<th>Planning &amp; Thinking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCS</td>
<td>**.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JIQ</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>**.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative Importance</td>
<td>**.66</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning &amp; Thinking</td>
<td>**.63</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Attitude</td>
<td>**.88</td>
<td>**.56</td>
<td>*.39</td>
<td>**.53</td>
<td>*.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*  p < .05  
** p < .01

According to Table 15, male participants had significant relationships between the CSS and the CCS as well as between the CCS and the JIQ. The general attitude component of the CSS was significantly correlated with all three scales and as with the previous correlations the components of the CSS had significant relationships with the overall scale. An interesting finding was that there was no significant correlation between the CSS and the JIQ for Male
participants.

Table 16: Correlations for Female Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CSS</th>
<th>CCS</th>
<th>JIQ</th>
<th>Relative Importance</th>
<th>Planning &amp; Thinking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCS</td>
<td></td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JIQ</td>
<td>**.27</td>
<td></td>
<td>**.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative Importance</td>
<td>**.48</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>**.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning &amp; Thinking</td>
<td>**.69</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Attitude</td>
<td>**.67</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>**.27</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>*.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05  
** p < .01

From Table 16 it is evident that females had significant relationships in terms of the JIQ and the CSS and with the JIQ and the CCS. The Job Involvement Questionnaire was also significantly correlated with the relative importance and general attitude components of the CSS. Attention must also be drawn to the fact that unlike their male counterparts, female employees did not have a significant correlation when it came to the CSS and the CCS.
3.8. Analysis of Variance

Eight ANOVA’s were carried out to determine whether or not there were significant differences between each demographic variable and the Career Salience Scale and its three components, the Career Commitment Scale, and the Job Involvement Questionnaire. From Table 18 presented below, it was evident that there were twelve statistically significant relationships. Those variables that contained more than two levels underwent a Fisher’s Least Square Differences (LSD) post-hoc analysis in order to determine the mean differences.

3.8.1 Age

According to Table 18 it appeared that employees between the ages of 40-49 years had the highest career salience in terms of planning and thinking about their careers, whilst employees between the ages of 20-29 years displayed the lowest levels. However, employees between the ages of 20-29 years did have the highest career commitment with employees aged 50-59 years displaying the lowest levels.

According to Fisher’s LSD, which is illustrated in Table 19, the planning and thinking component of the CSS had significant differences in terms of those employees between the ages of 20 to 29 and 30 to 39 years, 20 to 29 years and 40 to 49 years, and 30 to 39 years and 40 to 49 years. In each case those who belonged to the younger group of employees displayed less planning and thinking when it came to their career.

As for the Career Commitment Scale, Table 19 depicts that employees between the ages of 20 to 29 years and 30 to 39 years, 20 to 29 years and 50 to 59 years, 30 to 39
years and 50 to 59 years, and 40 to 49 years and 50 to 59 years all possessed significantly different results. All of those who belonged to the younger group of employees were found to possess greater career commitment scores.

3.8.2 Tenure

There were two statistically significant scores for tenure. Generally employees who have been with this organisation between 6-10 years had higher overall career salience and planning and thinking about one’s career scores. Whereas those employees who had a tenure of 21-25 years were found to possess the lowest scores in terms of the CSS scale as well as in its planning and thinking component.

Tenure proved to have six significant differences, according to Fisher’s LSD. For the CSS the significant difference lay between those employees who had been with the organisation for 0 to 5 years and 6 to 10 years whereby those employees who had been with the organisation for longer had higher overall career salience. The planning and thinking component of the CSS had the following significantly different mean scores in terms of tenure: between 0 to 5 years and 6 to 10 years; between 0 to 5 years and 11-15 years; and between 0 to 5 years and 16 to 20 years. In each of these cases those employees who belonged to the groups with less tenure possessed higher planning and thinking scores. Other significant differences were also found in terms of the planning and thinking component of the CSS and these were: between 6 to 10 years and 21-25 and between 16 to 20 years and 21 to 25 years. Employees who had been with the organisation for a longer period were found to plan and think about their career less.
3.8.3 Race

It was evident that there were quite large differences in the sample size for this demographic variable, as 72% of the sample consisted of Black employees, 2% of this information was missing, and White, Indian, and Coloured employees made up the remaining 26%. It would be ideal, when conducting an ANOVA, to have the same number of observations in each treatment however this does not happen very often for reasons that often have nothing to do with the research. An unequal sample size relates to two assumptions of an ANOVA, namely normality and equality of variance. In order to test equality of variance, Levene’s test for homogeneity was conducted for each demographic variable. In terms of race, this test was of importance due to the unequal sample sizes and the results concluded that only the planning and thinking component of the CSS had unequal variances as the p-value < alpha. However, the overall CSS was found to have equal variances and therefore parametric tests were still carried out.

With regards to race, Indian employees possessed the highest score in terms of the relative importance of work and career. Coloured employees possessed the second highest scores, whilst Black employees had the lowest levels of this component. This was all according to Table 18.

In Table 19, Fisher’s LSD pointed out significantly different results for the relative importance component of the CSS in terms of Black employees and their White, Indian, and Coloured colleagues whereby Black employees placed less relative importance in terms of their work and career.
3.8.4 Children
According to Table 18, those employees who had children possessed the most overall career salience and the highest relative importance to work and career scores. Employees who did not have children were the most committed to their careers in terms of the Career Commitment Scale.

3.8.5 Marital Status
The sample mainly consisted on single and married employees, with very few being either divorced or in a relationship. Such discrepancies in terms of sample sizes may lead to unequal variances and therefore Levene’s test for homogeneity was conducted for this demographic variable. All the scales possessed equal variances and therefore parametric tests were carried out.

Table 18 revealed three statistically significant results for marital status. Single employees had the highest level of career salience as well as planning and thinking about one’s career scores. Single employees had the highest career commitment and divorced employees possessed the lowest career commitment scores.

Fisher’s LSD found significant differences in terms of the CSS and its planning and thinking component for single and married employees as well as for single and divorced employees. The Career Commitment Scale also had a significant mean difference according to those employees who were single and divorced. These findings were present in Table 19.
3.8.6 Gender

In Table 18, female employees were found to possess higher levels of the planning and thinking component of the CSS as the p-value was less than .05. A Fisher’s LSD was not carried out as gender only consisted of two levels. However, due to the unequal sample sizes between males and females, Levene’s test for homogeneity was conducted. The results showed that the p-value was .43 (greater than alpha) and therefore one could assume equality of variance.

Table 17: Non Significant Results for ANOVA for Demographic Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>CSS M</th>
<th>CSS Imp M</th>
<th>CSS P &amp; T M</th>
<th>CSS Att M</th>
<th>CCS M</th>
<th>JIQ M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Store</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N = 145)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fourways</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>19.50</td>
<td>15.60</td>
<td>20.70</td>
<td>21.20</td>
<td>28.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Sandton</td>
<td>66.04</td>
<td>19.79</td>
<td>17.08</td>
<td>22.21</td>
<td>20.69</td>
<td>28.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Cresta</td>
<td>64.31</td>
<td>19.19</td>
<td>16.81</td>
<td>21.56</td>
<td>17.87</td>
<td>28.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Westgate</td>
<td>64.20</td>
<td>21.20</td>
<td>15.90</td>
<td>21.10</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>26.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Eastgate</td>
<td>71.27</td>
<td>19.92</td>
<td>19.81</td>
<td>23.69</td>
<td>19.69</td>
<td>27.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Centurion</td>
<td>64.36</td>
<td>19.73</td>
<td>17.55</td>
<td>20.73</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>27.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Eastrand</td>
<td>65.89</td>
<td>20.68</td>
<td>16.47</td>
<td>21.63</td>
<td>20.84</td>
<td>28.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Pretoria</td>
<td>68.59</td>
<td>20.48</td>
<td>18.34</td>
<td>22.21</td>
<td>19.72</td>
<td>27.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F stat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p-value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Grade</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sales Assist</td>
<td>67.28</td>
<td>20.16</td>
<td>17.36</td>
<td>22.62</td>
<td>19.98</td>
<td>27.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N = 113)</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>66.48</td>
<td>20.76</td>
<td>17.67</td>
<td>21.38</td>
<td>21.52</td>
<td>28.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Beauty</td>
<td>67.14</td>
<td>21.29</td>
<td>16.43</td>
<td>22.57</td>
<td>18.50</td>
<td>30.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Stockroom</td>
<td>65.75</td>
<td>19.75</td>
<td>17.12</td>
<td>21.75</td>
<td>18.37</td>
<td>27.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Display</td>
<td>60.50</td>
<td>21.50</td>
<td>13.50</td>
<td>18.50</td>
<td>18.50</td>
<td>24.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>67.09</td>
<td>20.64</td>
<td>18.36</td>
<td>20.45</td>
<td>19.09</td>
<td>27.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F stat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p-value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < 0.05
Table 18: Significant Results for ANOVA for Demographic Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>CSS M</th>
<th>CSS Imp M</th>
<th>CSS P &amp; T M</th>
<th>CSS Att M</th>
<th>CCS M</th>
<th>JIQ M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N = 99)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>20-29 yrs</td>
<td>64.81</td>
<td>20.95</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>21.86</td>
<td>21.68</td>
<td>29.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30-39 yrs</td>
<td>64.34</td>
<td>19.38</td>
<td>17.25</td>
<td>20.81</td>
<td>19.32</td>
<td>27.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>40-49 yrs</td>
<td>68.91</td>
<td>19.59</td>
<td>19.50</td>
<td>22.69</td>
<td>19.50</td>
<td>26.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50-59 yrs</td>
<td>68.75</td>
<td>19.75</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>22.50</td>
<td>14.25</td>
<td>27.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F stat p-value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N = 143)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>65.70</td>
<td>19.31</td>
<td>17.49</td>
<td>22.04</td>
<td>19.95</td>
<td>27.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>69.31</td>
<td>21.62</td>
<td>17.37</td>
<td>22.44</td>
<td>19.44</td>
<td>28.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>69.33</td>
<td>23.33</td>
<td>16.89</td>
<td>21.44</td>
<td>18.78</td>
<td>27.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Coloured</td>
<td>70.77</td>
<td>21.85</td>
<td>19.23</td>
<td>22.54</td>
<td>20.83</td>
<td>27.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F stat p-value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>6.43</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tenure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N = 127)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>0-5 yrs</td>
<td>64.79</td>
<td>20.22</td>
<td>16.21</td>
<td>21.81</td>
<td>20.53</td>
<td>28.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6-10 yrs</td>
<td>71.23</td>
<td>21.59</td>
<td>20.06</td>
<td>22.18</td>
<td>20.65</td>
<td>30.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11-15 yrs</td>
<td>68.50</td>
<td>19.56</td>
<td>19.37</td>
<td>22.19</td>
<td>19.19</td>
<td>26.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16-20 yrs</td>
<td>69.91</td>
<td>18.27</td>
<td>19.91</td>
<td>23.82</td>
<td>18.82</td>
<td>26.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21-25 yrs</td>
<td>62.40</td>
<td>18.60</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>15.40</td>
<td>23.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F stat p-value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>7.19</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Children</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N = 143)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>68.29</td>
<td>20.14</td>
<td>18.59</td>
<td>22.28</td>
<td>19.15</td>
<td>27.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>63.68</td>
<td>20.09</td>
<td>15.39</td>
<td>21.69</td>
<td>21.50</td>
<td>28.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F stat p-value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.78</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>19.33</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N = 144)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>64.51</td>
<td>20.11</td>
<td>16.36</td>
<td>21.53</td>
<td>20.81</td>
<td>28.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>68.76</td>
<td>20.22</td>
<td>18.44</td>
<td>22.59</td>
<td>19.54</td>
<td>27.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>71.00</td>
<td>20.40</td>
<td>20.50</td>
<td>22.20</td>
<td>16.70</td>
<td>27.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>69.60</td>
<td>18.80</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>24.60</td>
<td>18.40</td>
<td>27.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F stat p-value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N = 144)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>65.36</td>
<td>20.42</td>
<td>16.31</td>
<td>22.08</td>
<td>19.22</td>
<td>26.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>108</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>67.39</td>
<td>20.04</td>
<td>18.02</td>
<td>22.13</td>
<td>20.15</td>
<td>28.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F stat p-value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < 0.05
Table 19: Fisher’s LSD for ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>CSS</th>
<th>CSS Imp</th>
<th>CSS P&amp;T</th>
<th>CCS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td>20 to 29 yrs – 30 to 39 yrs</td>
<td>-1.87*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.35*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20 to 29 yrs – 40 to 49 yrs</td>
<td>-4.12*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20 to 29 yrs – 50 to 59 yrs</td>
<td>-2.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.43*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30 to 39 yrs – 40 to 49 yrs</td>
<td>-2.25*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30 to 39 yrs – 50 to 59 yrs</td>
<td>-0.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.07*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40 to 49 yrs – 50 to 59 yrs</td>
<td>-1.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.25*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td>White – Black</td>
<td>2.31*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indian – Black</td>
<td>4.02*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coloured – Black</td>
<td>2.53*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indian – White</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coloured – White</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indian – Coloured</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tenure</strong></td>
<td>1 to 5 yrs – 6 to 10 yrs</td>
<td>-6.44*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-3.85*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 to 5 yrs – 11 to 15 yrs</td>
<td>-3.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-3.17*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 to 5 yrs – 16 to 20 yrs</td>
<td>-5.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-3.70*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 to 5 yrs – 21 to 25 yrs</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 to 10 yrs – 11 to 15 yrs</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 to 10 yrs – 16 to 20 yrs</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 to 10 yrs – 21 to 25 yrs</td>
<td>8.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.06*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 to 15 yrs – 16 to 20 yrs</td>
<td>-1.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 to 15 yrs – 21 to 25 yrs</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 to 20 yrs – 21 to 25 yrs</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.91*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td>Single – Married</td>
<td>-4.25*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-2.08*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Single – Divorced</td>
<td>-6.49*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Single – Relationship</td>
<td>-5.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Married – Divorced</td>
<td>-2.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Married – Relationship</td>
<td>-2.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Divorced – Relationship</td>
<td>-0.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.9 Summary of Results

The primary focus of this study was to investigate the inter-relationships between the Career Salience Scale, the Career Commitment Scale, and the Job Involvement Questionnaire. The above section described the statistical results that were generated.

In terms of the internal reliability of the CSS, the CCS, and the JIQ, as well as the various combinations of the three scales, were all reasonable. However, the internal reliability of the components of the CSS were bought into question as they were all below .60.

According to the mean scores of each of the three scales, respondents generally possessed slightly above average scores. The relative importance of work and career component of the CSS also displayed relatively high scores. As for the results of standard deviations, each scale could be assumed to be normally distributed.

With respect to the item analyses that were conducted, it appears that almost all of the items of the three scales under investigation were problematic in terms of the item-total correlations, skewness, and kurtosis results.

Correlations were then assessed in order to establish whether there were significant relationships between the three scales as a whole. The results depicted statistically significant correlations between all three scales as well as between the CSS and its three components. The component of the CSS relating to one’s general attitude towards work displayed significant results in terms of the CSS (and its components),
the CCS, and the JIQ and the three scales with two demographic variables, namely
children and gender.

Following on from the above mentioned correlations, the partial correlations found
that the CSS was independent of the relationship that occurred between the CCS and
the JIQ and that the CCS was independent of the relationship that occurred between
the CSS and the JIQ. Finally, the JIQ was found to be the connector between the CSS
and the CCS as this was the only result that drastically decreased when partially out
the third variable.

The principal components factor analysis identified that the items from the same
scales and each sub-scale did not load on the same factors. Twelve out of the 27 items
of the CSS appeared to load on Factor 2, however the remaining items were also
loading on Factors 1, 3, 4, and 5. The Career Commitment Scale had four items
loading on Factor 1 and three on Factor 3. The items from the JIQ mainly loaded on
Factor 1, with the exception of three items, which either loaded onto Factor 3 or
Factor 5.

Further correlations between the three scales and two of the demographic variables,
namely children and gender, were then carried out. Those participants who had
children possessed statistically significant results in terms of the correlations between
the three scales whereas the participants who did not have children only had one
statistically significant result between the CCS and the JIQ. There were also
significant relationships between the three components of the CSS and the other
scales for both cases. As for gender, male participants displayed statistically
significant results for the correlations between the CSS and the CCS as well as between the CCS and the JIQ. On the other hand, female participants had statistically significant correlations in terms of the JIQ with the CSS, and the JIQ with the CCS.

Finally, the ANOVAs that were conducted resulted in numerous significant results. The overall CSS displayed significant results in terms of tenure and marital status whereas the three components of the CSS had varying significant results throughout all the demographic variables, with the exception of job grade. The Career Commitment Scale possessed significant results in terms of age, children, and marital status. It was interesting to note that the JIQ was the only scale that did not display any significant results when assessed in accordance with demographic variables.
Discussion of Results

The primary aim of this research was to investigate the inter-relationships between the Career Salience Scale, the Career Commitment Scale, and the Job Involvement Questionnaire. In an attempt to fully understand the constructs that these three instruments measure, the term ‘career’ and how it has evolved over the years, was critically discussed. The information that was gathered from the literature on the topic lead to the understanding that the three scales under investigation may no longer measure what they were originally designed to measure.

The present chapter will discuss the results described in the previous section, in light of the theoretical argument put forward in the literature review. The three research questions that were posed will be addressed and reference will be made to other relevant and pertinent findings that were attained. Following on from the discussion of the results section, the theoretical and practical implications for the present study as well as its limitations and directions for future research, will be mentioned.

4.1 Item Analyses

The item-total correlations, skewness, and kurtosis scores from the CCS, the CSS, and the JIQ highlighted numerous problematic items. The majority of these weaker items were in the CSS and the CCS. In line with the literature on the applicability of these two scales to the current understanding of careers, it appears that further investigations should be undertaken to address such concerns. For instance, problematic items may be extracted and replaced with more relevant statements, or
the entire scale may be replaced with more appropriate items. Additional analyses were conducted in this research to further understand such findings and based on these one may assess whether or not the CSS, the CCS, and the JIQ need to be replaced or revised.

4.2 Correlations for Scales

According to the results from the correlations that were conducted, there was a significant correlation present between the CSS and the CCS. According to Murphy and Davidshofer (1998) a correlation coefficient close to or greater than .3 represents a moderate relationship. This relates to convergent validity and means that the instruments may not be distinct from one another. The correlation of .18 that was obtained should therefore illustrate that the CSS and CCS possess discriminant validity and are thus distinct from one another. In terms of the three components of the CSS, there was only a significant correlation between ‘one’s general attitude toward work’ and the CCS. Here the correlation was .27, which tends to further represent that the CSS and the CCS maybe distinct from one another.

Originally, Greenhaus (1971, p209) defined career salience and career commitment as the “perceived importance of work and a career in one’s total life”. However, over the years researchers such as Blau (1985, p278) re-conceptualised career commitment and defined it as “one’s attitude towards one’s profession or vocation”. Therefore in line with the literature, the results found the CSS and the CCS to be distinct from one another as they measure different constructs.
The results from this research found a significantly positive relationship ($r = .59$) between the CCS and the JIQ. According to Murphy and Davidshofer (1998) this means that the CCS and JIQ represent convergent validity and are therefore not considered distinct from one another. Such a finding is expected due to the fact that the CCS refers to the term ‘job’ in one of its items and makes reference to ‘vocation’ in all of its other items. Thus the construct ‘career’ is never actually measured and the participants do not actually realise that the answers they provide should be in line with the feelings they have towards their current career.

In line with literature on the topic, a study conducted by Cohen (1999) concluded that the CCS and the JIQ possess a significantly positive correlation $r = .57$. This provides further evidence of convergence between these two scales.

A correlation of $.30$ was present between the CSS and the JIQ. In accordance with Murphy and Davidshofer (1998) correlations of $.3$ and above possess convergent validity. There were also significantly positive correlations between the JIQ and the ‘relative importance of work and career’ ($r = .30$) and ‘general attitude towards work’ ($r = .31$) components of the CSS. Both of these correlations, although borderline, further illustrate the convergence between the CSS and the JIQ.

From the literature on the topic, career salience and job involvement have been found to overlap with one another as there has been evidence of the scales being significantly inter-related and not clearly distinguishable from one another (Morrow, 1983, 1993; Shore, Thornton, and Shore, 1990). For example correlations of $.52$ and $.62$ have been reported between the CSS and the JIQ (Morrow & McElroy, 1986;
Shore, Thornton, and Shore, 1990). However, although the current research agreed that these scales converge, the correlations were quite a bit lower (a correlation of .30).

Sekeran (1982) provided an explanation of why the CSS and the JIQ may converge. He stated that someone who is confident and exudes a strong sense of self-esteem, is more likely to identify and become involved with their job (job involvement), which in turn may link to an increase in the importance they place on their career (career salience) (Sekeran, 1982). One must keep in mind though that such a relationship may not always be present, however it does provide a further explanation of how the JIQ and the CSS relate to one another.

**4.3 First-Order Partial Correlations**

This current research conducted a first-order partial correlation in an attempt to determine whether the JIQ confounded the significant correlation that was present between the CSS and the CCS. As the correlation between these two scales was drastically decreased when the JIQ was partialed out, the relationship was affected, indicating that JIQ connected the CSS and the CCS. Furthermore, after the partial correlation there was a non-significant negative correlation present between these two instruments.

Such a finding is confirmed by Blau, Paul, and St. John’s (1993) study, as the factor analysis that that was conducted resulted in the CSS and the CCS being weakened by conceptual confusion and measurement problems, as there were item inconsistencies
and construct contamination. For example one item from the CSS states “If I work very hard on my job, I can’t enjoy the better things in life” (See Appendix B) whilst one item from the CCS states “I would take a different job that paid the same” (See Appendix C). Therefore it appears obvious that the JIQ would connect the CSS and the CCS as all three scales make reference to the term ‘job’.

The correlation between the CCS and the JIQ, with the CSS partialed out, resulted in the relationship remaining fairly stable ($r = .57$). This means that in this case, the CSS may be viewed as being independent from the relationship that occurred between the CCS and the JIQ. This was the most significant finding out of the three partial correlations and was thus considered the most important as it illustrated that the CSS does not confound the strong relationship that arose between the CCS and the JIQ.

The partial correlation that was carried out therefore provides further evidence that there is an overlap between the CCS the JIQ and what they aim to measure. This is also apparent in the definitions of job involvement and career commitment as job involvement examines how one can satisfy one’s salient needs (Kanungo, 1982) whilst career commitment transcends that of a job and considers the development of personal goals (Corelli & Bishop, 1997). Therefore being involved in your job is a basis for being committed to your career.

The correlation between the CSS and the JIQ with the CCS partialed out remained fairly constant, which means that the CCS is independent from the relationship that arose between the CSS and the JIQ. However, once the CCS was partialed out the correlation became .24, which led to the conclusion that, the correlation between the
CSS and the JIQ might represent discriminant validity. This finding does not appear to be supported by previous research. However, these inconsistencies may be due to conceptual confusions and measurement problems in terms of item inconsistencies and construct contamination found in the CSS (Blau, Paul, & St. John, 1993).

For example one item of the CSS states that “It is more important to have some leisure time after work than to have a job in my chosen career, be devoted to it, and be a success at it” (See Appendix C). An item such as this makes reference to other constructs such as “work” and “job” and is quite a long statement. This makes it more difficult for the participant to interpret the item and provide a relevant answer, especially for this particular sample as English was not the first language for many of the participants. Overall such discrepancies may impact on the measurement of the scale as a whole.

4.4 Principal Components Factor Analysis

A principal components factor analysis was conducted to further test whether the three scales under investigation were distinct from one another. Five factors were extracted, which might be indicative of the CSS and its three components, the CCS, and the JIQ. However, the factor loadings provided a different interpretation, as the three scales did not distinctly load on the five different factors. This provided evidence of concept redundancy amongst the scales under investigation.
4.4.1 Factor 1

Most items from the CCS and the JIQ loaded onto Factor 1. The correlations that were conducted for the scales and the demographic variables illustrated this point, as there was convergent validity between these two scales. This finding was further confirmed from the partial correlations that suggest that one may use either the CCS or the CSS to predict job involvement, as there appears to be an overlap between the CCS and the JIQ. Therefore it appears that from the statistical analyses that were conducted, in answering the second research question, the CCS and the JIQ are not distinct from one another.

It is interesting to note that the current research found overwhelming evidence of convergence between the CCS and the JIQ whilst Blau (1985, 1988, 1989) found evidence to suggest that the CCS is actually factorially independent from the JIQ (Blau, 1988, 1989). Thus it is highly recommended that further research be conducted to identify whether or not these two scales are actually distinct from one another.

Two other items also loaded onto Factor 1. The first item was from ‘the relative importance of work and career’ component of the CSS and stated “It is more important to be liked by a fellow man, devote my energies for the betterment of man, and be at least some help to someone than to have my job in my chosen career, be devoted to it, and be a success at it” (See Appendix B). This particular item from the CSS is quite long and confusing as it refers to numerous situations making it difficult to answer. Furthermore there is a clear indication that this statement places emphasis on how important one’s job is within a career, which relates to the JIQ. This may be a reason why this item of the CSS loads onto the same factor as many of the JIQ items.
The second item was from the ‘general attitude towards work’ component of the CSS and stated “Work is one of the few areas in life where I can gain real satisfaction” (See Appendix B). Here there is no reference to one’s career as the term “work” is used, which might be viewed as relating to one’s immediate job. Therefore one may see how this item also relates to the JIQ.

**4.4.2 Factor 2**

The component of the CSS entitled ‘general attitude towards work’ generally loaded onto Factor 2 as well as the three remaining items of the CSS that did not belong to any of the three components of the scale. These items were “If I work hard on my job, I can’t enjoy the better things in life,” “I’m ready to make many sacrifices to get ahead in my job.” and “I would move to another part of the country if I thought it would help me advance in my career” (See Appendix B). These three items appear to refer to an employee’s general attitude towards their work or career, whilst still measuring one’s overall importance of a career. Therefore there seems to be a connection between these items and the ‘general attitude towards work’ component of the CSS.

Other items that loaded on Factor 2 included two items from the ‘relative importance of work and career’ component of the CSS and two items from the ‘planning and thinking about one’s career’ component of the CSS. Therefore in terms of Factor 2 from the principal components factor analysis that was carried out, there appears to be an overlap with regards to the three components of the CSS. However, items from the CCS and the JIQ did not load onto this factor, so it appears that in terms of Factor 2, the CCS and the JIQ are distinct from one another. From this one can see that there
does tend to be a need for reconfiguring the components of the CSS, although this is
not the focus of this research.

4.4.3 Factor 3

The remaining items from the CCS and two items from the JIQ loaded on Factor 3.
Once again this illustrates an overlap between these two scales. One reason for such a
strong overlap between these two scales is that the CCS refers to the terms ‘job’ and
‘vocation’, throughout its statements, which may relate to the JIQ.

Another three items loaded onto Factor 3. These were from the ‘planning and thinking
about one’s career’ and the ‘general attitude towards work’ components of the CSS.
An interesting item to make mention of is the one that stated “I never really think
about these types of questions much” (See Appendix B). As most of the items from
the CSS make reference to one’s job instead of one’s career, in answering this
statement the respondents may actually relate this item more to the JIQ than the CSS.
Therefore one would expect this item to load where the JIQ loads, which in this case
is on Factor 3.

The second item from the CSS that loaded onto Factor 3 also made reference to the
term “job” so once again this may explain why it may be found here. The final CSS
item states “I often find myself thinking about whether I will enjoy my chosen career”
(See Appendix B). This item appears to relate more to career commitment than to
career salience as the former refers to one’s commitment to a career whilst the latter
identifies the importance that a person places on their career. One may assume that if
someone enjoys their career they are more committed to it, which would therefore explain why this item loads on Factor 3 in accordance with the CCS.

**4.4.4 Factor 4**

Most of the items from the ‘relative importance of work and career’ component of the CSS loaded on Factor 4. However there were two other items, each from the other two components of the CSS that loaded here. The item from the ‘planning and thinking about one’s career’ component of the CSS states “Planning for a specific career usually is not worth the effort, it doesn’t matter too much what I do” (See Appendix B). This item could also refer to the relative importance one places on their work or career as it highlights whether or not planning a specific career is of a major concern in one’s life. The second item was from the ‘general attitude towards work’ component of the CSS and states “It is difficult to find satisfaction in life unless I enjoy my job” (See Appendix B). There also appears to be a link between this item and the ‘relative importance of work and career’ component of the CSS as it places a ‘job’ relative to one’s life.

**4.4.5 Factor 5**

One item from the JIQ and four items from the CSS loaded onto Factor 5. All of these items, with the exception of one, appear to place emphasis on a life-span approach to one’s career, work, or job. The odd item is from the ‘general attitude towards work’ component of the CSS and states “To me a job should be viewed primarily as a way of making money” (See Appendix B). However, if one had to delve a little deeper they may assume that there is an association between money and future plans and therefore these items link together.
4.5 Summary for Research Question 1:

Is there a distinction between Career Commitment and Career Salience?

From the correlations of the scales it appears that there is a distinction between career commitment and career salience. However there were conflicting and interesting findings in terms of the partial correlation that was conducted. For instance the partial correlation was drastically reduced when the JIQ was removed, which illustrated that this third scale affected the relationship between the CSS and the CCS. The factor analysis then went on to identify that the CSS is problematic as it loaded across all five factors. The CCS therefore overlapped with many of the items from the CSS, however emphasis was placed on those items that loaded onto Factor 1 and Factor 3. Thus in terms of answering this research question, there appears to be contradictory results in whether or not the CSS and the CCS are actually distinct from one another.

4.6 Summary for Research Question 2:

Is there a distinction between Career Commitment and Job Involvement?

The results from the various correlations that were carried out illustrated that there is convergence between the CCS and the JIQ because in all the significant correlations, Pearson’s correlation co-efficient was found to be above .30. Therefore according to the correlations there is strong evidence to conclude that there is a lack of a distinction between the CCS and the JIQ.

From the findings of the factor analysis, one may further conclude that there is a definite overlap between the CCS and the JIQ. In a study conducted by Blau (1983)
all of the items of the CCS loaded onto a single factor and all of the items of the JIQ loaded onto a different factor. However Morrow and Wirth (1989) found job involvement to load onto two different factors, which supports the findings from this research. Therefore previous research on the JIQ does not appear to be consistent in terms of factor loadings.

4.7 Summary for Research Question 3:

Is there a distinction between Career Salience and Job Involvement?

According to Murphy and Davidshofer (1994) a correlation coefficient close to or greater than .30 represents convergent validity. However this should be used as a guideline and therefore when interpreting the correlation score of .30 that was present between the CSS and the JIQ, one may view it as being a borderline case. In the partial correlation that was conducted the correlation between the CSS and the JIQ remained fairly stable after the CCS was partialed out, with Pearson’s correlation coefficient falling below .30, which meant that there was discriminant validity present.

In the factor analysis, the JIQ mainly loaded onto Factor 1. However, as the CSS loaded onto all five factors there was an overlap amongst this scale and the items from the JIQ. Therefore in answering the third research question, there appears to be evidence to conclude that in certain circumstances the CSS and the JIQ converge, whereas in other cases they are distinct from one another.
4.8 Correlations for Demographic Variables

4.8.1 Children

Only participants who had children were found to possess a significantly positive correlation between the CSS and the CCS (r = .27). This finding reiterates the idea that these two scales represent discriminant validity. One may interpret this finding as follows: For those participants, who had children, one could assume that when their level of career salience increases, so will their levels of career commitment. This may relate to literature on the topic of careers as one may assume that as job security is no longer a guarantee, employees who have children may feel the extra pressure of providing for their families (Shreuder & Theron, 2001). The additional financial costs involved when people have children may result in the parents placing more importance on their careers and being more committed to them so that they may grow within that career, achieve more, and hopefully earn more money. This may also explain why there was not a significant correlation between the CSS and the CCS for participants who did not have children.

There was also a significantly positive relationship between the CCS and the ‘planning and thinking about one’s career’ component of the CSS for those participants who had children. Once again discriminant validity was present (r = .25). Due to the additional financial burden of having children one would expect parents to plan and think about their careers in an attempt to foresee what they would be able to afford in terms of their children’s future.
A significantly positive relationship arose between the ‘general attitude towards work’ component of the CSS and the CCS for both participants who had children and for those who did not have children. In terms of those participants who had children, there was further evidence for discriminant validity ($r = .25$), however convergent validity was present for participants who did not have children ($r = .34$).

Themes that arose in the ‘general attitude towards work’ component of the CSS included satisfaction and success, and a career being necessary and seen as a means for making money. According to the literature on careers, employees appear to rely more on themselves and taking responsibility for their own careers (Yarnall, 1998). Such changes have resulted in a more prominent focus on internal, subjective interpretations of how an individual views their career. Therefore regardless of whether or not an employee has children, one would assume that one’s ‘general attitude towards work’ would be significant in terms of career salience and career commitment.

This is quite an important finding because it illustrates how the definition of a career has changed over the years. The current notion of a career refers to one’s subjective interpretation (Yarnall, 1998) whilst the traditional notion of a career was viewed as a quality or occupation of an organisation (Greenhaus, 1987). It therefore appears that both the CSS and the CCS are being interpreted in a more modern way, which is evidence that they are still at least partially applicable.

Participants who had children as well as those who did not have children, both experienced significantly strong, positive correlations ($r = .50$ and $r = .73$).
respectively) between the CCS and the JIQ. This provides further evidence of convergence between these two scales.

There were only significantly positive correlations between the CSS and the JIQ for participants who had children. Thus as these respondents’ career salience increased, so did their level of job involvement. A result of $r = .39$ was obtained, which demonstrated that there was convergent validity between the CSS and the JIQ. Once again this is in line with previous research on these two scales (Morrow, 1983, 1993; Shore, Thornton, and Shore, 1990).

It is interesting to note that all the results thus far pertaining to children and the three instruments have resulted in significant correlations. One may deduce that having children increases a parent’s financial obligations and therefore they become more involved in their job and place more importance on their careers in an attempt to earn more money. Furthermore, due to a lack of job security, employees with children may feel that if they are more dedicated then they may be less likely to lose their jobs (Schreuder & Theron, 2001).

Participants with children also had a significantly positive relationship when it came to the JIQ and the ‘relative importance of work and career’ component of the CSS. Once again there was convergent validity present ($r = .33$). All the items from this component include the term ‘job’ and therefore one may identify why there is a correlation present. However it is only significant for those participants who had children, which means that they probably place more importance on their work and career. This reiterates the influence that job insecurity has had on families.
The final significantly positive correlation was between the JIQ and the ‘general attitude towards work’ component of the CSS. This was present for all participants regardless of whether or not they had children. The results were both borderline in terms of discriminant validity for participants who had children (r = .29) and convergent validity for those that did not have children (r = .30).

Items from the ‘general attitude towards work’ component include “Work is one of the few areas in life where you can gain real satisfaction.” and “I look at a career as a means of expressing myself.” These refer to a more modern outlook on what defines a career as these items focus on internal matters such as image of self identity and subjective perceptions of what defines a career (Collin, 1998). Therefore these general attitudes appear to be shared by both parents and non-parents in terms of the correlation between this component of the CSS and the overall JIQ.

**4.8.2 Gender**

Only male participants were found to have a significantly positive correlation for the CSS and the CCS (r = .46). This illustrates that as a male’s level of career salience increased, so did their levels of career commitment. In this instance the CSS and CCS are found to possess convergent validity, which contradicts the findings from the previous results. However, such a finding may be related to the way the participants interpreted their own careers. For instance a male’s role within the workplace has not undergone as drastic a change as a female’s role. Thus one may assume that males still tend to follow a more traditional career path which, according to them, is seen as sequential, predictable, and organised (Holmes & Cartwright, 1993). As this is the type of definition that both the CSS and CCS were based on when they were
originally formulated, it appears that they are able to measure the male participants’ interpretation of the instruments.

However, since the construction of the CSS and CCS there has been a large influx of females into the workplace. Therefore a female’s interpretation of what defines a career may be viewed in a more modern way as they experience more disruptions in their careers in terms of having children, and generally being the ones to put their careers on hold (Schreuder & Theron, 2001). Therefore the non-significant correlation that arose for females and the CSS and CCS, may be due to the instruments being based on a traditional view of what defines a career. In other words the two scales may be unable to measure a more modern interpretation of the term ‘career’.

Male participants also had a significant positive correlation when it came to the CCS and the component of the CSS depicting ‘one’s general attitude towards work’ ($r = .56$). Once again the reason for this result may be related to how males and females have different interpretations of a career. The two instruments refer to the importance and commitment one places on a career and for working females, their family responsibilities may still take precedence over their careers. Thus only males had a significant correlation for this component of the CSS.

In terms of gender, males and females were also found to have significantly strong, positive correlations ($r = .66$ and $r = .56$ respectively) between the CCS and the JIQ. Hence all participants, regardless of whether they were male or female, felt that as their level of career commitment increases, so does their level of job involvement. This is in line with what has already been discussed, as the definitions of career
commitment and job involvement overlap and thus one would expect there to be significant correlations between these two scales.

Female participants had a significantly positive correlation in terms of the CSS and the JIQ ($r = .27$). In this case there appears to be discriminant validity between these two scales, which is not in accordance with previous literature. However, as stated earlier, there have been confusions and measurement problems in terms of item inconsistencies and construct contamination for the CSS, which may explain this contradictory finding (Blau, Paul, & St. John, 1993).

Females also had a significantly positive correlation when it came to the ‘relative importance of work and career’ component of the CSS and the JIQ ($r = .33$). In this case there appears to be convergent validity present, which was also noted by Morrow (1983, 1999).

One reason that only females experience this significant correlation between the CSS and the JIQ is that they may feel that they have to put in extra effort to compete with their male counterparts. Often a female’s career path is disrupted when they have children and with the added pressure of breaking down stereotypical barriers of women in the workplace, females may place more importance on their careers (career salience) and get more involved in their jobs (job involvement) (Schreuder & Theron, 2001).

Both males and females displayed a significantly positive relationship in terms of the ‘general attitude towards works’ component of the CSS and the JIQ. However, for
males it appears that convergent validity is present \( (r = .39) \) whereas for females discriminant validity \( (r = .27) \) is present. Once again there appears to be conflicting results for these two scales.

As was previously noted, common themes that arose in this component of the CSS included satisfaction and success, and a career as being necessary and seen as a means for making money. This relates to an internal focus on how a career is viewed, which is in line with literature on careers whereby employees appear to relying more on themselves and taking responsibility for their own careers (Yarnall, 1998). Thus the term ‘career’ is viewed here in a more modern light, which makes it seem that the scales are still applicable today.

4.9 Summary of Correlations for Demographic Variables: Research Question 1. Is there a distinction between Career Commitment and Career Salience?

Participants who had children were found to possess discriminant validity when it came to the CSS and the CCS, and the CCS and the ‘planning and thinking about one’s career’ component of the CSS. However, when it came to the correlation between the CCS and the ‘general attitude towards work’ component of the CSS, participants with children possessed discriminant validity, whereas those with no children displayed convergent validity. Convergent validity was also present in terms of male participants and the significant correlations between the CSS and the CCS, and the CCS and the ‘general attitude towards work component’ of the CSS. Thus in terms of answering this research question, there appears to be contradictory results in whether of not the CSS and the CCS are actually distinct from one another.
4.10 Summary of Correlations for Demographic Variables: Research Question 2.

Is there a distinction between Career Commitment and Job Involvement?

The results from the various correlations for demographic variables identified convergence between the CCS and the JIQ because in all the significant correlations, Pearson’s correlation co-efficient was found to be above .30.

4.11 Summary of Correlations for Demographic Variables: Research Question 3.

Is there a distinction between Career Salience and Job Involvement?

The correlations pertaining to the demographic variables led to conflicting results. For example, participants with children had convergent validity in terms of the CSS and the JIQ, and the JIQ and ‘the relative importance of work and career’ component of the CSS. However they had discriminant validity when it came to the JIQ and the ‘general attitude towards work’ component of the CSS, whereas participants who did not have children displayed convergent validity in this instance.

Furthermore female participants displayed convergent validity when it came to the JIQ and ‘the relative importance of work and career’ component of the CSS, but they had discriminant validity in terms of the CSS and the JIQ, and the JIQ and ‘general attitude towards work’ component of the CSS. Finally, male participants possessed convergent validity between the JIQ and the ‘general attitude towards work’ component of the CSS. Therefore in answering the third research question, there appears to be evidence of both convergent and discriminant validity between the CSS and the JIQ.
4.12 Summary of the Correlations and the Factor Analysis

As the results thus far have shown, the CCS and the JIQ do not appear to be distinct from one another as they possess convergent validity and their items overlapped in the factor analysis.

The CSS appears to be problematic as the correlations found reason to believe that in certain instances the CSS converged with whilst at other times is discriminated against the other two scales. The factor analysis confirmed this finding as items from the three components of the CSS loaded onto all five factors.

Previous research has also identified problems with the CSS. For instance even in Greenhaus’ (1973) original factor analysis of career salience only 27% of variance was explained which was quite poor and questioned the scale’s reliability. Other researchers have found there to be a lack of congruence between the definition of career salience and its items, indicating poor construct validity (Blau, 1985; Morrow, 1983; Morrow, Eastman, & McElroy, 1991). Not to mention Allen (1999) who stated that the use interchangeable terms and reference to other constructs may also elicit inappropriate responses and may explain a lack of internal reliability and discriminant validity. Overall, the CSS appears to be problematic and it is highly recommended that the scale is either revised or a new instrument is developed to measure career salience.

The above statistics were therefore useful in answering the three research questions that were put forward from the literature review. Following on from this numerous
analyses of variances were then conducted to identify whether the findings from this particular sample were in line with previous research.

4.13 Significant Results for Analysis of Variance for Demographic Variables

ANOVA\textsuperscript{s} were conducted to provide a further information regarding the demographics of this particular sample in relation to the CSS, the CCS, and the JIQ. The results showed that there were significant differences when it came to age, race, tenure, children, marital status, and gender.

4.13.1 Age

Age was found to have two significant results. These were for the ‘planning and thinking about one’s career’ component of the CSS and for the CCS. Fisher’s LSD identified the significant differences between the means for each age group. The greatest difference was found to lie between 20 to 29 years and 40 to 49 years for the component of the CSS and between 20 to 29 years and 50 to 59 years for the overall CCS.

For the ‘planning and thinking about one’s career’ component of the CSS, employees who were 20 to 29 years displayed lower levels of this component when compared to 40 to 49 year olds. This would appear to be in line with the literature on careers because the younger employees, who have just started working, need to find a balance between two opposing tasks. The first task involves maximising one’s alternatives and engaging in career exploration (Jepson & Choudhuri, 2001). Therefore there is less
planning and thinking about a particular career, as the employee has not yet settled down.

Furthermore the youngest group of employees (20 to 29 years old) were found to possess greater career commitment than the oldest group of employees (50 to 59 year olds). One would expect this, as this finding corresponds to the second task experienced in this phase. The younger employees have just started their careers and should be more committed to their career as they aim to create stability and become responsible for establishing family relations and a stable work structure (Holmes & Cartwright, 1993).

Employees who were between the ages of 40 to 49 years had the greatest career salience in terms of the ‘planning and thinking about one’s career’ component. This career phase is prone to mid-life crises and fears of the future after employment. Therefore employees within this age group may be planning and thinking about starting a new career post-retirement (Jepsen & Choudhuri, 2001).

Employees between the ages of 20 to 29 years were found to display the highest levels of career commitment. Erikson (1963) in Schreuder and Theron (2001) regards the developmental task of early adulthood as developing intimacy, which refers to commitment and involvement. This task is realised through relationships with loved ones, with a co-worker, with a boss, or through commitment to an organisation. If a new employee is committed to the organisation then one may assume that they would be committed to their career within that organisation.
4.13.2 Tenure

Two statistically significant results were discovered for tenure, namely for the CSS as a whole and for its ‘planning and thinking about one’s career’ component. The Fisher’s LSD that was conducted resulted in the largest differences being found between employees whose tenure ranged from 1 to 5 years and 6 to 10 years, for the CSS, and between 6 to 10 years and 21 to 25 years, for the component of the CSS.

For the CSS, employees who had been with the company for fewer years (1 to 5 years) displayed lower levels of career salience than employees who had been with the company for longer (6 to 10 years). Career salience refers to the importance of work and career in a person’s life (Greenhaus, 1971). Thus respondents with a lower tenure may not have had enough time within their current career to explore it and decide whether it is important to them.

The component of the CSS entitled ‘planning and thinking about one’s career’ also produced a statistically significant result where the largest difference lay between 6 to 10 years and 21 to 25 years, with the former group possessing higher levels of this component. As this particular company had a relatively low turnover rate, one could assume that the longer, an employee had been with the company, the older they were. Hence, as with age, the employees who had been with the company for fewer years probably have a longer career term ahead of them and therefore they would plan and think more about their careers than someone nearing the end of their employment with the organisation (Jepson & Choudhuri, 2001).
4.13.3 Race

The demographic variable race was found to have one statistically significant result. This was for the component of the CSS entitled ‘relative importance of work and career’, whereby Indian employees displayed the highest levels. Fisher’s LSD found that the greatest difference lay between Indian and Black employees, with Indians possessing higher levels of this component.

There appears to be little or no literature on the topic of race and career salience, especially for Indian and Black employees within a South African context. Therefore this result may be solely related to this particular research, however further research should be carried out to verify this claim.

4.13.4 Children

There were three significant results for the demographic variable pertaining to children. However as this variable only consisted on two levels, no Fisher’s LSD was conducted. Instead the two groups of participants were compared to identify who had the largest mean. The first two significant results were for the overall CSS and the ‘planning and thinking about one’s career’ component of the CSS, with participants who had children possessing a greater level of both.

The discussion section of this result has already drawn the reader’s attention to the added financial pressure of having children. This may result in employees placing more importance on their careers so that they may grow within that career, achieve more, and hopefully earn more money. Furthermore due to the additional financial burden of having children one would expect parents to plan and think about their
careers in an attempt to foresee what they would be able to afford in terms of their children’s future (Schreuder & Theron, 2001).

The final significant result for the children variable was in terms of the CCS, with participants who did not have children possessing higher levels of career commitment. Having children may disrupt an employee’s career path, as they may need to take maternity leave or take time off when the child is sick (Holmes & Cartwright, 1993). Therefore, the employee’s commitment lies more with their child than with their career.

4.13.5 Marital Status

In terms of marital status, there were three significant results. These were for the overall CSS, the ‘planning and thinking about one’s career’ component of the CSS, and the CCS. According to the Fisher’s LSD that was conducted, the greatest differences lay between single and divorced employees for all three of the significant findings.

Single employees were found to possess lower levels of overall career salience as well as the ‘planning and thinking about one’s career’ component of the CSS when compared to divorced employees. One may assume that single employees are generally younger than employees who have been married and are now divorced. Therefore, as with age and tenure, single employees may have a longer career life-span ahead of them for which they must plan for, whereas divorced employees may be older and are closer to the end of their employment with the organisation (Jepsen & Choudhuri, 2001).
Furthermore, large proportions of the participants were divorced females with the majority of them having children. Divorced female employees with children may place less importance on their careers when compared to single employees because they have an added responsibility and perhaps less of a support structure to assist them when they need to attend to ‘family emergencies’ (Schreuder & Theron, 2001). Therefore one would expect divorced employees to have lower levels of career salience when compared to single employees.

### 4.13.6 Gender

There was only one significant result for gender. Once again this variable only consisted of two levels and therefore a Fisher’s LSD was not conducted.

Female employees were found to possess higher levels of the ‘planning and thinking about one’s career’ component of the CSS. It is interesting to note that results from numerous studies over the years have concluded that men and women place the same importance on their careers (Almquist & Angrist, 1982; Sekeran, 1982; Moya, Exposito, & Ruiz, 2000). However, in terms of this component of the CSS, one may find that because a female usually experiences more disruptions in their career when they have children, they need to plan and think more than their male counterparts in terms of where they see their careers leading them in the future.
4.14 Non Significant Results for Analysis of Variance for Demographic Variables

4.14.1 Store
The stores that the relevant employees worked for did not have any significant results in terms of the CSS, the CCS, and the JIQ. This is an interesting finding as it represents consistency across the region in terms of factors, such as supervisory practices and policies and procedures that might effect an employee’s career salience, career commitment, or job involvement.

4.14.2 Job Status and the Job Involvement Questionnaire
According to the job status variable, there were no significant results for the three instruments under investigation. Therefore, it did not matter which position respondents held as their levels of career salience, career commitment, and job involvement remained fairly consistent. Such a finding illustrates that even if an employee is promoted there will be no significant changes in the results of each of these three scales.

The JIQ has been found to be a relatively stable and reliable instrument and therefore the lack of significant results must be related to the characteristics of this particular sample. One reason for there being no significant results for the JIQ may be explained by the non-significant findings that were also found for demographic variable job status as there may be few incentives offered by the organisation. The employees may therefore not feel the need to get involved in their jobs, as status does not appear to impact on their levels of career salience or career commitment.
4.14.3 The ‘General Attitude towards Work’ Component of the CSS

One’s attention must be drawn to the fact that there were also no significant results for the ‘general attitude towards work’ component of the CSS. From the correlations that were conducted the ‘general attitude towards work’ component of the CSS provided conflicting results in terms of convergent and discriminant validity and in the factor analysis this component was also the only one out of all three of the scales to load onto all five factors. Therefore, overall the ‘general attitude toward work’ component of the CSS appears problematic and this may be a reason for why there were no significant results for the ANOVA’s that were carried out.

4.15 Theoretical Implications

Numerous significant statistical analyses were found in this present study. The correlations and partial correlations that were conducted were useful in answering the three research questions.

4.15.1 Career Commitment and Career Salience

These results identified that there were contradictory findings as to whether or not career commitment and career salience are distinct from one another. This was due to the fact that there was convergent and discriminant validity present amongst the various correlations.

In terms of the theory underpinning the CCS and the CSS, the CSS was originally used to measure career commitment so one would expect there to be an overlap in what these two scales claim to measure. However, when Blau (1985) decided to
formulate a separate instrument to measure career commitment, research began to identify how the CSS and the CCS were distinct from one another. Although following on from the separation of these two scales, evidence has still shown there to be a connection between the CSS and the CCS. This is apparent in the interchangeable use of numerous constructs such as ‘job’, ‘work’, and ‘career’, which according to Blau, Paul, and St. John (1993) are understood as portraying different meanings. Such inconsistencies have thus created conceptual confusion and measurement problems. Therefore the contradictory findings from the present research appear to be indicative of results from previous research.

4.15.2 Career Commitment and Job Involvement

The second research question related to whether there is a distinction between career commitment and job involvement. The correlations found strong evidence to conclude that there is convergent validity present between these two variables. The principal components factor analysis confirmed this finding, as it appeared that the majority of the items from the CCS and the JIQ loaded onto the same two factors.

Blau (1988, 1989) found evidence to suggest that career commitment and job involvement are independent from one another, which is contradictory to the findings from this study. However, as previously mentioned, Blau, Paul and St. John (1993) stated that the career facet measures in their study, which included the CCS, displayed item inconsistencies and construct contamination. Thus when interpreting the CCS and the JIQ one must take into account that the results from the CCS may be weakened, which makes it difficult to make a solid conclusion in line with the JIQ. However, as the results from this particular study found strong evidence to conclude
that the CCS and the JIQ converged, it is recommended that further studies be conducted.

### 4.15.3 Career Salience and Job Involvement

The final research question asked whether there is a distinction between career salience and job involvement. Once again there were conflicting results as the correlations found evidence of both convergent and discriminant validity. The factor analysis that was conducted illustrated that the items from the CSS loaded onto all five factors. Such findings further explain why there were conflicting results in terms of the CSS and the CCS, and the CSS and the JIQ. This is in line with Morrow (1993), who suggested that Blau’s career commitment measure has more and stronger evidence of independence with job involvement and is therefore preferable to Greenhaus’ career salience measure. This is not to say that the CSS and the JIQ are not independent from one another, it merely means that the CSS is more independent than the CCS when compared to the JIQ (Kanungo, 1982; Misra, Kanungo, von Rosentiel & Stuhler, 1985). Such a finding was also discovered by Shore, Thornton, and Shore (1990), who stated that job involvement and career salience appear to be less clear to distinguish from one another.

Other researchers have found that there is concept redundancy among career salience and job involvement, which illustrates that the link between the conceptual definition and measurement procedure of these two instruments is less than perfect (Morrow & McElroy, 1986). Therefore as there appears to be evidence of independence and convergence between the CSS and the IQ, the findings from this study provide further evidence of the confusion surrounding the measurement of the CSS and the JIQ.
Thus in terms of the theoretical implications of the present study, it appears that the Greenhaus’ (1971) CSS requires some further development in terms of the career salience construct and what it aims to measure. This was evident in the conflicting results that were discovered in terms of the scale’s convergent and discriminant validity, when compared to the CCS and the JIQ. Therefore one recommends that further research is also required in testing the validity of the CSS in a South African context to identify whether these findings were related to this particular sample.

This study also identified a strong overlap between the CCS and the JIQ. This was an important finding as previous research has found that these two constructs are distinct from one another (Blau 1988, 1989). However, as the term ‘career’ has evolved over the years the scales under investigation may no longer accurately measure what they were originally designed to measure. Thus, even though previous research has concluded that the CCS and JIQ are distinct from one another, due to the findings from this study, it appears that further research should be carried out.

**4.16 Practical Implications**

The ANOVA’s that were conducted provide information about the practical implications of all three scales. The findings from this study concluded that in terms of the practicality of the CSS, the CCS, and the JIQ, all three scales need to be updated.
4.16.1 Greenhaus’ (1971) Career Salience Scale

There were nine statistically significant results for the CSS, including its three components. These were for age, race, tenure, children, marital status, and gender. It is important for organisations to realise that all of these variables relate to their employees’ level of career salience because if an employee does not find their career to be important to them, then they are less likely to perform to the best of their ability. Employees must take responsibility for their own careers as job security is no longer a guarantee and organisations need to provide their employees with the necessary training to assist the employee’s progression in their sought after career path (Higgins, 2001).

4.16.2 Blau’s (1989) Career Commitment Scale

There were significant results between the CCS and age, children, and marital status. Age may impact on one’s level of career commitment for various reasons. For example, younger employees must deal with two opposing tasks, namely establishment and exploration (Schreuder & Theron, 2001). The organisation may wish to retain valuable employees and therefore engage in exercises that assist in establishing a career path for those employees.

Participants with children displayed lower levels of career commitment. Employers should aim at improving this by creating a flexible and ‘child friendly’ working environment as they will benefit in terms of increased productivity and lower staff turnover. The employee will also feel that their company has taken their concerns into account and should become more committed to their careers.
Finally, single employees had higher levels of career commitment than divorced employees. As an employee in South Africa is not required to disclose their marital status, it is difficult for organisations to combat lower levels of career commitment. Thus, practically, there is probably little that a company can do.

4.16.3 Kanungo’s (1982) Job Involvement Questionnaire

In terms of the ANOVA’s that were conducted, there were no significant results between the JIQ and the various demographic variables under discussion. Thus it appears that regardless of one’s age, race, tenure, number of children, marital status, gender, job status, or store an employee works for, the level of job involvement remains unaffected. This is an important finding for organisations because factors such as promotions and one’s career life stage will not play a significant role in aiming to improve an employee’s level of involvement in their job. Therefore an organisation needs to look elsewhere in order to make such changes.

4.17 Limitations of the Present Study

This research was only carried out in a single organisation, which could effect the generalisability of its findings. The organisation was quite specific in terms of it being a large retail company and the participants were narrowed down to only include full-time store level employees within the Gauteng area. Hence the generalisability of these results has not been tested against part-time employees or across other careers in the same or in a different organisation, whether it be involved in retail or some other area. Therefore it may not be advisable to generalise this study to a broader context as
generalisability theory is used to measure and study the consistency of test scores (Murphy & Davidshofer, 1998).

A questionnaire was administered on a voluntary basis to the full-time store level employees. The questionnaire consisted of demographic information, which included age, gender, race, job grade, tenure, marital status, and whether or not the participant had children. Although these questions were sufficient for this particular research, other demographic variables such as the number and age of the participants’ children as well as length of employment in their current position could have also been mentioned. Following on from this section, the three instruments, namely the CCS, the CSS, and the JIQ, were included.

Another limitation of this study was that there were no additional questions incorporated into each of these scales, which would have been useful in reflecting the new understanding of a career. The three scales were critiqued and placed within a new context and as no new questions were included one could only infer the findings and not assess them in terms of additional items. Overall, the questionnaire method, which was quantitative in nature, was a limited approach and ideally one would like other studies to also consider a qualitative methodology.

The organisation under investigation is open seven days a week and therefore the full time staff work according to shifts. Hence in order to gain a larger sample size, one would need to visit each store numerous times, however in this instance due to time constraints, it was not possible and therefore a larger sample size was not achieved.
According to Murphy and Davidshofer (1998) having population groups of largely different sizes may affect the results in a study. This was particularly the case for the race and gender demographic variables and therefore these findings may have been altered by their varying sizes.

Social desirability may also have affected the study as research has demonstrated that people from different backgrounds, education levels, and cultures may answer questionnaires in a socially desirable way. This could have a negative effect on the results in this study, which would then not be a true reflection of people’s thoughts (Murphy & Davidshofer, 1998).

Therefore the results from this particular study may be an antecedent of the sample and response set and there may be different findings if a different sample were to be used.

4.18 Directions for Future Research

As individual constructs, career salience, career commitment, and job involvement have gathered much attention over the years. However, when combined, their appears to be little research explaining their relationship.

It is suggested that this relationship be examined in further detail as well in other organisational settings. Firstly, this would clarify whether these findings were valid and reliable, and secondly, much research is needed when it comes to these three constructs as they are all real life phenomenon that affect people and organisations on
a daily basis. Additional research could include the analysis of other demographic variables, more in-depth item analyses, as well as incorporating other items in the CCS, the CSS, and the JIQ, as this would provide a richer understanding of the topic. Some researchers may even wish to construct and analyse new scales, and from what has been found in this study, such an approach is particularly advisable for the CSS.

As many of the results for this study were significant and provided further interesting findings, further research regarding the relationship between the three scales under investigation is advisable. For example some of the most pertinent findings were those pertaining to the CSS, as some of the items require rephrasing and new items need to be included in order to reflect the new understanding of careers.
Conclusion

This research investigated whether career salience, career commitment, and job involvement are distinct from one another. From the findings it appears that the CSS is problematic in terms of its validity as there were conflicting results regarding whether or not it converges with or discriminates against the other two scales. There did however appear to be strong evidence to suggest that career commitment and job involvement are not distinct from one another as the correlations and factor analysis displayed an overlap between the CCS and the JIQ.

There were also statistically significant results for the ANOVA’s that were conducted. The only non-significant results lay with the store to which each employee belonged, job status, and the JIQ. All of these findings provided additional insight into the topic, however one must take into account the fact that the sample was demographically heterogeneous, which may have influenced these findings.

Career commitment, career salience, and job involvement are all important factors when trying to understand individuals and how they behave in an organisational setting. In a South African setting, where a unique relationship between the employee and employer exists and numerous factors impact on one’s career or job, this research was found to be original and beneficial.
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