Multiple commitments in the Chinese context: Testing compatibility, cultural, and moderating hypotheses
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Abstract

This paper evaluates the contribution of the multiple constituencies of commitment framework in explaining work attitudes and behaviors in a sample of Chinese manufacturing workers. Findings suggest that the organization, the supervisor, and co-workers were seen by respondents as separate commitment foci. Although the various commitments were moderately positively correlated, they were related differently to the dimensions of organizational citizenship behavior and withdrawal cognitions, in a way which provides support for the “compatibility” hypothesis. There was only limited support for our “cultural” hypothesis. An analysis of interactions between commitments suggested that commitment to supervisor was a stronger positive predictor of protecting company resources and interpersonal harmony when commitment to work group was lower, providing partial support for our moderating hypotheses.
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1. Introduction

Research suggests that employees who are highly committed to their organizations have better attendance, lower quit rates, more organizational citizenship behavior, and perhaps also higher levels of job performance (e.g., Becker, Billings, Eveleth, & Gilbert, 1996; Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch, & Topolnytsky, 2002). However, commitment is not a straightforward concept. The notion of “multiple constituencies of commitment” considers commitment to several “foci”, including the organization as a whole, the supervisor, and co-workers, amongst others (Reichers, 1985). Evidence suggests the existence of multiple commitments, predicting such outcomes as job satisfaction, intent to quit, and performance (e.g., Becker, 1992; Becker, Randall, & Riegel, 1995; Becker et al., 1996; Cohen, 1993).

We evaluate the contribution of multiple commitments to the explanation of work attitudes and behaviors, drawing on a study of manufacturing workers in the People’s Republic of China (PRC). There have been multiple commitment studies of organizational and supervisor commitment using Chinese samples (Chen, Tsui, & Farh, 2002; Cheng, Jiang, & Riley, 2003), but we go beyond the existing studies. First, we examine not only commitment to organization and supervisor, but also to co-workers. We consider a corresponding range of outcomes, including organizational citizenship behaviors and withdrawal cognitions. By including commitment to co-workers, we are better able than previous studies to assess the salience of personal or “in-group” commitments, which may be especially important in the collectivist cultural context (Hofstede, 2001). Second, we provide an analysis of interactions between multiple commitments. The literature has examined the independent effects of multiple commitments. However, studies of the different bases of commitment (e.g., affective, normative, and continuance) suggest that they may have interactive effects (Jaros, 1997; Randall, Fedor, & Longenecker, 1990; Somers, 1995; Snape & Redman, 2003). A single commitment may be sufficient to produce an intention to remain, for example, so that the incremental effect of each commitment is reduced where other commitments are already high. This is reflected in significant interactions between commitments in predicting outcomes (Jaros, 1997; Somers, 1995; Snape & Redman, 2003). Our suggestion is that there may also be interactions between commitments to multiple foci, a hitherto unexplored possibility.

2. The multiple commitments perspective

Reichers’ (1985) conceptualization has the individual employee at the core, surrounded by commitment foci which are more or less psychologically close to the individual, with intra-organizational foci (management and co-workers) closer than those outside the organization (e.g., customers). Cohen (2003) takes issue with Reichers’ (1985) suggestion that commitments to multiple foci are components of organizational commitment. Instead, drawing on Hunt and Morgan’s (1994) analysis, he suggests that employees see commitment foci as distinct to the extent that they see “conceptual distance” between them: “A constituency that is distant from the organization in the employee’s view represents separate commitment foci and not a component of organizational commitment such as the top or middle management” (Cohen, 2003, p. 108). We adopt this view, seeing “distant” foci as potentially independent commitments.

In Becker’s (1992) US study, the multiple commitments were distinct, and commitment to top management, supervisor and work group predicted job satisfaction, intention to
quit and pro-social organizational behaviors beyond the explanation provided by organizational commitment. Subsequent studies found similar results for top management, the supervisor, and co-workers (Becker et al., 1995, 1996; Chen et al., 2002; Cheng et al., 2003; Stinglhamber & Vandenberghe, 2003), and for external foci such as customers (Stinglhamber, Bentein, & Vandenberghe, 2002).

In this study of manufacturing workers, who lack significant customer contact, we concentrate on internal organizational foci, including the organization as a whole, the supervisor and the work group. Our first hypothesis is:

**Hypothesis 1.** Employees will distinguish between multiple foci of commitment (organization, supervisor, and work group).

All three commitments may be negatively related to withdrawal cognitions, since leaving the organization usually involves distancing oneself from all three. Other than that, multiple commitments may have different consequences, with the relationship between commitment and outcome being stronger where the focus of each variable is similar (Becker, 1992; Becker et al., 1995), a long-established principle in social psychology (e.g., Ajzen & Fishbein, 1977). For example, citizenship behaviors which benefit the organization as a whole will be predicted primarily by organizational commitment, whilst interpersonal helping will be predicted by commitment to co-workers. This is consistent with research suggesting that commitments reflect a favorable social exchange with the focal partner (e.g., McNeely & Meglino, 1994).

This matching of commitment foci and outcomes is referred to by Cheng et al. (2003) as the “compatibility” hypothesis, and they found some support for this in a Taiwanese study of organizational and supervisor commitment. There has so far been no test of this in relation to co-worker commitment in a Chinese context.

Thus, our second hypothesis is:

**Hypothesis 2.** Employee attitudes and behaviors will be associated with commitment to the likely beneficiary or target of the attitude or behavior. Specifically, (a) all three commitments will be negatively associated with organizational withdrawal cognitions; (b) organizational commitment will be positively associated with those citizenship behaviors likely to benefit the organization (identification with the company, protecting company resources, and conscientiousness); (c) supervisor commitment will be positively associated with individually focussed citizenship behaviors (altruism and interpersonal harmony); and (d) work group commitment will be positively associated with individually focussed citizenship behaviors (altruism and interpersonal harmony).

There is also a suggestion that outcomes may in general be more strongly related to commitment to specific foci (supervisor, work group) than to overall organizational commitment, since specific foci are likely to be cognitively closer to the individual than is the organization, an impersonal abstraction. Employees are thus likely to see supervisor and work group as less distant than the organization, and to therefore have a higher degree of “cognitive immediacy and salience” (Mueller & Lawler, 1999, p. 327).

This may be especially important in the Chinese cultural context, which emphasises personal loyalty to the supervisor, with supervisor–subordinate relationships characterized by a high degree of particularism (Cheng et al., 2003; Farh, Early, & Lin, 1997). Thus, Chen et al. (2002) found that loyalty to supervisor was more important than organizational commitment in predicting organizational citizenship and in-role performance. There is also
evidence of such a “cultural” effect in Cheng et al.’s (2003) Taiwanese study, where commitment to supervisor had an effect on organizational citizenship behavior, job performance, job satisfaction and turnover intention, whilst organizational commitment was associated only with job satisfaction and turnover intention. Similarly, a collectivist culture such as China emphasises “in-group” identity and commitment to group members (Hofstede, 2001), suggesting that commitment to co-workers may also assume a particular significance. We have seen no tests of this cultural hypothesis in the case of co-worker commitment. The discussion suggests that supervisor and work-group commitments will be important, not only in relation to directly reciprocating attitudes or behavior, but more generally, and so will also be significantly associated with organizationally focussed citizenship behaviors. Thus:

**Hypothesis 3.** Person- and in-group-based commitments will be particularly salient, such that both supervisor and work-group commitments will be positively associated with organizationally focussed citizenship behaviors (i.e., identification with the company, protecting company resources, and conscientiousness).

Western studies of organizational and occupational commitment have suggested that different bases of commitment (e.g., affective, normative, and continuance) may have interactive effects (Jaros, 1997; Randall et al., 1990; Somers, 1995; Snape & Redman, 2003). Meyer and Herscovitch (2001) argue that commitment on one dimension alone is sufficient to produce an outcome such as intention to remain, so that the incremental effects of commitment dimensions are smaller where other commitment dimensions are already high. This is reflected in the finding of significant interaction effects between commitments in regressions for withdrawal intentions and behaviors. Somers (1995) found significant interactions between affective and continuance organizational commitment for intent to remain and absence, as did Jaros (1997) between normative and continuance organizational commitment for turnover intentions. Snape and Redman (2003) found a significant interaction between normative and continuance occupational commitment for occupational withdrawal cognitions. The findings suggest that the relationship between a commitment dimension and the outcome is stronger when commitment on the other dimension is low. Most of the significant findings concern interactions between two commitment dimensions (Jaros, 1997; Randall et al., 1990; Snape & Redman, 2003), although one study has reported significant three-way interactions, for staying intentions and citizenship behavior (Gellatly, Meyer, & Luchak, forthcoming).

We examine different foci for affective commitment. However, as for bases of commitment, a single commitment may be sufficient to produce an outcome, so that the relationship between each commitment and outcomes will be weaker where other commitments are high. There have been very few studies of interactions between focal commitments. McElroy, Morrow, Power, and Iqbal (1993) examined commitment to profession and to career, and job involvement, but found little evidence of interactions in predicting job attitudes, perceptions and performance, with only six significant effects in 56 possible interactions. However, Chang (1999) found a significant interaction between affective organizational commitment and career commitment in predicting turnover intentions, providing some evidence for interactions between focal commitments.

According to the above, interactions are plausible only where we anticipate relationships between an outcome and more than one commitment focus. This is true for
organizational withdrawal cognitions and organizationally focussed citizenship behaviors, where we have hypothesized relationships with all three foci. Thus:

**Hypothesis 4.** The relationships between commitments and both (a) organizational withdrawal cognitions; and (b) organizationally focussed citizenship behaviors (identification with the company, protecting company resources, and conscientiousness) will be stronger when commitment to other foci is low.

This hypothesis implies interactions between all three commitments in pairs and an overall three-way interaction (Randall et al., 1990).

For individually focussed citizenship behaviors, we anticipate relationships with commitment to supervisor and work group only, and not with organizational commitment. Since Meyer and Herscovitch’s (2001) argument for interactions only applies where each commitment alone may be associated with a particular outcome, organizational commitment should be excluded from the analysis of interactions in this case. Thus:

**Hypothesis 5.** The relationships between commitment to supervisor and workgroup and individually focussed citizenship behaviors (altruism and interpersonal harmony) will be stronger when commitment to the other focus (supervisor or work group) is low.

### 3. Method

#### 3.1. Sample

The study site was a manufacturing company situated in Guangzhou. The company is a state-owned enterprise, established in 1955, producing rubber products, including balloons, gloves, and condoms. It is one of the largest producers of condoms for the domestic Chinese market, and exports to Asian and European countries, securing ISO9001 accreditation in 1999. There were 1200 employees in 2004.

Fifty-one direct supervisors were randomly chosen and asked to rate the organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) of five of their subordinates, themselves randomly selected from amongst their teams by the researchers. The 255 workers were then invited in small groups to a different room to complete the employee questionnaire. Supervisor and employee questionnaires were matched using a code number. In total, 255 matched responses were returned, a 100% response rate. We excluded 26 employees working as “leaders”, because their team leadership role might make them a-typical in terms of commitments, attitudes and behaviors. We also excluded six cases with missing values on the study variables. This reduced our sample to 223 responses. Of these employees, 85% were directly involved in production and the rest were in production support and other jobs. Sixty-three percent were female, and 90% were on regular contracts. Mean age was 36, with mean company tenure of 13.24 years.

#### 3.2. Measures

Affective commitment to the organization as a whole, the supervisor, and the work group were measured with the affective commitment scales reported in Vandenberghe, Bentein, and Stinghamber (2004), a revised version of the Meyer, Allen, and Smith (1993) scales, developed for international replications. Example items for commitment to organization, supervisor, and work group, respectively, are: “This organization has a great deal of
personal meaning for me”, “I feel proud to work with my supervisor”, and “I really feel a sense of belonging to my work group”. We deleted one negatively worded item from each of the scales, because an initial analysis suggested very low loadings for these items, leaving 5 items for each (The deleted items were: “I do not feel like ‘part of the family’ at my organization”, “I am not really attached to my supervisor”, and “I do not feel emotionally attached to my work group”). All responses were on a seven-point scale from “Strongly disagree” (= 1) to “Strongly agree” (= 7).

Organizational citizenship behavior was assessed by supervisors, using Farh et al.’s (1997) Chinese OCB scale. Four items each measured an employee’s identification with the company (e.g., “Willing to stand up to protect the reputation of the company.”), altruism (e.g., “Willing to help colleagues to adjust to the work environment.”), interpersonal harmony (e.g., “Often speaks ill of the supervisor or colleagues behind their back.” [reversed]), and conscientiousness (e.g., “Takes one’s job seriously and rarely makes mistakes.”), with three items measuring protecting company resources (e.g., “Uses company resources to do personal business.” [reversed]). We removed one item from the conscientiousness measure (“Tries hard to self study to increase the quality of work outputs.”), because it was felt that this would not be applicable to manufacturing employees in this factory. A confirmatory factor analysis of this five-factor structure provided a reasonably good fit ($\chi^2 = 295.078; df = 142; \text{GFI} = 0.882; \text{AGFI} = 0.842; \text{TLI} = 0.906; \text{CFI} = 0.922; \text{RMSEA} = 0.070$). Withdrawal cognitions were measured with five items in the employee questionnaire, for example: “I often think of quitting this job”.

We included several control variables: company tenure (years), temporary job status (= 1; regular status = 0), gender (female = 1; male = 0), age (years), and marital status (married or living as married = 1; other = 0).

The questionnaire was written in English and backtranslated into Chinese. Adjustments were made to the Chinese version to remove ambiguities.

4. Results

4.1. Dimensionality of commitment

We assessed the dimensionality of commitment with a confirmatory factor analysis (Table 1). We compared the hypothesized three-factor model (separate factors for commitment to organization, supervisor, and work group), with a two-factor model (combining the factors for commitment to organization and supervisor), and a single-factor model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Change in $\chi^2$</th>
<th>GFI</th>
<th>AGFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independence model</td>
<td>1295.503</td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Factor</td>
<td>486.955</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>808.548*</td>
<td>0.756</td>
<td>0.674</td>
<td>0.611</td>
<td>0.667</td>
<td>0.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Factor</td>
<td>316.744</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>170.211*</td>
<td>0.822</td>
<td>0.760</td>
<td>0.774</td>
<td>0.809</td>
<td>0.107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Factor</td>
<td>185.684</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>131.060*</td>
<td>0.897</td>
<td>0.858</td>
<td>0.900</td>
<td>0.917</td>
<td>0.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 2-factor</td>
<td>384.856</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>199.172*</td>
<td>0.805</td>
<td>0.737</td>
<td>0.707</td>
<td>0.751</td>
<td>0.122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $N = 223$. GFI, goodness of fit index; AGFI, adjusted goodness of fit index; TLI, Tucker–Lewis index; CFI, comparative fit index; RMSEA, root mean square error of approximation. The models are as explained in the text. Change in $\chi^2$ is relative to the preceding model in the table. *$p < .05$, **$p < .01$. 

We compared the hypothesized three-factor model (separate factors for commitment to organization, supervisor, and work group), with a two-factor model (combining the factors for commitment to organization and supervisor), and a single-factor model.
The rationale was to progressively combine factors at an increasing cognitive distance from the organization, the notion being that the supervisor, as an authority figure, may be identified by respondents as representing the organization, and with fellow workers as being distinct from these two foci. In addition, we tested a two-factor model which combined commitment to the supervisor and work group. This evaluated the possibility that these person-based and in-group commitments are identified as a single commitment focus, distinct from the organization, an impersonal abstraction.

According to the change in $\chi^2$ tests, the hypothesized three-factor model provided a superior fit to each of the others in the nested sequence, and the indices for this model suggested a moderately good fit, with the RMSEA below .08, the TLI and CFI above .9, and the GFI and AGFI approaching that level. All items loaded significantly on their respective latent constructs ($p < .001$). Whilst each of the two-factor models provided an improvement over the one-factor model, both were inferior to the hypothesized model. This suggests that we can identify three foci of commitment (organization, supervisor, and work group), in line with Hypothesis 1.

In addition, because withdrawal cognitions were employee self reports, we assessed the discriminant validity of this construct relative to the self-report commitment dimensions. A four-factor confirmatory analysis, including the three commitment dimensions and withdrawal cognitions as a separate construct, provided a reasonable fit ($\chi^2 = 303.700; df = 164; \text{GFI} = 0.877; \text{AGFI} = 0.842; \text{TLI} = 0.903; \text{CFI} = 0.916; \text{RMSEA} = 0.062$), and a better fit than 3-factor models which combine withdrawal cognitions with one of the commitment factors. This suggests that withdrawal cognitions are distinct from the commitment dimensions.

4.2. The consequences of multiple commitment

Table 2 shows the means, standard deviations, correlations, and reliabilities for the study variables. Scale reliabilities were all greater than .7.

Hypothesis 2 suggested that outcomes would be associated with commitment to the likely beneficiary or target—the so-called “compatibility” hypothesis (Cheng et al., 2003). According to our regression analysis (Table 3), all three commitments were, as hypothesized, negatively associated with organizational withdrawal cognitions, providing full support for Hypothesis 2(a). Organizational commitment was positively associated with protecting company resources and conscientiousness (the latter only without the interaction terms entered and the overall equation was only marginally significant with $p = .052$), but not with identification with the company. This provides only partial support for Hypothesis 2(b). Commitment to supervisor was positively associated with altruism and interpersonal harmony, providing support for Hypothesis 2(c). Although there was a significant zero-order correlation, in the regression analysis commitment to work group was not significantly associated with altruism, nor with interpersonal harmony, providing no support for Hypothesis 2(d), at least as regards main effects.

Hypothesis 3 suggested that commitment to supervisor and work group would be especially salient in a Chinese sample, so that commitment to these foci would also be associated with organizationally focussed citizenship behaviors, the “cultural” hypothesis. However, the analysis of main effects in Table 3 suggests that, in the regression analysis, only one such relationship was significant, with commitment to supervisor positively asso-
Table 2
Means, standard deviations, correlations, and reliabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>13.24</td>
<td>9.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>-.28*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>35.60</td>
<td>10.25</td>
<td>.83**</td>
<td>-.18**</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>-.18**</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.68**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to organization</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to supervisor</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>-.19**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to work group</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altruism</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal harmony</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.14*</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting co. resources</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.68**</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawal cognitions</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>-.30**</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.34**</td>
<td>-.31**</td>
<td>-.45**</td>
<td>-.36**</td>
<td>-.42**</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
<td>-.18**</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 223. (2-tailed tests). Reliability coefficients are shown on the diagonal.

* p < .05.

** p < .01.
Table 3
Regression analysis (standardized coefficients)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1—controls</th>
<th>Identification</th>
<th>Altruism</th>
<th>Interpersonal harmony</th>
<th>Protecting company resources</th>
<th>Conscientiousness</th>
<th>Withdrawal cognitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>β</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.20**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Step 2—commitment to

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>β</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.18*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.18*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work group</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Step 3—two-way interactions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>β</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organization x</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work group</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Step 4—three-way interaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>β</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organization x</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work group</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Change in $R^2$ | .04           | .03      | .01                  | .08**                       | .07**            | .00                  |

Final $R^2$     | .07*          | .07      | .08                  | .15**                       | .15**            | .14**                |

Note. $N = 223$.

* $p < .05$.

** $p < .01$. 
associated with identification. This provides only limited support for Hypothesis 3. An unexpected finding was that organizational commitment was positively associated with interpersonal harmony, unexpected insofar as this OCB dimension may be seen as targeted at the supervisor or work group.

Finally, we examined the interactions between commitments. Hypothesis 4(a) suggested a three-way moderation effect, with relationships between commitment and withdrawal cognitions being stronger where commitment to other foci is low. However, we found no evidence for this, with no significant interactions for withdrawal cognitions in Table 3. Hypothesis 4(b) suggested a similar effect for organizationally focussed citizenship behaviors, identification, protecting company resources and conscientiousness. The only significant finding was for protecting company resources, with a significant negative two-way interaction between commitment to supervisor and work group (the three-way interaction was non-significant). We conducted a simple slope analysis, including only the significant two-way interaction. The findings showed a marginally significant positive relationship between commitment to supervisor and protecting company resources (simple slope = .145; \( p = .070 \)) when commitment to work group was low (one standard deviation below the mean), and a non-significant relationship (simple slope = -.140; \( p = .109 \)) when commitment to work group was high (one standard deviation above the mean). This provides partial support for Hypothesis 4(b).

Hypothesis 5 anticipated a two-way interaction between commitment to supervisor and to work group for the individually focussed citizenship behaviors. Table 3 shows no significant interaction for altruism, but for interpersonal harmony there was a significant negative interaction. We found a significant positive relationship between commitment to supervisor and interpersonal harmony (simple slope = .281; \( p = .002 \)) when commitment to work group was low (one standard deviation below the mean), and a non-significant relationship (simple slope = .066; \( p = .494 \)) when commitment to work group was high. This provides partial support for Hypothesis 5.

5. Discussion

Our findings provide additional support for the view that the multi-dimensional view of employee commitment generalizes to the Chinese context (Chen et al., 2002; Cheng et al., 2003). The organization, the supervisor, and co-workers were seen by respondents as separate commitment foci. Although the focal commitments were moderately positively correlated, the fact that they were related differently with outcomes supports the conclusion that these are distinct dimensions. There was evidence that the relationship between commitment and outcome is stronger where the constituency focus of each variable is consistent (Becker, 1992; Becker et al., 1995), in line with our consistency hypotheses. Organizational commitment was associated with organizational withdrawal cognitions, protecting company resources, and conscientiousness, and commitment to supervisor was associated with altruism and interpersonal harmony. These findings are consistent with social exchange theory, suggesting a correspondence between the focus of commitment and the beneficiary of the reciprocating behavior (e.g., McNeely & Meglino, 1994).

We hypothesized that person-based commitments would be especially important in the Chinese context, but our findings provided only limited support for this “cultural” hypothesis. We found no significant main effects for work group commitment on organizationally-focussed citizenship behaviors, for supervisor commitment there was a significant
main effect only for identification, and the significant interaction between supervisor and work group commitments suggests that such commitments may be associated with protecting company resources when commitment to the other is low.

Earlier Chinese studies provide evidence of effects for supervisor commitment on OCB and performance, but do not test such relationships for work group commitment (Chen et al., 2002; Cheng et al., 2003). We found a significant main effect for commitment to work group only in the case of withdrawal cognitions. The lack of positive regression findings for work group commitment, along with the unexpected finding that organizational commitment was associated with interpersonal harmony, may in fact reflect a cultural effect. Whilst we anticipated a greater salience for person-based and in-group commitments, it seems that such an argument may apply to commitment to supervisor but not to work group. One possible explanation for the failure of work group commitment to predict citizenship behaviors is that in the Chinese context the in-group is defined in terms of the organization as a whole, rather than the work group. This is plausible to the extent that Chinese collectivism is of the “vertical” type, emphasizing the integrity of the in-group and a readiness to submit to authority in the pursuit of group interests, rather than a “horizontal collectivism”, which would be more likely to emphasize common goals with peers in the work group (Singelis, Triandis, Bhawuk, & Gelfand, 1995).

Our analysis of interaction effects between commitments in predicting outcomes revealed only two significant interactions, a negative two-way interaction between commitment to supervisor and work group for protecting company resources, and a similar interaction between commitment to supervisor and work group for interpersonal harmony. There was a significant positive relationship between commitment to supervisor and these outcomes when commitment to work group was low, but no significant relationship when commitment to work group was high. These findings are consistent with our hypotheses and also with prior research on interactions between different bases of commitment, which have found similar two-way interactions between commitments in predicting withdrawal cognitions and absence (Jaros, 1997; Randall et al., 1990; Somers, 1995; Snape & Redman, 2003). Our findings provide evidence of a substitutability of these two focal commitments, suggesting that commitment to either supervisor or to work group is sufficient to produce such citizenship behaviors. It is interesting that organizational commitment does not interact in this way, suggesting its effects are independent of commitment to supervisor and work group.

Commitment appears to be a non-zero sum game. Commitment to one focus does not necessarily come at the expense of commitment to another, reflected in the moderately positive correlations amongst commitments (Table 2), and the lack of examples of commitment to one focus positively predicting, and to another negatively predicting, the same behavior. Furthermore, all three commitments were associated with low levels of withdrawal cognitions. All this is important, because it suggests that commitments to non-organizational foci do not necessarily contradict with being a loyal organizational member.

Our findings have implications for management. First, employee commitment is complex and managers must recognize that employee attitudes and behavior may reflect more than a commitment to the organization as a whole. Whilst organizational commitment may be associated with a willingness to stay, and to show conscientiousness and a concern to protect the company’s resources, commitment to supervisor is the key factor associated with other aspects of citizenship behavior, and commitment to work group is especially important in fostering a wish to remain with the organization. Second, employees are not
necessarily trading off conflicting loyalties, and commitment to supervisor and to work group appear to have no negative consequences for the organization. Furthermore, our analysis of interactions suggests that the effects of organizational commitment are independent of commitment to supervisor and work group. Finally, our finding that commitment to work group has low salience suggests that managers in Chinese organizations tend not to face a collective challenge from below. All this suggests that management need not necessarily fear multiple commitments. Instead, management may be advised to consider how to foster them, and it may be fruitful to try to monitor commitment profiles.

Our findings need to be interpreted in light of the limitations of the research. First, self reports were used for withdrawal cognitions, so that these results may be vulnerable to common method bias. However, our confirmatory factor analyses suggest that withdrawal cognitions were distinct from the commitment dimensions, so it is unlikely that our findings are entirely due to common method bias. We used supervisor ratings of OCB, so that common method bias does not arise here. Second, our study involved only front-line manufacturing workers, so that generalizability is an issue. Our findings confirming the utility of the multiple commitments framework are consistent with a growing body of Chinese evidence (Chen et al., 2002; Cheng et al., 2003), providing some assurances on generalizability, but further research is needed to assess the generalizability of our findings across a wider range of occupational groups in China and also to other Asian cultures. Cultural hypotheses may also be tested further using comparative samples, and with culture measured at the individual level. A third limitation is that our analysis of interactions examined foci, but not bases, of commitment. This is to our knowledge the first attempt to analyse interactions between foci of commitment. Studies examining commitment profiles across both multiple foci and bases of commitment would be useful, although such profiles will be rather complex and may need to be analysed by methods other than regression interactions. Finally, given the cross-sectional design of our study, we cannot determine causation. Longitudinal studies of multiple commitments would be useful in examining causal links.
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