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The study examined the relationship between employees’ psychological career meta-capacities and their job retention-related dispositions. Participants were a convenience sample (n=355) of managerial and staff levels in the human resource management field. They completed the Psychological Career Resources Inventory (PCRI), Career Adaptability Inventory (CAI), Personal Views Survey II (PVS), Job Embeddedness Scale (JES) and the Organizational Commitment Survey (OCS). Data were analyzed using canonical correlations to predict the relationship between the psychological career meta-competencies and the job retention-related dispositions. Structural Equation Modelling was used to validate the overall relationship between the two canonical construct variates. The results show that the psychological career meta-capacities predict the job retention-related factor job embeddedness.
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The retention of qualified, highly skilled and high performing employees is important for businesses competitiveness (Hausknecht, Rodda, & Howard, 2009; Presti, Nonnis, & Briscoe, 2011; Rappaport, Bancroft, & Okum, 2003; Samuel & Chipunza, 2009). Organizations that do not manage to retain their high performers will be left with an understaffed and less qualified workforce that will ultimately hold back their capability to continue being competitive (Presti et al., 2011).

The retention of employees is influenced by their job embeddedness and commitment to the organization (João, 2011; Van Dyk, 2012). It is also influenced by psychological coping resources and self-regulation capacities that include individuals’ ability to adapt to and deal proactively with the changing and uncertain nature of their careers in the contemporary world of work (Bezuidenhout, 2010; Ferreira, 2009; Savickas, 2011; Savickas et al., 2009; Savickas & Porfeli, 2012). However, in an increasingly turbulent job environment context people are increasingly dependent on their psychological and social resources (human capital), and less dependent on organizational career arrangements (Savickas, 2011). This may be because they experience more frequent career transitions, have greater agency in career decisions and must be able, adaptable life-long learners (Arthur, Khapova, & Wilderom, 2005; Baruch, 2004; Rossier, Zecca, Stauffer, Maggiori, & Dauwalder, 2012; Savickas, 2011; Savickas & Porfeli, 2012). Consequently, subjective career resources that emphasize psychological attributes may be increasingly important to work participation in today’s work environment (Brown, George-Curran, & Smith, 2003; Coetzee, 2008; Ebberwein, Krieshok, Ulven, & Prosse, 2004; Kidd, 2008; Savickas, 2011; Savickas et al., 2009; Savickas & Porfeli, 2012; Van Dam, 2004).

In the current study we examined how individuals’ psychological career meta-capacities (comprising their psychological career resources, career adaptability resources and hardiness) relate to their retention-related dispositions (job embeddedness and organizational commitment). Specifically, we propose that individuals’ repertoire of psychological career resources, career adaptability resources, and hardness are explained by his or her retention-related dispositions (job embeddedness and organizational commitment) by acting as mediating constructs between an individual’s work and personal life.

Psychological Career Meta-Capacities

Psychological career meta-capacities act as personal resources in managing the person-environment fit harmonics. For instance, psychological career resources (people’s career preferences and values, career enablers, career drivers and career harmonizers) enable individuals to adapt to changing career circumstances and to shape and select environments in order to attain success within a particular socio-cultural context (Coetzee, 2008).

People’s career preferences and values comprise their unique views about the paths their careers should follow and guide their career decisions. Together with people’s sense of career purpose, career directedness and career venturing attitudes. For instance, career enablers (practical or creative skills, and personal and interpersonal management skills that help people to succeed in their careers), career harmonizers (people’s self-esteem, behavioral adaptability, emotional literacy and social connectivity) are psychological attributes important to job retention (Coetzee, 2008).

Savickas’s (1997, 2005) proposed the notion of career adaptability to refer to a set of five specific attributes, beliefs, and competencies (concern, control, curiosity, confidence and commitment), which shape the actual problem-solving strategies and coping behavior that individuals use to synthesize their vocational self-concepts with work roles.
As a psychological career resource, hardiness is regarded as a collection of personality attributes related to commitment, control and challenge. Individuals high in hardiness tend to whole-heartedly involve themselves in or commit to whatever they are doing, believe and act as if they can influence or control the events forming their lives, and consider change to be not only normal but also a stimulant or challenge to development or personal growth (Azeem, 2010; Delahaj, Gailard, & van Dam, 2010; Hystad, Eid, Johnsen, Laberg, & Bartone, 2010; Kobasa, Maddi, & Zola, 1985; Zhang, 2010).

Retention-Related Dispositions

Job embeddedness and organizational commitment are regarded as a composite set of retention-related dispositions. Job embeddedness refers to individuals' dispositional orientations or perceptions of their: (1) fit (the extent to which a person perceives that the job, organization and environment meshes with or complements (fit) other areas and aspects of his or her life space), (2) links (the extent of an individual's ties with other people and activities at work to family, non-work and off-the-job interests), and (3) sacrifice (the ease with which a person feels that links can be broken, or people's perceptions of what they would have to give up if they were to leave their current position (Feldman & Ng, 2007). In short, the more an employee perceives that which he or she would have to give up (financially or psychologically) by leaving a job or organization, the more difficult it will be for the individual to sever employment with the organization (Mitchell et al., 2001; Shaw, Delery, Jenkins, & Gupta, 1998).

Organizational commitment reflects three extensive aspects of reasons for staying at or leaving an organization, namely: (1) affective commitment, (2) continuance commitment, and (3) normative commitment. Commitment is viewed as a set of affect-driven job attitudes that affect the individual's affective or psychological attachment to, identification with and participation in the organization; acknowledgement of the consequences of, or expenses and threats linked to leaving the organization (and thus their continuance commitment based on their perception that they need to stay); and an internalized normative idea of ethical responsibility to stay which allows individuals to value their continued membership of a specific organization (Allen & Meyer, 1990). Similar to job embeddedness, research indicates organizational commitment as a significant predictor of turnover and job satisfaction (Griffeth, Hom, & Gaertner, 2000; Hom & Griffeth, 1995; Mitchell et al., 2001).

Goals of the Study

We hypothesize that highly career adaptable individuals with a range of well-developed career resources might show stronger perceptions of embeddedness (fit) with the organization, having a sense that their values, career goals and plans for the future fit with the larger corporate culture as well as the demands (e.g., job knowledge, skills and abilities) of the immediate job (Mitchell et al., 2001). Research by Van Dyk (2012) also produced evidence that high levels of job embeddedness significantly increase individuals' sense of organizational commitment.

We also propose that individuals with a well-developed hardy personality might demonstrate the hardy values of cooperation, credibility and creativity at team and organizational level, implying higher levels of job embeddedness and organizational commitment.

Method

Sample and Procedure

The participants were a non-probability sample (N = 355) of employed adults at managerial and staff levels in a South African service industry who were enrolled for a human resource management programme at a distance higher education institution. Data were collected during a study school which the participants attended. The sample predominantly comprised blacks (92%), and females (71%), and single (55%) and married (38%) participants mostly during their early adulthood life stage or the establishment phases of their careers (26 – 40 years; 64%) as indicated in Table 1. In terms of employment 76% of the participants were full time employed.

Measures

Participants completed the Psychological Career Resources Inventory (PCRI), the Career Adaptability Inventory (CAI), the Personal Views Survey II (PVS-II), the Job Embeddedness Scale (JES) and the Organizational Commitment Survey (OCS). They also provided data on personal demographics.

The Psychological Career Resources Inventory (PCRI: Coetzee, 2008) is a self-rated measure of career preferences, career values, career enablers, career drivers, and career harmonizers. It is scored on a 6-point Likert-type scale (1 = never, 6 = always). The Cronbach alpha inter-consistency coefficients with the study sample were .71 to .88.

The Career Adapt-Abilities Inventory (CAI: Savickas, 2010) is 55 item self-report measure of control, curiosity, cooperation and confidence. It is scored on a 5-point Likert-type scale (1 = strongest, 5 = not strong). The Cronbach’s alpha coefficients (internal consistency) for the five subscales for the sample of this study were as follows: control (.88), control (.90), curiosity (.90), cooperation (.85) and confidence (.90).

The Personal Views Survey II (PVS-II: CITATION) is a 50 item self-rated measure of hardi-commitment, control and challenge and scores on a 4-point Likert-type scale (1 = not at all true, 4 = completely true). The Cronbach alpha coefficients (internal consistency) for the five subscales for the sample of this study were as follows: commitment (.76), control (.71) and challenge (.59).

The Job Embeddedness Scale (JES: Mitchell, Holtom & Lee, 2001) is a 23 item measure of organizational fit (7 items), sacrifice (10 items) and links (6 items). It is scored on a 6-point Likert type scale (1 = strongly disagree, 6 = strongly agree). The Cronbach alpha coefficients (intestinal consistency) for the five subscales for the sample of this study were as follows: fit (.84), links (.77) and sacrifice (.87).

The Organizational Commitment Scale (OCS: Meyer & Allen, 1997) is a 30 item Likert scale measure (1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree) of affective commitment (8 items), continuance commitment (9 items) and normative commitment (6 items). The Cronbach Alpha coefficients (internal consistency) for the five subscales (as obtained for the sample of this study) were as follows: affective commitment (.56), continuance commitment (.73) and normative commitment (.74).

Data Analyses

Canonical correlational analyses were performed to assess the relationship between the PCRI, CAI and PVS II variables (as a composite set of multiple independent variables of the psychological career meta-capacities construct), and the JES and OCS variables (as a composite set of multiple dependent variables of the retention-related dispositions construct). Canonical
correlation analysis limits the probability of committing Type I errors (Hair, Black, Babin & Anderson, 2010). The Wilks Lambda’s chi-square test was performed to test for the significance of the overall canonical correlation between the independent and dependent variates of a canonical function. In order to counter the probability of a type I error, it was decided to set the significance value for interpreting the results at a 95% confidence interval level ($F_p = .05$).

Effect sizes were used to decide on the practical significance of the canonical correlation findings. In line with guidelines by Hair et al. (2010), the cut-off criteria for factorial loadings (= .30) were used to interpret the relative importance of the canonical structure correlations or loadings in deriving the canonical variate constructs. The redundancy index was also considered for assessing the magnitude of the overall correlational relationships between the two variates of a canonical function and the practical significance of the predictive ability of the canonical relationship (Hair et al., 2010). Squared canonical correlation ($R_c^2$) values of = .12 (small practical effect), = .13 = .25 (medium practical effect) and = .26 (large practical effect) ($F_p = .05$) (Cohen, 1992) were also considered in the interpretation of the magnitude or practical significance of the results.

Structural Equation Modelling (SEM) was also performed using AMOS 18 (Arbuckle, 1995-2009) to validate the overall relationship between the two canonical construct variates (psychological career attributes and retention-related dispositions) as latent variables. The canonical correlation analysis results were regarded as the measurement model. In line with guidelines provided by Garson (2008), we assumed that an adequate fit of the structural model to the measurement data exists when we obtain a confirmatory fit index (CFI) of .90 or higher, a root-mean-square error of approximation (RMSEA) of .08 or lower, and a standardized root-mean-square residual (SRMR) of .05 or lower.

**Results**

Descriptive Statistics: Means and Standard Deviations

Table 2 shows that the participants obtained the highest mean scores on the following PCRI subscales: stability/expertise career preference ($M = 5.28$; $SD = .11$); growth/development career value ($M = 5.42$; $SD = .16$); career purpose driver ($M=5.39; SD= .05$); and self/other skills ($M=4.89; SD= .23$).

Table 2 also shows that the participants obtained the highest mean scores on the CAI (career adaptability) control ($M = 4.39$; $SD = 6.93$), PVS-II (hardiness) challenge ($M = 3.43; SD = 5.71$), JES fit ($M = 5.04; SD = 6.73$) and OCS continuance commitment ($M = 4.76; SD = 9.92$) subscales.
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Table 3 shows that the canonical model has three canonical functions (dimensions) of which the canonical correlation of only the first function is statistically significant: \( R_c = 0.454 \) \( (R_c^2 = .21\); moderate practical effect; \( F(p) = 1.56 \) \( (p = .0001) \). The canonical function explains the relationship between the two canonical variates, that is, the canonical variate for the set of dependent variables (retention-related dispositions: job embeddedness and organizational commitment) and the canonical variate for the set of independent variables (psychological career attributes: psychological career resources, career adaptability and hardiness). The four multivariate criteria and the \( F \) approximations for the model are also statistically significant \( (p = .0001) \).

Table 4 shows that the psychological career meta-capacities variate construct was most strongly influenced by the PCRI (psychological career resources) and CAI (career adaptability) variables. More specifically, the PCRI variables career directedness \( (R_c = .59) \), self/other skills \( (R_c = .56) \) and behavioral adaptability \( (R_c = .52) \) showed a practically large degree of association with the psychological career meta-capacities construct variate. The PCRI career preference variable stability/ex-
pertise ($R_c = .36$), and the career harmonizer variables self-esteem ($R_c = .42$) and social connectivity ($R_c = .42$) showed a practically moderate degree of association with the psychological career meta-capacities construct variate ($R_c^2 = 13 = .25$). All the CAI (career adaptability) variables showed a practically large degree of association with the psychological career meta-capacities construct variate. All the PVS-II (hardiness) commitment variables showed an inverse association of a practically moderate degree with the psychological career meta-capacities construct variate. The JES-fit variable ($R_c = -.64$), control ($R_c = -.49$) and challenge ($R_c = -.31$) variables showed an inverse association of a practically moderate degree with the psychological career meta-capacities construct variate.

Table 4 shows that the retention-related dispositions canonical variate construct was most strongly influenced by the JES-fit variable ($R_c = .77$; very large practical effect), and to a lesser extent by the JES variables links ($R_c = .43$; moderate practical effect) and sacrifice ($R_c = .38$; small practical effect). The results furthermore indicated that the retention-related dispositions variate construct was most strongly influenced by the OCS continuance variable ($R_c = -.49$), which indicated an inverse association of a practically moderate degree with the retention-related dispositions variate construct. The OCS affective ($R_c = -.08$) and normative variables ($R_c = .07$) both indicated an association with the canonical variate construct of small practical effect.

**Career meta-capacities.** The psychological career meta-capacities canonical variate construct was able to predict only 4% (small practical effect) of the variance in the individual original retention-related dispositional construct variables. The retention-related dispositional canonical variate construct was able to predict only 4% (very small practical effect) of the variance in the individual original PCRI, CAI and PVS-II variables. Neither of the two canonical variate constructs was thus found to be a good overall predictor of the opposite canonical variate construct. By contrast, each canonical variate was a stronger predictor of its own construct variables. The psychological career meta-capacities canonical variate construct explained 19% (moderate practical effect) of the variance in the individual original PCRI, CAI and PVS-II variables while the retention-related dispositions canonical variate construct explained 20% (moderate practical effect) of the variance in the individual original JES and OCS variables.

**Job embeddedness.** The JES-fit variable exhibited the highest correlation with the psychological career meta-capacities canonical variate construct which explained 21% of the variance in the JES-fit variable. Overall, it appears from the cross-loadings (although small in practical effect size) that the psychological career meta-capacities of self/other skills, and career adaptability competencies of concern, control, and confidence contributed the most in explaining the variance in the job embeddedness fit variable.

**Path analytic structure of career meta-capacities and job embeddedness.** Table 5 shows that model 3 had a very good fit to the data: chi-square = 91.24 (41 df); CMIN/df = 2.23; $p = .000$; RFI = .95; TLI = .97; CFI = .98; RMSEA = .06 and SRMR = .03. Figure 1 specifies the standardized path coefficient estimates between the psychological career meta-capacities construct and its variables and the standardized path coefficients estimates between the retention-related dispositions construct and its variable job embeddedness (fit). The standardized path coefficient estimates between the psychological career meta-capacities construct and the job embeddedness (fit) construct are also specified.

The model fit (shown in figure 1) revealed that the model explains 9% of the variance in the retention-related disposition construct fit (job embeddedness). In terms of relative importance, the psychological career meta-capacities construct is
Table 4

Standardized Canonical Correlation Analysis Results for the First Canonical Function Variates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variate/variable</th>
<th>Canonical coefficients (weights)</th>
<th>Canonical loading (Rc) (structure coefficients)</th>
<th>Canonica cross-loadings (squared multiple correlations)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Career Preference (PCRI)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability/Expertise</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety/Creativity</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence/Autonomy</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Career Values (PCRI)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth/Development</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority/Influence</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Career Enablers (PCRI)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical/Creative skills</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self/Other skills</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Career Drivers (PCRI)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Purpose</td>
<td>-.45</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Directedness</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Venturing</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Career Harmonizers (PCRI)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral adaptability</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional literacy</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social connectivity</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Career adaptability (CAI)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curiosity</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hardiness (PVA-II)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>-.50</td>
<td>-.64</td>
<td>-.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.49</td>
<td>-.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent canonical variate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(psychological career meta-capacities)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared variance:</td>
<td>.19++</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Rc²:</td>
<td>.21++</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redundancy index:</td>
<td>0.4+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.77 (.59)</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Links (organization)</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.43 (.19)</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacrifice</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.38 (.14)</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational commitment (OCS)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective commitment</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.08 (.01)</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuance commitment</td>
<td>-.65</td>
<td>-.49 (.24)</td>
<td>-.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative commitment</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.07 (.01)</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependent canonical variate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Retention-related dispositions)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared variance:</td>
<td>.20++</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Rc²:</td>
<td>.21++</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redundancy index:</td>
<td>0.4+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. + $Rc^2 \leq .12$ (small practical effect size)  $++ Rc^2 \geq .13 \leq .25$ (moderate practical effect size)  $+++ Rc^2 \geq .26$ (large practical effect size); N=355
mostly explained by the psychological career resources variables (self/other skills, behavioral adaptability and career direct-
ness), and the career adaptability variables (curiosity, con-
cern, control, confidence and cooperation). The psychological career resources variables in the model explain 98% of the vari-
ance in the psychological career meta-capacities construct while the career adaptability variables explain 74% of the vari-
ance. The hardness variables (commitment and control) showed an inverse relationship with, and contributed the least in
explaining the variance (8%) in the psychological career meta-capacities construct.

Discussion

Overall, the results suggested that the psychological career meta-capacities (self/other skills, behavioral adaptability, ca-
reer directedness, curiosity, concern, control, confidence, curi-
osity, hard-commitment and hard-control) significantly con-
tributed to explaining the participants’ sense of fit with their work
group, job and organization.

Several implications follow from the findings. First, increas-
ing the participants’ psychological career meta-capacities (psy-
chological career resources and career adaptability resources)
may assist them in managing or negotiating their personal fit
with the work group, job or organization as an aspect of their ca-
reers. Psychological meta-capacities might influence other ca-
reer or work-related outcomes such as job tenure and organiza-
tional commitment impacting the retention of valuable and
talented staff. Employees who feel strongly embedded and
committed may define their relationships with their employers
as long term, and have lower intention to quit as opposed to em-
ployees who have lower levels of embeddedness and commit-
tment to their organizations (Mallol et al., 2007).

The findings indicated that the participants’ behavioral adaptability, self-management and interpersonal skills, and clarity about their future career direction were important to in-
crease their job embeddedness and organization commitment. Moreover, their overall career adaptability was also significantly related to their sense of fit with the job and organization. Accord-
ing to Mitchell et al. (2001a, 2001b), a fit between employees’ values, career goals and plans for the future and the larger cor-
porate culture as well as the demands of the immediate job
(e.g., job knowledge, skills and abilities) leads to a stronger
sense of embeddedness. Research by Van Dyk (2012) showed
employees’ satisfaction with career opportunities and the char-
acteristics of their jobs (autonomy, skill variety and challenge) to
be significantly related to their sense of job embeddedness (fit
and sacrifice). João (2010) also found the need for career growth
and advancement opportunities and challenging work to be sig-
nificant factors that keep professionally qualified employees
from leaving their organizations.

More specifically, organizational career development sup-
port interventions should focus on developing the psychological career meta-capacities pointed out in the findings of the current study as important psychosocial resources to increase the par-
ticipants’ sense of job embeddedness (fit). Developing employ-
ees’ career adaptability resources encourage proactive career
behaviors which will help them to shape the problem-solving
strategies and coping behaviors they need to synthesize their
vocational self-concepts with their work-roles (Savickas, 2005)
in negotiating the person-environment fit harmonics (Savickas
& Porfeli, 2012), thus increasing their attachment (sense of
job-embedded fit) to the organization.

Limitations and Future Research

Since the present study has been limited to early career par-
ticipants predominantly employed in the human resources man-
gagement field in the South African organizational context, the
findings cannot be generalized to other occupational contexts,
age, race or gender groups. Furthermore, given the cross-sec-
tional nature of the research design, this study can yield no
statements about causation. Associations between the vari-
ables have therefore been interpreted rather than established.
These findings therefore need to be replicated with broader
samples across various occupational groups and economic
sectors before more comprehensive conclusions can be drawn
about the relationship between employees’ psychological ca-
reer meta-capacities (psychological career resources, career
adaptability and hardiness) and their retention-related disposi-
tions (job embeddedness and organizational commitment).
Longitudinal studies are also recommended to investigate the
relationship between these variables and how they influence
the retention of employees over the long term.

Conclusion

From the findings of our study it can be concluded that de-
veloping and enhancing employees’ psychological career

---

Table 5
SEM Fit Statistics Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>CMIN(χ²)</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>CMIN/df</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>NFI</th>
<th>RFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
<th>ΔCMIN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>12188.97</td>
<td>7122</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>155.37</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
<td>12033.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>91.24</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>64.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * p < .01. Model 1 is the hypothesised five-factor model in which psychological career resources, career adaptability, hardi-
ness, job embeddedness and organizational commitment each load onto their respective latent factors. Model 2 is a two-factor
model in which psychological career resources, career adaptability and hardiness load onto one factor and job embeddedness and
organizational commitment onto another factor. Model 3 is a two-factor model in which psychological career resources, career
adaptability and hardness load onto one factor (psychological career meta-capacities) and job embeddedness onto a second fac-
tor (retention-related dispositions). CMIN(χ²) = chi-square; df = degrees of freedom; p = significance level; NFI = Bentler-Bonett
normed fit index; RFI = relative fit index; TLI = non-normed fit index; CFI = comparative fit index; RMSEA = root-mean-square error
of approximation. SRMR = standardized root-mean-square residual; N=355.
meta-capacities may assist them in managing or negotiating their personal fit with the work group, job or organization as an aspect of their careers. Should individuals perceive a low fit with the job or organization, they might have the confidence and inner drive or motivation (hardiness) to attempt to deal responsibly with the undesirable situation. They might draw on their career resources to deal positively with the perceived lack of fit. Organizational commitment appears to be less important than individuals’ job-embedded fit in terms of retaining them. Managers and industrial psychologists may use the findings of the study to better understand the psychological factors that influence the retention of valuable staff members.

References


