Validation of a new LINOR Affective Commitment Scale

Research project by

PhD Student Kristina Schoemmel, Professor Hans Jeppe Jeppesen, & Associate Professor Thomas Jønsson
LINOR (Leadership and INvolvement in ORganizations)
Department of Psychology, School of Business and Social Sciences
University of Aarhus, Denmark
Agenda

› The theoretical foundation
› Measurement problems addressed by the LINOR Affective Commitment Scale (LACS)

› Study 1
  › Development of the LACS (methodology used to identify the questions, procedure and participants, analysis, and results).

› Study 2
  › Discriminant and convergent validity of the LACS. Predicting turnover intention and job performance.
  › Procedure and preliminary results.

› Discussion
  › Limitations.
  › Questions for the OPEN-network.
The theoretical foundation

The current dominant perspective, in the study of commitment, is taken by Meyer and Allen (1991;1997). In this approach commitment refers to a force that binds an individual to a target and to a course of action of relevance to that target.

Commitment is experienced as one or more of three distinct mindsets.

- The affective mindset is defined as an employee’s emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the organization. The continuative mindset is experienced by the awareness of costs associated with leaving the organization. The normative mindset is characterized by the employee’s sense of obligation to remain in the organization.

The employees can have different mind-sets to multiple targets in varying degrees.

Affective commitment has shown the strongest and most favorable correlations (Meyer et al., 2002).
Measurement problems addressed by the LACS

Although there are hundreds of studies investigating affective commitment using Allen and Meyer’s (1990) operationalization (ACS), we argue that this scale has suffered from measurement problems for four reasons:

- First, the ACS poorly reflects the development in the theoretical literature where identification is separated from affective commitment (e.g. Meyer, Becker, & van Dick, 2006; Van Kippenberg & Sleebos, 2006; Riketta & Van Dick, 2009).

- Second, the ACS has been criticized for not measuring involvement, even though it is a theoretical component of affective commitment (Jaussi, 2007; Riketta & Van Dick, 2009).

- Third, the ACS presumes that it is possible to be negatively committed, an assumption that does not have theoretical support (e.g. the ACS items are rated from strongly disagree to strongly agree).

- Fourth, the ACS is constructed for organizational commitment, which implies new scales must be developed for each commitment target resulting in problems comparing commitment to multiply targets (e.g. “I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization”) (Klein, Molloy, & Brinsfiels, 2012).
Measurement problems addressed by the LACS continued

- Development of a new LINOR Affective Commitment Scale (LACS):
  - Items reflect emotional attachment and involvement.
  - The items are rated from “not at all committed” to “very committed”.
  - The items apply to any commitment target.

Therefore, the objective is to bring greater precision to the research on affective commitment by addressing these issues.
Study 1: Development of the LACS

- Literature search. 20 affective commitment scales were identified. Identical items were eliminated. Revised the items to measure commitment to all different targets by reframing the questions to be open and broad. Created two new items reflecting involvement. Items were translated into Danish using translation-back-translation-procedure.

- The questions were piloted through the social network service Facebook (N = 190) and factor analysis used to create a first draft of 7-item LACS.
Study 1: First draft of the LACS

Consisted of a mix of reframed existing items and two new ones.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>A little</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Much</th>
<th>Very much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am willing to put a great deal of effort beyond normally expected ____</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am very involved in ____</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am very interested in ____</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I really care about ____</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel emotionally attached to ____</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like the ____</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do feel a strong sense of belonging to ____</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Study 2: Discriminant and convergent validity

We chose the most recent 6-item scale by Meyer, Allen, and Smith (1993) to measure affective commitment, because they present two different scales reflecting affective commitment towards the profession and the organization.

- Turnover intention
  - Hypothesis 1. When measuring affective commitment to the organization using Meyer, Allen, and Smiths (1993) scale organizational commitment will be stronger negatively related to turnover intention than when organizational commitment is measured using the LACS.

- Job performance
  - Hypothesis 2. When measuring affective commitment to the profession, using the LACS, commitment to the profession will be stronger related to job performance than when affective commitment to the profession is measured by Meyer, Allen, and Smith (1993).
Study 2: Procedure and preliminary results

- The scale was validated within the healthcare system of Denmark (N = 496) measuring affective commitment towards the job, the profession, the division, and the organization.

- Reliability of the LACS
  - When the preliminary LACS was used for commitment to the job, the profession, the division, and the organization the statistic indicated that multicollinearity was not a problem. Furthermore, all four scales showed high reliabilities (commitment to the job, $\alpha= .90$, the profession, $\alpha= .92$, the division, $\alpha= .93$, and the organization, $\alpha= .94$).

- Discriminant and convergent validity
  - Both hypothesis one and two were supported using regression analysis.

- Work in progress: Further reduction of the LACS-items items using CFA
  - Premise: Affective commitment to the four different targets should be different.
Limitations

› The LACS needs testing on a greater variety of targets and has only been validated on a Danish speaking population.

› The results are limited to the chosen professions in the healthcare system, where females are more heavily weighed than males.

› Our measurement of job performance where based on the employees self-rating which may be positively biased (Heidemeire & Moser, 2009; Harris & Schaubroeck, 1988).

› Further this study is limited by its cross-sectional design.
Questions for the OPEN-network

› How can we further validate the LACS?

› Is it helpful to reduce the LACS- items using CFA?

› Which other analysis would be valuable in the study?

› Can you think of more important limitations?

› Would it be helpful to include antecedent differences between the ACS and the LACS scales in the validation?
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