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ABSTRACT

This paper reports a study of career-stage effects on organizational commitment among Australian managers. Organizational commitment was measured using the 24-item scale developed by Allen and Meyer. This scale measures affective, continuance, and normative organizational commitment. Career stage was operationalized on the basis of three criteria: age, organizational tenure, and positional tenure. The main aim of this study is to examine the relationship between career stage and organizational commitment and to determine the effects of career stage on organizational commitment of Australian managers. The findings support the expectation from previous research that organizational commitment increases with age. The findings indicate that increasing age strengthens calculative or continuance commitment.
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1. Introduction

The commitment of employees is important to organizations. Persons committed to an organization are likely to want to serve it better, and costs commonly associated with human resources, such as absenteeism, turnover, and low motivation will be reduced. Allen and Meyer (1993) suggest that being able to anticipate the course of work attitudes over career stages would be useful for both employers and employees. If particular work experiences are more closely linked to work attitudes in some career stages than in others, it might be possible to manage work experiences at different career stages to promote desired attitudes. Previous studies suggest that work related attitudes of workers in later career stages deserve particular attention for several reasons, including the need of many organizations to influence retirement decisions (Morrow, 1982), concern over quality of work life issues, and demographic projections indicating that workers will not be able to progress upward through organizational hierarchies at the rate of the previous generation (Drucker, 1984).
Studies have also suggested that career stage moderates the relationships between attitudes and work behavior (Blackburn and Fox, 1983; Gould and Hawkins, 1978; Slocum and Cron, 1985; Stumpf and Robinowitz, 1981). These findings have refueled an interest in how high levels of organizational commitment can be achieved and maintained over time. Findings in the literature seem to suggest that affective commitment developed because of work experiences which increased the employees’ feelings of challenge and comfort in the organization (for example, Allen and Meyer, 1996; Meyer and Allen, 1987; Meyer, Allen, and Gellatly, 1990; Meyer et al., 1993). Based on the literature, Bassham (2009) deduced that the employees felt that they had found their niche that benefited both them and the organization whereas continuance commitment developed as a cost factor analysis. The parameters of continuance commitment took into consideration the amount of the employees’ investment in the organization for the position and the degree of loss encountered if they pursued other employment alternatives. Literature also indicate that the antecedents of normative commitment which include the employees’ moral and ethical standards, were overwhelmingly strong which influenced them to remain in their current position and this strong stance of feeling obligated based on loyalty is what kept the employees committed to the organization (for example, Allen and Meyer, 1996; Meyer and Allen, 1984, 1991; Meyer et al., 1990; Meyer, Srinivas, Lal, and Topolnytsky, 2007; Noordin, 1999; Heere and Dickson, 2008).

The prevailing view seems to be that levels of organizational commitment in the western countries are influenced by their individualist orientation. Individualism and collectivism are theorized to have an impact on work values (Erez and Earley, 1987). In individualistic societies, affection, autonomy, and equity in exchange are salient, whereas collectivists emphasize skills development, prestige, and the well-being and goals of in-groups. Individualists stress the opportunity to “do their own thing,” which is reflected in autonomous work, decentralized decision-making, and incentive systems that reward individual action and accomplishment. Furthermore, Allen, Miller, and Nath (1988) note that, in countries where individualism dominates, individuals view their relationship with the organization from a calculative perspective whereas, in collectivist societies, the ties between the individual and the organization have a moral component. This suggests that the concept of organizational carries very different meanings in collectivist and individualist societies. Employees who have collectivist values commit to organizations primarily due to their ties with managers, owners, co-workers (collectivism), and much less due to the job itself or the particular compensation scheme (individualistic incentives) (Boyacigiller and Adler, 1991). According to Earley (1989), American theoretical structures have failed to include a full range of explanations for organizational commitment. As a result, our present knowledge of the generalizability of observed relationships and boundary condition of theories of organizational is limited.

Boyacigiller and Adler (1991) comment that the dimension of individualism versus collectivism may have particular relevance for organizational commitment researchers. Randall (1993) theorizes that a country’s individualism-collectivism score may be associated with different levels and types of organizational commitment. She further states that it can be anticipated that employees in collectivist cultures would reflect higher levels of organizational commitment than employees in individualistic cultures. It can also be anticipated that there will be greater affective attachment (a sense of loyalty) to institutions in collectivistic cultures, and greater calculative involvement (a cost-benefit approach) with institutions in individualistic cultures. The purpose of this study is to examine the influence of career stage on organizational commitment in an individualistic culture, that is, Australia (Hofstede, 1980). Similar to Allen and Meyer (1993), the study seeks to advance our understanding of the relationship by considering multiple components of organizational commitment and multiple operationalizations of the career stage construct. The study examines the relationship between career stage and organizational commitment in samples of Australian managers.

2. Theory and Hypotheses

Organizational commitment has been examined extensively (for example, Allen and Meyer, 1993; Matheiu and Zajac, 1990; Meyer et al., 1990; Meyer, et al., 2007; Steers, Mowday, and Shapiro, 2004) and it has been defined in several different ways. These various definitions share a common theme in that organizational commitment is considered to be a bond or linking of the individual to the organization. The definitions differ only in terms of how this bond is considered to have developed. The two commonly studied types of organizational commitment are attitudinal and calculative commitment. Attitudinal commitment is defined as “the relative strength of an individual’s identification with and involvement in a particular organization” (Mowday et al, 1982, p.27). Calculative commitment (Becker, 1960) is defined as “a structural phenomenon which occurs as a result of individual-organizational transactions and alterations in side-bets or investments over time” (Hrebinia and Alutto, 1972, p. 556). Over the years, other types of organizational commitment have emerged.
These include normative commitment (Wiener, 1982) and organizational identification (Hall, Schneider, and Nygren, 1970). But according to Mathieu and Zajac (1990), these other forms of organizational commitment have either been subsumed into the attitudinal or calculative definitions, or distinguished from commitment to the organization and treated as correlates. Allen and Meyer (1990) developed a three-component theory of organizational commitment (affective, continuance, and normative commitment) which stimulated recognition of the multidimensionality of the measure. Allen and Meyer (1991) defined the three dimensions of organizational commitment as follows:

i. **Affective commitment** refers to the employee’s emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the organization. Employees with a strong affective commitment continue employment with the organization because they want to do so.

ii. **Continuance commitment** refers to an awareness of the costs associated with leaving the organization. Employees whose primary link to the organization is based on continuance commitment remain because they need to do so.

iii. **Normative commitment** reflects a feeling of obligation to continue employment. Employees with a high level of normative commitment feel that they ought to remain with the organization.

According to Allen and Meyer (1990), the three dimensions provide valuable insight into the employee-organization link, and a more comprehensive understanding of this link is achieved when all three are considered simultaneously. Allen and Meyer (1993) note that research examining the relationships between work attitudes and career stages have focused on two related issues. One is whether there are changes in work attitudes that occur as employees proceed from one career stage to another. The other issue involves the possibility that particular work experiences are differentially related to work attitudes at different career stages.

A number of studies have suggested that career stages predicted the relationship between work attitude and behaviors (for example, Allen and Meyer, 1993; McElroy, et al., 1999; Bassham, 2009). Literature has revealed that there is a link between organizational commitment and several outcomes, such as absenteeism, job satisfaction, and turnover (for example, Ambrose, Arnaud, and Schminke, 2008; Inverson and Buttgieg, 1999; Mathieu and Zajac, 1990; Mowday, et al., 1982; Tsai, Wu, Yen, Ho, and Huang, 2005). In addition a number of studies have suggested that career stages predicted the relationship between work attitudes and behavior (for example, Allen and Meyer, 1993; McElroy, Morrow, Crum, and Dooley, 1995; McElroy, et al., 1999; Morrow and McElroy, 1987, Bassham, 2009). According to Bassham (2009), attitudes and behaviors, known as psychological linkage between employee and organization, have been quantified using various scales and measures. Such studies (for example, Gonzales and Guillen, 2008; Mowday, et al., 1982; Porter and Lawler III, 1968; Porter, Steers, Mowday, and Boulian, 1974; Steers and Mowday, 1987; Tomas and Manuel, 2008) have shown that employee attitudes and behaviors vary over time spent on job. A basic finding of much research on work attitudes is that older workers are, in general, more committed to their employing organizations and more satisfied with their jobs (see, Angle and Perry, 1983; Hrebiniai and Alutto, 1972; Sheldon, 1971; Tayeb, 1988).

Moreover, a positive relationship between age and commitment has been found in different cultures. Lincoln and Kalleberg (1985) report that, in their samples of manufacturing employees in the US and Japan, older people are both more committed and more satisfied than younger employees. Allen and Meyer (1993) found that both affective and normative organizational commitment were significantly higher in older than younger employees. Sommer, Bae, and Luthans (1996) found that older Korean employees reported higher commitment than younger respondents. Mannheim, Baruch, and Tal (1997) found that age was positively related to organizational commitment.

Meyer and Allen (1984) suggest that older workers become more attitudinally committed to an organization for a variety of reasons, including greater satisfaction with their jobs, gaining advancement, and having “cognitively justified” their remaining in an organization. Salancik (1977) also suggests that the positive relationship between age and commitment could be due to self-justification processes (“I have been here for 20 years, I must like it”). It should also be noted that over time, less committed employees are more likely to leave their organizations. Other researchers (for example, March and Simon, 1958) have suggested that age should be more highly related to calculative organizational commitment. This relationship is typically attributed to limited alternative opportunities and greater sunk costs in later years. Furthermore, age might also be associated with continuance organizational commitment because it serves as a proxy for the investments one makes in one’s organization (Meyer and Allen, 1984).
However, Mathieu and Zajac’s (1990) in their review and meta-analysis of antecedents, correlates and consequences of organizational commitment, report that age is significantly more related to attitudinal than to calculative organizational commitment. Studies have also found that commitment increases with organizational and positional tenure (Luthans, Black, and Taylor, 1987; Stevens, Beyer, and Trice, 1978). Mathieu and Zajac (1990) found that positional tenure was significantly and positively related to attitudinal organizational commitment, suggesting that years spent in a particular position may build an employee’s psychological attachment to the organization. They also found that organizational tenure tended to be more related to organizational commitment than did positional tenure, but both effects were reported to be small. Allen and Meyer (1993) found that employees with longer tenure in organizations had significantly higher affective organizational commitment. Findings in the literature suggest that when employers could identify the type of commitment their employees held at a particular age, organizational tenure, or positional tenure, then an appropriate stimulus of incentives could be initiated to increase efficiency and productivity (Gonzales and Guillen, 2008; Mowday, et al., 1982; Tomas and Manuel, 2008). However, according to Morrow and McElroy (1987), inconsistencies and diversity of career stages have hampered the comparison across the examined variables of work attitudes and career stages.

Boyacigiller and Adler (1991) theorize that culture has an effect on organizational commitment and propose that Hofstede’s dimension of individualism versus collectivism may have particular relevance for cross-cultural organizational commitment research. Hofstede (1980) characterizes members of individualist cultures as self-centered, competitive, having little loyalty to the organizations they work for, pursuing their own goals, having low dependency on others, and having calculative orientations towards their relationships with organizations. As such one would anticipate greater sense of calculative involvement with organizations in individualist cultures. Boyacigiller and Adler (1991) argue that the commitment of employees with an individualist orientation may be due to the job itself or the compensation system (see also Randall, 1993). On the basis of the previous research reviewed above, the study tested the following hypotheses:

1. Older Australian respondents would express stronger calculative or continuance commitment than younger Australian respondents.
2. Respondents with longer organizational tenure would express stronger organizational commitment than respondents with shorter organizational tenure.
3. Respondents with longer positional tenure would express stronger organizational commitment than respondents with shorter positional tenure.

3. Methodology

3.1. Data Gathering Procedure

A mail survey was administered in accordance with the principles and procedures advocated by Dillman (1977) and the administrative procedure recommended by Chan (1992). All responses were voluntary and anonymous. The average age of the Australian respondents was 41.2 There were more males than female respondents (male = 79.2; female = 20.8). Fifty percent of the Australian respondents were university graduates. The work demographics indicate that the respondents, on the average, have worked for their current organizations for 7.8 years. On the average, the Australians have worked, on average, for at least 3 organizations.

3.2. Questionnaire Measures

Organizational commitment was measured using the 24-item scale developed by Allen and Meyer (1990). This scale measures affective, continuance, and normative organizational commitment. Affective organizational commitment refers to the employee’s emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the organization. Continuance organizational commitment refers to an awareness of the costs associated with leaving the organization. Normative organizational commitment reflects a feeling of obligation to remain with the organization (Allen and Meyer, 1990). Career stage was operationalized on the basis of three criteria: age, organizational tenure, and positional tenure. In accordance to Morrow and McElroy (1987), age was measured using respondents’ self-reported age and ages were grouped into the trial stage (less than 31 years old), the stabilization stage (31 – 44 years), and the maintenance stage (over 44 years). These particular age groupings are identical to those used by Allen and Meyer (1993), Morrow and McElroy (1987), Gould (1979), and Slocum and Cron (1985) facilitating comparisons across studies. Organizational tenure was measured using respondents’ self-reported years of working in the organization.
Groupings employed were 2 years or less for the establishment stage, over 2 years and up to 10 years for the advancement stage, and over 10 years for the maintenance stage. The same groupings were used in previous research by Allen and Meyer (1993), Morrow and McElroy (1987), Mount (1984), Stumpf and Rabinowitz (1981) and Gould and Hawkins (1978). Positional tenure was measured using respondents’ self-reports. The groupings were also in three stages: the orientation stage (2 years or less), growth stage (over 2 to 10 years), and the plateau stage (more than 10 years). These groupings are identical to those used by Allen and Meyer (1993) and Morrow and McElroy (1987).

4. Results

4.1. Means, Standard Deviations, Reliabilities, and Correlations

Table 1 shows the means, standard deviations, reliabilities and correlations of the measures. Internal consistency estimates (alpha coefficients) obtained in several studies employing the organizational commitment scales range from .74 to .89 for ACS, .69 TO .84 for CCS, and .69 to .79 for NCS (Allen and Meyer, 1990; Allen and Smith, 1987; Bobocel, Meyer, and Allen, 1988; McGee and Ford, 1987; Meyer and Allen, 1984, 1986; Meyer et al, 1989; Withey 1988). The reliability estimates in this study are comparable, although the reliabilities of the NCS are slightly lower.

Insert Table 1 here

Table 2 shows the means for the ACS, CCS, and NCS scores of the respondents within each career stage, as well as a summary of the results of analyses of variance comparing each organizational commitment components across each career stage.

Insert Table 2 here

More significant results are observed for the Australian respondents. CCS appears to be significantly higher in the older than the younger respondents. ACS and CCS are significantly higher in the ≥10 years of OT than in the 2 – 10 years group. Older respondents show a significantly higher level of NCS compared to their younger counterparts. Table 3 shows the correlations between each organizational commitment component and each career stage variable. Also shown are the correlations between the components of organizational commitment and each career stage variables with the other two career stage variables partialled out. This allows us to evaluate the link between each career stage variable independently of the other two (Allen and Meyer, 1993).

The findings on the Australian respondents on the other hand indicate that ACS has a relatively weak relationship with OT. When age was partialled out, the correlation became insignificant but, when PT was partialled out the relationship increases slightly. Table 4 also shows that CCS is strongly related to age and OT but, has a relatively weak relationship with PT. When PT was partialled out, the relationship between CCS and age was reduced slightly but, when OT was partialled out, the relationship became insignificant. It also appears that CCS has a weak positive correlation with OT but, when either age or PT is partialled out, the correlations are reduced. The findings suggest that NCS has a relatively weak relationship with OT. When age is partialled out, the relationship increases significantly. But when PT is partialled out, the relationship becomes insignificant. CCS also has a relatively weak correlation with PT. When either age or OT is partialled out, the relationship becomes insignificant. Finally, NCS has a relatively weak relationship with PT. When age is partialled out, the correlations increase slightly. But when OT is partialled out, the relationship becomes insignificant.

Insert Table 3 here

5. Conclusion and Discussion

The main aim of this study is to examine the relationship between career stage and organizational commitment and to determine the effects of career stage on organizational commitment of Australian managers. The findings support the expectation from previous research that organizational commitment increases with age. The findings indicate that increasing age strengthens calculative or continuance commitment. Managers in who were older than 44 years expressed a higher level of continuance organizational commitment than those who were less than 31 years of age. This finding supports the second hypothesis. Australia has been an affluent, leisure-time and consumption-oriented society since the early years of the post-war period. In the literature, individualism is positively associated with continuance/calculative organizational commitment (Boyacigiller and Adler, 1991; Hofstede, 1980; Randall, 1993; Triandis, 1995). This may partly account for the finding that continuance commitment, rather than affective commitment, increased with age among the Australian managers.
According to Triandis (1995), parents and children in individualistic cultures are less interdependent and emphasize self-reliance. Older Australia respondents who are nearer to their retirement than the other age groups would like to make the transition from working life to retirement in an easy, well-prepared manner, both financially and emotionally. Due to their age, alternative job opportunities might be limited and, if there were other alternatives available, the overall benefits offered might not match the ones they currently enjoyed. If they chose to leave their current organizations, the investments (side bets) they have made would be lost. However, they are also likely to feel that it would be inappropriate to ask for help, and their children may feel that it is inappropriate to offer help (Triandis, 1995). Therefore, the higher level of continuance organizational commitment among older Australian managers may reflect a desire to be self-reliant and self-sufficient in their lives after retirement.

The findings in the present study do support the third hypothesis. Affective organizational commitment for the Australian managers who have more than 10 years of organizational tenure appears to be higher than the 2-10 years group. In addition, Australian respondents with longer organizational tenure appear to have a significantly higher normative commitment than those with shorter organizational tenure. These results for the Australian managers are consistent with Allen and Meyer’s (1993) findings. The present study also found that Australian managers with “more than 10 years” of organizational tenure had a higher level of continuance organizational commitment. Mathieu and Zajac (1990) found that, when moderator analyses were conducted by types of organizational commitment, the results showed organizational tenure to be positively related to calculative (continuance) commitment. Consistent with this, it seems that, for the Australian managers, years spent in the one organization are likely to yield greater side bets, such as a pension plan, and thus they develop greater calculative (continuance) organizational commitment. However, contrary to previous research and the third hypothesis, no significant positive relationship was found between positional tenure and any of the components of organizational commitment in the present study.

6. Conclusion and Future Studies

Several limitations exist in the present study which warrants review. First, since only managers were used as samples in this study, this raises the issue of generalizability of findings. More research is needed before firm generalizable implications can be drawn. Generalizability of the results of these analyses for employees in other positions or designations remains an open empirical question. Additional replication using a more careful comparison by types of workers and types of occupation would be useful.

Secondly, a possible limitation of the study is some method bias resulting from the use of a common instrument (questionnaire). However, this is unlikely to be a serious problem because Spector (1987) has shown that method bias is generally not a problem with well-developed instruments. The high alpha levels are evidence of the soundness of the instruments in the present study. Nevertheless, future research is strongly recommended to use an approach that allows for checks of convergence across methods as an alternative to reduce the problem of method bias (Triandis, 1993). Future research should combine the use of questionnaire method with observation and / or field experimentation. In addition, longitudinal investigation could be conducted to determine whether variable effects change over time and, if they do, whether they change differentially across organizations or countries.

The overall findings of this study are encouraging. However, by no means are the present results conclusive. Rather, interpretation and specification of the influence career stages on organizational commitment that are empirically examined in the present study must be regarded as tentative.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australian (n =120)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Affective commitment</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Continuance commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td></td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Normative commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Age</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>41.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Organizational tenure</td>
<td></td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Positional tenure</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *p < .05; **p < .01

Reliability estimates (coefficient alpha) are shown in the diagonal.
Table 2: Organizational Commitment Components at Three Age (AG1, AG2, AG3), Organizational Tenure (OT1, OT2, OT3), and Positional Tenure (PT1, PT2, PT3) Levels:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample and Commitment Components</th>
<th>Levels of the Career Stage Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Components</td>
<td>AG1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT2</td>
<td>PT3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia (N = 120):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective</td>
<td>5.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuance</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative</td>
<td>3.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Within each commitment component/career stage grouping (e.g., Affective commitment/Age), those means with different superscripts differ significantly (p < .05). Those that share a superscript, or for which no superscripts appear, are not significantly different from each other (p > .05).

For employee age: AG1 =< 31 years; AG2 = 31 – 44 years; and AG3 => 44 years.

For organizational and positional tenure: OT1/PT1 =< 2 years; OT1/PT1 = 2 – 10 years; and OT1/PT1 => 10 years.

N = number of cases.

Table 3: Correlations and Partial Correlations between Career Stage Variables and Affective, Continuance, and Normative Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career Stage Variable(s)</th>
<th>ACS</th>
<th>CCS</th>
<th>NCS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (OT)</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (PT)</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (OT/PT)</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OT</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.22*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OT (Age)</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.27**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OT (PT)</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OT (Age/PT)</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.21*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.19*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT (Age)</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT (OT)</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT (Age/OT)</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Variables in parentheses have been partialled out. OT = organizational tenure; PT = positional tenure; ACS = affective commitment score; CCS = continuance commitment score; NCS = normative commitment score.

*p < .05;  **p < .01;  ***p < .001