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ABSTRACT

The purpose of the study was to test whether the perceptions of employment equity (EE) and black economic empowerment (BEE) are related to union commitment and whether the perceptions about the mentor’s role significantly mediate this said relationship. The sampling frame for the study constituted 1200 employees of a division of a large public transport organisation and a convenience sample including all 1200 employees yielded 637 fully completed records (a 53% response rate). The results of the study indicate that the perceptions of EE and BEE are significantly related to union commitment, but that perceptions of the mentor’s role do not mediate this relationship. More detailed findings on the study are reported.

OPSOMMING

Die doel van die studie was om vas te stel of die persepsies van werkgeeligheid (EE) en Swart ekonomiese bemagtiging (BEE) verband hou met vakunieverbondenheid en of die persepsies omtrent die mentorrol hierdie verhouding beduidend medieer. Die steekproefraamwerk van die studie het bestaan uit 1200 werknemers uit ‘n divisie van ‘n groot vervoeronderneming en ‘n gerieflikheidsteekproef wat al 1200 werknemers ingesluit het, het 637 volledige rekords opgelever (‘n 53% responskoers). Die resultate van die studie dui daarop dat die persepsies van EE en BEE beduidend verwant is aan vakunieverbondenheid, maar dat persepsies van die mentorrol nie hierdie verhouding medieer nie. Meer gedetailleerde bevindinge van die studie word gerapporteer.

Little research has been done on the influence of unions on employees and organisations (Muchinsky, 1990; Barling (1988); Barling, Fullagar and Kelloway (1992); Fullagar (1984) and Gordon and Nurick (1981) have agreed and mentioned that knowledge of organisational behaviour is incomplete without an understanding of union influence. Little attention is also given to union commitment (Fukami & Larson, 1984). The involvement of union members is crucial for unions to secure and maintain their power base (Gordon, Philpot, Burt, Thompson & Spiller, 1980). These facts provide a rationale and the motivation for the current study.

One needs to look at the history of South Africa to understand black and white worker union loyalty. Webster (1983) identifies three labour segments in South Africa, namely skilled labour where whites hold the majority of positions, semi-skilled labour mainly occupied by Coloured and Asian workers and finally the large unskilled black labour market. White skilled workers were part of the “protective” craft unions that gained status, security and privilege and were therefore committed to the union (Walker & Lawler, 1979).

Webster (1983) refers to these white unions as restrictionists. Black unskilled and semi-skilled workers were part of the “aggressive” unions that gained some democratic and social justice, improved security, conditions of work and standard of living (Walker & Lawler, 1979). Webster (1983) refers to the black unions as expansionists. White workers associate union loyalty with extrinsic factors. They also have access to other institutions for the satisfaction of intrinsic needs. Black workers join a union for improved benefits, and to defend African workers’ rights (Webster, 1979).

Given the above and the changes that legislation (the Employment Equity Act and the Broad-based Black Economic Empowerment Act) implies, the question arises what impact it has on individuals.

Different individuals may respond differently to a particular force of change. For some it may be satisfactory, but for others it will bring pain, stress and disadvantages (Human, 2000; Yousef, 2000). Research shows that higher committed individuals will accept change more easily (Guest, 1995; Iverson, 1996; Lau & Woodman, 1995).

With the EE Act aiming at providing a more productive workforce, that is better trained and motivated employees and helping to make a company more efficient and competitive (Republic of South Africa, 1998), the question that can be asked is whether all individuals are experiencing the outcome of the implemented Act as positive and equally challenging. This study will empirically test which biographical variables are significantly related to the perceptions of EE (see Figure 1).

With the aim of the Broad-based Black Economic Empowerment (BBEE) Act to transfer the ownership of assets into black hands (Innes, 2002), the same question as with the Employment Equity Act can be asked. Experience in practice has shown that individuals are not equally enthusiastic about the change and that this might also affect their commitment levels. This study will empirically test which biographical variables are significantly related to the perceptions of BEE (see Figure 1). The next section will provide some research evidence on the relationship between biographical variables, EE and BEE.

Biographical variables, EE and BEE

Some of the research that has been published will highlight the relationship between biographical variables and EE and, to a lesser extent, BEE because this legislation has just recently been promulgated.

Race

Easton-Leadly (1994) has reported that the perceptions of racism are more negative and black respondents claim even more experiences of discrimination. Jordaan (2002) is of the opinion...
that whites are to experience reverse discrimination, because black workers are given preference. Mahanyele (1993) reflects the frustration that organisations only talk about EE, but deny blacks the opportunity.

**Gender**

Muller and Roodt (1998) found women to be more negative than men about affirmative action (EE), because they have fewer opportunities. Contrary to this, Van Zyl and Roodt (2003) found women to be more positive than men about EE. This inconsistency is probably attributable to the differences in the country’s development stages.

**Age**

Walbrugh and Roodt (2003) reported that younger groups (<35 years) feel progressively more positive about EE than older groups (35-50). The older group (>50) again felt more positive about EE.

**Tenure**

Tenure is strongly related to age. The reason for the group in their mid-career to be more negative about EE may be related to their career demands and the typical mid-career crisis as pointed out by Walbrugh and Roodt (2003).

**Marital status**

No research could be found to shed more light on this relationship.

**Education levels**

No research was found to shed more light on this relationship.

**Home language**

Müller and Roodt (1998) found that English- and Afrikaans-speaking respondents were more negative about affirmative action (EE) than the group speaking African languages.

**Job level**

Several authors have commented on the excessive job mobility of black managers (Matuna, 1996; Primos, 1994; Sibanda, 1995). Innes (2001) and Roberts (1997) found that black managers were poached at high salaries that are higher than those paid by the market. Vallabh and Donald (2001) reported on the following perceptions of black managers:

- They place a high value on being trusted and recognised for their work, though their values are not recognised.
- They are placed in positions that do not meet their academic background.
- They do not have the opportunity to use their knowledge and skills.
- They are second-guessed by their colleagues and supervisors.

The above research results indicate that people have different experiences and expectations regarding EE and BEE, which will have a definite impact on their union commitment. For the purpose of this study union commitment is defined as: ‘a cognitive predisposition towards a particular focus (the union), insofar this focus has the potential to satisfy needs, realise values and achieve goals’ (Roodt, 2004, p. 85).

With reference to the theoretical model (Figure 1) the next section deals with the relationship between biological variables and union commitment.

**Biographical variables and union commitment**

**Race**

Fullagar (1986) found that there are no differences for black and white workers in South Africa with regard to their level of union commitment.

**Gender**

Gordon et al. (1980) found women to be more committed to an union than men.

**Age**


**Tenure**

Fukami and Larson (1984) found no relationship between union commitment and tenure. However, Barling, Wade and Fullagar (1990) found that only union tenure was a significant predictor of union commitment an aspect not investigated in this study.

**Marital status**

No evidence could be found in the relevant literature on the relationship between different marital status categories and their levels of union commitment.

**Educational level**

Fukami and Larson (1984) found no relationship between union commitment and educational level.

**Home language**

No evidence could be found in the relevant literature on the relationship between different home language groups and their levels of union commitment.

**Job level**

No evidence could be found in the relevant literature on the relationship between job level categories and their levels of union commitment.

In the theoretical model (Figure 1) it is suggested that the relationship between EE, BEE and union commitment is mediated by perceptions of the mentor’s role.

**Commitment and mentorship**

One of the key success factors in managing change and diversity is mentorship (Clutterbuck & Abbott, 2003; Jordaan, 2002; Singh, Bains & Vinnicombe, 2002; Wingrove, 2002). Mentors influence the level of the commitment of protégés (Clutterbuck, 1997; Mowday, Steers & Porter, 1979).

One context in which mentorship can work is within BEE. If one departs from the vantage point that mentoring is an equal relationship between the mentor and protégé, then entrepreneurial and managerial skills can be transferred while allowing the new manager or entrepreneur to develop the right competencies (Clutterbuck & Abbott, 2003).

According to Storm and Roodt (2002) and Wingrove (2002), white, middle-aged mentors may be cynical and negative about EE and this negativity may be projected to the protégé, which can again lead to lower commitment levels. Little empirical evidence could be found to support this rationale, except for the exploratory research by Storm and Roodt (2002) that focused on organisation-related commitment.

**Objectives of the study**

Against this background, the primary objective of this research will be to determine whether the perceptions of EE and BEE are related to union commitment.

The secondary objectives of the study will be:

1. to determine whether this relationship is mediated by the perceptions of the mentor’s role; and
2. to determine which biographical variables are significant predictors of the perceptions of EE and BEE.

The objectives of the study can be inferred from the theoretical model (Figure 1) compiled from the research literature.
Figure 1: Predictive model of Union Commitment
[Adapted from Guest (1995); Innes (2002); Iverson (1996); Lau and Woodman (1995); Mowday et al. (1982); Müller and Roodt (1998); Republic of South Africa (55 of 1998) and Storm and Roodt (2002).]

RESEARCH DESIGN

Research approach
The research approach followed in the study is from the quantitative paradigm and the application of measuring instruments in a cross-sectional, non-random field survey generated the primary data for the study. An ex post facto approach to data analysis was used in exploring the interrelationships between variables in the data set.

Research methodology
The research methodology followed, is described according to the following three headings:

Sample of participants
The largest division of this transport organisation was targeted for the research. A convenience sample including all employees in a sampling frame of 1200 employees yielded 637 completed questionnaires. A response rate of 53% was obtained. Only fully completed records were used for the data analyses.

As indicated in Table 1, the majority of the respondents were Whites (62%) followed by Africans (24%) and Coloureds/Indians/Asians (13,5%). Most of the respondents were male (80,5%) and a smaller group (19,5%) female. The majority of the respondents belong to an union (70,5%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Background Information</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africans</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>24,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coloureds/Indians/Asians</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>13,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whites</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>62,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>80,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>19,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 years and younger</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>16,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-45</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>14,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>12,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>22,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-50</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>18,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older than 50</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>16,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Background information of the respondents

Tenure
- 10 years or less: 158 (24,7)
- 11-20 years: 130 (20,4)
- 21-25 years: 124 (19,5)
- 26-30 years: 100 (15,7)
- More than 30 years: 125 (19,7)

TOTAL 637 (100%)

Marital Status
- Single, divorced or widowed: 171 (26,8)
- Married or living together: 466 (73,2)

TOTAL 637 (100%)

Educational Level
- Standard 9 or lower: 131 (20,6)
- Standard 10: 179 (28,1)
- Post-matric diploma/certificate: 218 (34,2)
- Degree or higher: 109 (17,1)

TOTAL 637 (100%)

Home Language
- Afrikaans: 320 (50,2)
- English: 162 (25,4)
- African: 155 (24,4)

TOTAL 637 (100%)

Job level
- Junior employees: 173 (27)
- Management: 464 (73)

TOTAL 637 (100%)

Union Membership
- Do not belong to a union: 188 (29,5)
- Belong to a union: 449 (70,5)

TOTAL 637 (100%)

Type of Mentor
- Hierarchical mentor in a higher grade: 119 (18,7)
- Hierarchical mentor in a lower grade: 11 (1,7)
- Supervisor as mentor: 88 (13,8)
- Peer mentor (same grade): 30 (4,7)
- Executive mentor: 13 (2,1)
- No mentor: 376 (59)

TOTAL 637 (100%)

Mentor Type
- Same race: 98 (15)
- Different race: 63 (10)
- Same sex: 61 (10)
- Opposite sex: 39 (6)
- No mentor: 376 (59)

TOTAL 637 (100%)

Mentor Phase
- Initial: 61 (10)
- Learning: 72 (11)
- Independency: 64 (10)
- Redefinition: 64 (10)
- No mentor: 376 (59)

TOTAL 637 (100%)

Mentor Age
- <25: 6 (1)
- 25-30: 17 (3)
- 31-35: 41 (6)
- 36-40: 31 (5)
- 41-45: 61 (10)
- 46-50: 45 (7)
- 51-55: 45 (7)
- 56-63: 15 (2)
- No mentor: 376 (59)

TOTAL 637 (100%)
A comprehensive measuring instrument, the Employee Commitment Questionnaire, was designed for the purpose of the study. The Employee Commitment Questionnaire consisted of 127 items measured on a five-point intensity scale (excluding the biographical questions). Examples of the items can be seen in Figure 2.

The union commitment questionnaire examples
Question D2: To what extent are you willing to stay on with your union, regardless the type of work you are doing?
To no extent 1 2 3 4 5 To a very large extent

Question D10: To what extent are you personally involved in your union?
To no extent 1 2 3 4 5 To a very large extent

The perceptions of employment equity questionnaire examples
Question E3: To what extent does your supervisor know what your training needs are?
To no extent 1 2 3 4 5 To a very large extent

Question E5: To what extent do all employees at the organisation have the same opportunities for promotion?
To no extent 1 2 3 4 5 To a very large extent

The perceptions of black economic empowerment questionnaire examples
Question F15: How much do you think black women will benefit from applying black economic empowerment strategies?
Little benefit 1 2 3 4 5 Large benefit

The perceptions of the mentor's role questionnaire examples
Question G18: To what extent should a mentor encourage one to communicate openly about anxiety and fears that distract one from work?
To no extent 1 2 3 4 5 To a very large extent

Question G23: To what extent should a mentor serve as a role model for protégés?
To no extent 1 2 3 4 5 To a very large extent

Figure 2: Item examples of the Employee Commitment Questionnaire
questionnaire based on the same theory. Twenty-nine items in question format were included in this questionnaire. No information on the reliability is available on this instrument, but findings of this study will be reported under the results section. This instrument seems to have content and face validity based on the item content.

Research procedure
The measuring instrument was distributed via the organisation’s intranet to all individuals in the division, excluding those on the lowest levels who were not able to read or write. A hard copy was also sent to employees via Human Resources Practitioners. All the ethical codes, e.g. control procedures, were adhered to. A letter of reminder was sent at a later stage to urge individuals to participate in the study. Individuals could respond anonymously and all the returned responses were treated with the utmost confidentiality. The identity of all the individuals was thus protected to ensure reliable responses.

RESULTS
The analysis of the data was conducted in two stages. The objective of the first stage was to establish whether all the variables were robust and reliable. In order to achieve this objective, all the measuring instruments were factor analysed separately on two levels. This procedure suggested by Schepers (1992) was followed to avoid the creation of artificial factors, resulting from differential item skewness.

In the first level factor analyses, all the items of each instrument were intercorrelated and anti-image correlations were executed to test the suitability of the matrices for factor analyses by referring to the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy and the Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity. Eigenvalues were calculated on the unreduced item intercorrelation matrices and a number of factors were postulated according to the Kaiser’s (1970) criterion of eigenvalues larger than unity.

In the second level factor analyses, sub-scores for each postulated factor were calculated and the same procedure as explained above was conducted on the sub-score intercorrelation matrices. Items of the obtained second level factors (scales) were subjected to an iterative item analysis to establish the internal consistency of each scale. Based on this procedure, the following reliabilities were obtained for each scale:

The Union Commitment (UC) Scale of Roodt (1997) yielded a Cronbach Alpha of 0.96. The Perceptions of Employment Equity Questionnaire yielded a Cronbach Alpha of 0.92 and the Perceptions of Black Economic Empowerment yielded a Cronbach Alpha of 0.91. The Perceptions of the Mentor’s Role Scale yielded a high Cronbach Alpha of 0.97. All the scales thus have acceptable reliabilities and can therefore be included for further analyses.

The second stage of the analyses was focused on the coefficients of association (Cramer’s V) between background variables and the intercorrelations of the different scales’ total scores (respectively displayed in Table 2 and 3). From Table 2 it can be seen that race and home language are significantly associated as well as job level and level of education. Tenure and race and tenure and age are also significantly associated. It is highly unlikely that significantly related variables will display any interactive effects. The intercorrelation matrix of scale scores (Table 3) indicates that UC is significantly correlated with the perceptions of EE (0.364), BEE (0.409) and the mentor’s role (0.210). EE and BEE are positively correlated (0.509). All the correlations are significant on the 0.01 level.

### Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Level of Education</th>
<th>Home Language</th>
<th>Job Level</th>
<th>Mentor Y/N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.447</td>
<td>0.273</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>0.509</td>
<td>0.324</td>
<td>0.590</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>0.324</td>
<td>0.194</td>
<td>0.466</td>
<td>0.455</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Education</td>
<td>0.130</td>
<td>0.158</td>
<td>0.185</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Language</td>
<td>0.681</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>0.304</td>
<td>0.351</td>
<td>0.285 0.132</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Level</td>
<td>0.098</td>
<td>0.160</td>
<td>0.159</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>0.131 0.653 0.111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor Y/N</td>
<td>0.193</td>
<td>0.090</td>
<td>0.214</td>
<td>0.185</td>
<td>0.057 0.053 0.116</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key for interpreting effect sizes:
+ 0.1 – no effect
0.1 to 0.3 – small effect
0.3 to 0.5 – moderate effect
+ 0.5 – large effect

### Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Union Commitment</th>
<th>Employment Equity</th>
<th>Black Economic Empower-</th>
<th>Mentor Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Union Commitment Correlation</td>
<td>0,364 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Equity Correlation</td>
<td>0,409 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Economic Empower- Correlation</td>
<td>0,210 0,237 0,220 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All Correlations are significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

For the next stage in the analyses, a multi-factor analysis of variance (ANOVA) was applied to predict a particular criterion variable. A model modification process was followed whereby the most parsimonious model was extracted. Residuals were systematically investigated to establish any possible interaction effects with the predictor variables.

The following biographical variables were included in the final summary model of the multi-factor analysis of variances (ANOVA) for predicting the perceptions of EE, namely gender, race and mentor Y/N. No significant interaction effects were detected. These three variables explain 7.4% of EE’s variance. See Figures 3-5 for the significant predictors.
As can be seen from Figure 3, females are more positive in terms of their perceptions of employment equity than males.

As can be seen from Figure 4, Coloured/Indian/Asian employees are the most positive in terms of their perceptions of employment equity, than African employees, and White employees are the least positive in terms of their perceptions of employment equity.

The following biographical variables were included in the final summary model of the multi-factor analysis of variances (ANOVA) for predicting the perceptions of BEE, namely race, home language, gender x race, age x race and age x home language. These variables explain 40% of BEE’s variance. See Figures 6-10 for the significant predictors.

As can be seen from Figure 5, employees who have a mentor are more positive in terms of their perceptions of employment equity than those without a mentor.

As can be seen from Figure 6, Coloured/Indian/Asian employees are more positive in terms of their perceptions of black economic empowerment than African employees, and White employees are the least positive in terms of their perceptions of black economic empowerment.

As can be seen from Figure 7, employees speaking African languages are more positive in terms of their perceptions of black economic empowerment than English-speaking employees, and Afrikaans-speaking employees are the least positive in terms of their perceptions of black economic empowerment.
As can be seen from Figure 8, White female employees are more positive in terms of their perceptions of black economic empowerment than white males. Coloured/Indian/Asian and African male and female employees are equally positive in terms of their perceptions of black economic empowerment, but more than White male/female employees.

As can be seen from Figure 9, African employees in the age group 31-35 years of age are the most positive in terms of their perceptions of black economic empowerment and 36-40 years of age are the least positive in terms of their perceptions of black economic empowerment. Coloured/Indian/Asian employees are the most positive in terms of their perceptions of black economic empowerment in the age group 30 years of age and younger and the Coloured/Indian/Asian employees in the age group 31-35 years of age are the least positive in terms of their perceptions of black economic empowerment. White employees 31-35 years of age are the most positive in terms of their perceptions of black economic empowerment and White employees in the age group 30 years of age and younger are the least positive in terms of their perceptions of black economic empowerment. African and Coloured/Indian/Asian employees are also more positive in terms of their perceptions of black economic empowerment than the White employees.

As can be seen from Figure 10, Afrikaans-speaking employees in the age group 31-35 years of age are the most positive in terms of their perceptions of black economic empowerment and Afrikaans-speaking employees 36-40 years of age are the least positive in terms of their perceptions of black economic empowerment. English-speaking employees in the age group 41-45 years of age are the most positive in terms of their perceptions of black economic empowerment and English-speaking employees 31-35 years of age are the least positive in terms of their perceptions of black economic empowerment. Employees speaking African languages between 30 years of age and younger are the most positive in terms of their perceptions of black economic empowerment and employees 31-35 years of age speaking African languages are the least positive in terms of their perceptions of black economic empowerment.

In applying univariate General Linear Modelling (GLM) (ANCOVA) with all biographical variables, the perceptions of
employment equity (EE) and the perceptions of black economic empowerment (BEE) as well as the perceptions of the mentor’s role (MR) as predictors of union commitment (UC), the following emerged from the model modification process: 30% of the variance was primarily explained by the perceptions of employment equity (EE), while secondary predictors were educational level, race, having a mentor or not and perceptions of employment equity (EE) in an interactive relationship with the perceptions of black economic empowerment (BEE). Educational level also has a direct relationship with union commitment.

The results of the final summary model are depicted in Table 4.

The statistical parameters of the final summary model are depicted in Table 5.

### Table 4
RESULTS OF THE FINAL SUMMARY MODEL FOR THE PREDICTION OF UNION COMMITMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of The Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.444*</td>
<td>0.198</td>
<td>0.198</td>
<td>0.89227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.513b</td>
<td>0.263</td>
<td>0.260</td>
<td>0.85609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.531c</td>
<td>0.282</td>
<td>0.277</td>
<td>0.84851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.542d</td>
<td>0.293</td>
<td>0.287</td>
<td>0.84007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.549e</td>
<td>0.301</td>
<td>0.293</td>
<td>0.83652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.555f</td>
<td>0.308</td>
<td>0.298</td>
<td>0.83334</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

f. Predictors: (Constant), EF (EExBEE)
g. Predictors: (Constant), EF (EExBEE), Post-matric
h. Predictors: (Constant), EF (EExBEE), Post-matric, Mentor Y/N
i. Predictors: (Constant), EF (EExBEE), Post-matric, Mentor Y/N, STD9
j. Predictors: (Constant), EF (EExBEE), Post-matric, Mentor Y/N, STD9, Whites
k. Predictors: (Constant), EF (EExBEE), Post-matric, Mentor Y/N, STD9, Whites, Degree
l. Dependent Variable: (Factor 1) D: Union

### Table 5
STATISTICAL PARAMETERS FOR THE PREDICTION OF UNION COMMITMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>B Std. Error Unstandardised Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardised Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>2.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EF (EExBEE)</td>
<td>0.08429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post-matric</td>
<td>0.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mentor Y/N</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STD9</td>
<td>-0.05459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Whites</td>
<td>0.268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.07038</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent variable: (Factor 1) D: Union

As can be inferred from Table 5, the statistical parameters for the prediction of union commitment (UC) are as follows:

\[
UC = 2.002 + 0.269 \text{ [std. 9]} - 0.311 \text{ [degree]} + 0.08429 \text{ [EF (EExBEE)]} - 0.121 \text{ [post matric]} - 0.05459 \text{ [mentor Y/N]} - 0.07038 \text{ [whites]}
\]

The results of the above model can be graphically illustrated in Figure 11.

![Figure 11: A graphical representation of the predictors of Union Commitment](image)

It should be noted that educational level acts as definite differentiator for union commitment levels. Within the three cohorts there are also differences with regard to racial groups and those who have a mentor or not.

### DISCUSSION

The first and second level factor analyses of the different measuring instruments, followed by iterative item analyses, yielded scales with acceptable coefficient Alphas (ranging from 0.91 to 0.97), indicating that the variables were suitable for inclusion in the second phase of the data analysis.

The second phase of the data analyses yielded the following associations or effect sizes between background variables (displayed in Table 2):

- Race and home language – The Africans speak African languages, the Coloureds/Indians/Asians speak English and the majority Whites speak Afrikaans, which were expected from the culture of this organisation.
- Job level and education – The majority of managers have a higher level of education, which is expected.
- Tenure and race – The African employees have less years of service compared to the White employees with longer years of service.
- Tenure and age – The younger employees have less years of service, which is self-explanatory.

As a result of these strong associations, one would expect that there would be no interaction effects between these mentioned variables.

From the intercorrelations of the scales’ total scores, the mentioned variables were all significantly correlated, ranging from 0.230 to 0.509 (displayed in Table 3). BEE and EE were positively correlated.

If EE was predicted with all biographical variables by using a multi-factor analysis of variance (ANOVA), the following background variables emerged as predictors in the final summary model, namely gender, race and mentor Y/N. These variables explain 7.4% of the variance in EE.
If BEE was predicted with all biographical variables by using a multi-factor analysis of variance (ANOVA), the following background variables emerged as predictors in the final summary model, namely race, home language, gender x race, age x race and age x home language where 40% of the variance is explained.

The findings of the above two multi-factor ANOVA’s indicated the biographical variables which are predictors of EE and BEE. Hereby, the second secondary objective of the study is achieved.

If union commitment (UC) was predicted by using a univariate GLM (ANCOVA), the following variables emerged as predictors in the summary model, namely educational level (direct relationship with union commitment) and also educational level, race, having a mentor or not and perceptions of employment equity (EE) in an interactive relationship with perceptions of black economic empowerment (BEE) that explain 30% of the variance. No other research could shed light on this finding. It is also clear that the perceptions of the mentor’s role do not mediate the relationship between EE, BEE and UC. This result does not correspond with the findings of Storm and Roodt (2002) To illustrate the above, see Figure 14.

The study has little nomothetic value, as it was limited to a single organisation. Further research needs to be conducted across different organisations in similar contexts to establish the external validity of the findings. The findings have some theoretical value as the perceptions of employment equity and the perceptions of black economic empowerment were for the first time included as predictors of union commitment. Furthermore, a more sophisticated, multi-variate General Linear Model (GLM) was used for the prediction of union commitment. Besides providing a parsimonious prediction model by isolating only predictors that were significantly explaining variance in the criterion, this model also illustrates possible significant interaction effects between the different predictor variables. In doing so the model serves as a good point of departure for understanding and explaining union commitment in a diverse workforce setting, where the perceptions of employment equity (EE) and the perceptions of black economic empowerment (BEE) are applied.
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