

ISSN:1995-1272

Vol.6, No. 2

Winter : 2012

# *FWU Journal of Social Sciences*

Published Biannually



*Shaheed Benazir Bhutto  
Women University, Peshawar*

**Editor**

Syeda Farhana Jahangir

**Associate Editor**

Mah Nazir Riaz



## Validation of the Three-Component Model of Organizational Commitment Questionnaire

**Aneela Maqsood**

Fatima Jinnah Women University, Rawalpindi

**Rubina Hanif and Ghazala Rehman**

Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad, Pakistan

**Williams Glenn**

Nottingham Trent University, Nottingham, UK

The psychometric evaluation of the measurement models developed in Western cultures has remained an important consideration in generalizability of the constructs. The present study was designed to test the theoretical factor structure of the Meyer and Allen's model of Organizational Commitment within higher education institutions in Pakistan. The measurement model assesses employees' experience of organizational commitment as three simultaneous mindsets encompassing; affective, continuance, and normative commitment. The participants included a sample of 426 regular faculty members of public and private sector Universities located in Rawalpindi, Islamabad, and Lahore cities of Punjab, Pakistan. Confirmatory Factor Analysis was used to analyze the data. Results of fit indices, factor loadings, consideration of reliability indices, and an understanding of the meaning of the items in relation to the Pakistani working culture were used as decision criteria to retain or exclude items within respective factors. The findings of this study provide support for the existing three factor structure of the OCQ along with the need for modification of the Continuance Commitment Scale. The findings were discussed in light of a culture-based understanding of dynamics of work and commitment.

**Keywords:** organizational commitment, academics, construct validity, cross-cultural differences, commitment profile

Studies on organizational commitment are dominant in the literature of management and behavioral sciences using variety of work settings. As a critical employee attitude, commitment has taken as a key component of work behavior (Cetin, 2006; Cooper-Hakim & Viswesvaran, 2005; Dalal, 2005; Herscovitch & Meyer, 2002; Riketta, 2002). Studies have shown that organizational commitment is an important construct to assess among teachers (Bogler & Somech, 2004; Finegan, 2000; Kushman, 1992; Shaw & Reyes, 1992; Singh & Billingsley, 1998). Commitment is defined and measured in variety of ways depending on the research models being tested (Meyer & Allen, 1991; Morrow, 1993; Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982). Definitional issues suggest that generally commitment is viewed as employees' psychological attachment or a bond (Armstrong, 1996). In a meta-analytic study (Cooper-Hakim & Viswesvaran, 2005) examining 997 studies associated with organizational commitment, the authors found the presence of a common psychological construct underlying different forms of commitment, with the exception of calculative, continuance, and union commitment.

### **Dimensionality of the construct**

Commitment appears to be a complex and multifaceted construct (Meyer, Allen, & Smith, 1993. Different efforts in

explaining the multidimensionality of the commitment concept revealed some similarities between existing multidimensional models. Earlier studies (e.g. McGee & Ford, 1987; Meyer & Allen, 1984) have emphasized that organizational commitment has two, possibly three, components (Allen & Meyer, 1990) including affective, continuance and normative elements. Later, several other multidimensional frameworks seem to have extended the existing conceptualizations of the construct (e.g. O'Reilly & Chatman, 1986; Angle & Perry, 1981; Jaros, Jermier, Koehler, & Sincich, 1993; Mayer & Schoorman, 1998).

The attitudinal and behavioral dimensions of organizational commitment were distinguished by Mowday, Porter, and Steers' (1982) model. Attitudinal commitment reflects the degree of employees' identification with organizational goals and their willingness to work towards these goals. Conversely, behavioral commitment represents an enactment of behaviors to bind the employee closer to the organization. Mowday and associates mentioned that a reciprocal relationship exists between both aspects of this kind of commitment. Based on this model (Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1979), Angle and Perry (1981) supported two underlying factors of commitment namely, acceptance of organizational goals and the willingness to exert effort (value commitment) and desire to maintain membership of the organization (continuance commitment). In similar lines, subsequently, Mayer and Schoorman's (1992) model suggested that organizational commitment comprises two

---

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Aneela Maqsood, Fatima Jinnah Women University, Rawalpindi, Pakistan, Email: aneelamaq@yahoo.co.uk

dimensions referred as *continuance commitment* (desire to remain) and *value commitment* (willingness to exert extra effort).

O'Reilly and Chatman's model (1986) focuses on commitment as an *attitude* towards the organization that develops through various mechanisms. Their model argued that commitment could take three distinct forms: *compliance*, *identification*, and *internalization*. Compliance occurs when attitudes and corresponding behaviors are adopted in order to gain specific rewards. Identification is the stage, where individuals relate well to the organizational influences so that it positively influences their satisfaction towards the organization. Finally, internalization occurs when the organization's influence is assimilated into one's everyday perceptions because the attitudes and behaviors one is being encouraged to adopt are congruent with existing values.

Meyer and Allen's (1991) model of commitment integrates numerous definitions of commitment that have proliferated in the literature and can be conceptualized according to three main elements namely through its affective, continuance, and normative forms of commitment. Affective commitment as the nature and quality of work experiences that affect employees' positive emotional attachment to an organization and is characterized by strong links with an organization through identifying with it and by being actively involved in organizational processes. In explaining affective commitment, identification (Etzioni, 1975; Mowday et al., 1982) expressed through the adoption of organizational goals occurs when individuals take pride in the organization, participate with intense interest in its activities, and speak positively about their connection with the organization

Continuance commitment is related to Becker's (1960) theory and Hrebiniak and Alutto's (1972) conceptualization of commitment as a cost-induced desire to remain in the organization. Continuance commitment reflects feelings of being "stuck" in one's present position (Angle & Lawson, 1993). Continuance commitment includes perceptions of high sacrifice and having few alternatives (Reilly & Orsak, 1991). Furthermore, normative commitment reflects an employee's feelings of obligation toward the organization; an individual committed to the organization on a normative basis engages in activities on the basis of a sense of duty. Wiener (1982) suggested that employees behave in accordance with organizational goals because "they believe it is the right and moral thing to do" (p. 421). Normative commitment describes a process whereby organizational actions (e.g. selection, socialization, procedure), as well as individual pre-dispositions such as personal organizational value congruence and generalized loyalty or a dutiful attitude, lead to the development of organizational commitment (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990).

These three types of commitment reflect a link between an organization and an employee and distinguish between commitment based on a desire to stay, need to stay, and obligation to stay in an organization. Allen and Meyer (1990) provided empirical support that each component represents a somewhat distinct link between employees and an organization that develops as the result of different work experiences. Therefore, the link between commitment and on-the-job behavior may vary as a function of the strength of the three components. Further, these components of commitment are not mutually exclusive: an employee can simultaneously be committed to an organization in an affective, continuance, and normative sense, at varying level of intensity (Popper & Lipshitz, 1992). Based on Allen and Meyer's framework, Jaros et al. (1993) suggested a multidimensional conceptualization namely, affective, continuance, and moral commitment. The difference here lay in terms of defining moral commitment as corresponding more closely with Allen and Meyers' definition of affective commitment than to their definition of normative commitment.

Morrow (1983) identified over 25 commitment-related constructs and measures, which highlights the need to have consistency in the measurement of this construct. Meyer and Allen's Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) has been widely used in organizational commitment research (Jaros, 2007). In a critical review of commitment measures, Allen and Meyer (1990) mentioned that other measures of affective commitment (Cook & Wall, 1980; Mowday et al., 1979), have not been subjected to rigorous psychometric evaluation. Meyer and Allen (1984) criticized that Ritzer and Trice's measure of continuance commitment which later on further modified by Hrebiniak and Alutto (1972) reflects an unwillingness to leave the organization suggesting that it may measure affective commitment rather than, or in addition to, cost-induced commitment. Allen and Meyer (1990) further mentioned that the normative assessment of commitment by Wiener and Vardi (1980) lacks in psychometric evaluation. WeiBo, Kaur, and Jun (2010) argued that measurement approach of Porter and his associates lack sufficiently adequate levels of good content and discriminant validity. In comparison of O'Reilly and Chatman's model (Vanderberg, Self, & Seo, 1994; WeiBo, et al., 2012), Meyer and Allen's model received considerable validation and its measurement approach has been credited as being the most effective in the bulk of the studies conducted in this area.

Allen and Meyer (1990) have provided evidence that affective and continuance components of organizational commitment are empirically distinguishable constructs. A concern about continuance commitment (Dunham, Grube, & Castaneda, 1994; Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch, & Topolnytsky, 2002; McGee & Ford, 1987) observed that *continuance commitment scale* underlies two sub dimensions, (a) a low job alternatives and (b) high personal sacrifice. However, Wasti (2002) supported that continuance

commitment is related to the single construct, i.e., perceived cost. Based on review of over 40 samples, Allen and Meyer (1996) claimed that the construct validity of the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) was strong enough to support its continued use.

#### The present study

Studies have provided empirical support to demonstrate that the components of the measure are distinguishable from one another on Malaysian sample of university librarians (Karim & Noor, 2006) and using nursing staff (Reilly & Orsak, 1991). Various validation studies have been carried out on three-component model of Meyer and Allen's using varied samples in both Asian and European countries (Akhtar & Tan, 1994; Cetin, 2006; Chen & Francesco, 2003; Tett & Meyer, 1993; Iverson & Buttigieg, 1999; Meyer et al., 2002; Vandenberghe, 1996; Wasti, 2002). However, Jaros (2007) further suggested the need to establish the construct validity of the model beyond western countries. The need to look into commonalities of the three forms of the commitment was evident through Jaors's (1997) analysis that series of researches have mentioned differences in antecedents and outcomes of the each component. Therefore, present study also looked into assessing the utility of composite score of commitment by summing each dimension into a unitary construct in comparison of the three-component model.

In Pakistan, the commitment has been measured with a variety of professionals i.e., business sectors (Nasir & Haque, 1996; Shah, Kaur, & Haque, 1992; Tayyab & Tariq, 2001), bankers (Hayat, 2004) etc. Few studies have been conducted into organizational commitment among staff within academic settings of Pakistan (Chughtai & Zafar, 2006). Within Pakistani workplaces, preliminary validation studies (Tayyab, 2007; Tayyab & Riaz, 2004) on Meyer and Allen's model have also suggested the need to extend the research in exploring the factorial validity of the model. Another validation study (Abdullah, 2011) on bank employees provided empirical support that three components of Meyer & Allen's model are distinguishable. A recent review of emerging status of organizational psychology in Pakistan has documented the major constraints for studies in Pakistan because of ignoring the validation of instruments for use on particular samples (Zadeh & Ghani, 2012). In that context, the present study is an effort to analyze the extent to which the existing structure of the OCQ may confirm with a sample of university teachers in Pakistan. The present study will look into analyzing the extent to which scale items are adding in theoretical relevance of the construct. The study will add in evaluating the degree of cross-cultural applicability of the measure when respondents may be operating under different cultural norms from some Western countries.

#### Method

##### Participants

University teachers ( $N = 426$ ; men = 268, women = 158) belonging to public ( $n = 212$ ) and private ( $n = 214$ ) sector universities of three cities i.e., Islamabad, Rawalpindi and

Lahore (Pakistan) participated in this study. In total, twelve public and private universities were selected, which were comparable on basis of performance ranking criteria provided by Higher Education Commission of Pakistan. Out of 575 participants, 445 respondents returned the completed questionnaires within which 19 incomplete questionnaires were discarded. The response rate of returned questionnaires was 74%. To deal with missing data, imputation of the missing values took place by using point score of each scale item. The mean age of participants of the study was 36.57 ( $SD = 8.96$ ). The sample comprised those with a taught Masters degree ( $n = 112$ ) and those with a Masters in research (M.Phil) or those with a doctorate (Ph.D:  $n = 314$ ). The marital status of the sample comprised 280 married respondents and 143 unmarried participants.

##### Material

The *Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ)* by Meyer & Allen (1991; 1997) measures three forms of commitment to an organization: affection-based (affective commitment), cost-based (continuance commitment), and obligation-based (normative commitment). Originally, the questionnaire comprised 24 items (Meyer & Allen, 1991) with eight items in each sub-domain. Meyer, Allen, and Smith (1993) later revised the OCQ into a six-item measure of normative commitment. Studies conducted in Pakistan have mainly used the 22-item OCQ on female school teachers (Rashid, 2000) and also on business sector (e.g. Hussain, 2004; Hussain, 2008). Meyer and Allen (2004) reported variation in number of items in using the OCQ questionnaire as a way of modification for reducing scale length which thereof is important to test through pilot test.

Before using the 22-item OCQ with a five-point Likert response scale format, the pilot test was done using sample of university teachers ( $N = 102$ ) with overall response rate of 68%. The obtained alpha coefficient of .76 was for total scores, .68 for affective commitment, .55 for continuance commitment, and .71 for normative commitment. The results of pilot study yielded concerns particularly for the continuance commitment. Rashid (2000) reported an alpha of .73 for affective commitment, .58 for continuance commitment, and .70 for normative commitment on sample of teachers in Pakistan. For continuance commitment, a quite low alpha coefficient stressed the need to further explore the validation of the scale. Reverse scoring procedure was used for negatively phrased items (i.e., no's 1, 5, 10, 13, & 17).

##### Procedure

After seeking formal written consent from the management of the selected universities, the teachers of respective universities were approached individually. The respondents were given an average time ranging from 2-3 days. Only those teachers were included in the study who consented formally to participate in the study. Follow-up

procedure was adopted via telephonic contact. The questionnaires were collected back, and in some cases these were sent to the researcher via post.

### Analysis

The three factor model and a unitary model of organizational commitment were examined through CFA using Maximum Likelihood estimation procedure with LISREL 8.80. Generally it is expected that estimation of model fit involving Maximum Likelihood (ML) estimation should reasonably be about 200 observations (Hox & Bechger, 1998). A meta-analytic study mentioned that studies using confirmatory factor analysis have used sample size ranged from 133 to 1,590 (Worley, Vassar, Wheeler, & Barnes, 2008).

**Confirmatory Factor Analyses (CFA).** CFA was conducted to test how well data supports the factor structure of the measures on individual item scores available from 426 participants. The purpose of assessing a model's overall fit is to determine the degree to which the hypothesized model as a whole is consistent with the empirical data at hand. A wide range of goodness-of-fit indices can be used as summary measures of a model's overall fit. It is difficult to rely only on any of the indices due to the fact that we can't say that any one is superior to other. As they operate somewhat differently based on given sample size, estimation procedure, model complexity, violation of the underlying assumptions of multivariate normality and variable independence, or any combination thereof (Diamantopoulos & Siguaw, 2000). The fit indices used in study were; chi-square statistic denoted as Minimum Fit Function Chi-Square, the Root Mean Square Residual (RMR), Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA), Goodness of Fit Index (GFI), the Adjusted Goodness of Fit Index (AGFI), Incremental Fit Index (IFI), Normed Fit Index (NFI), Comparative Fit Index (CFI), Akaike's Information Criterion (AIC), and Consistent Version of AIC (CAIC).

Chi-square likelihood ratio statistic is highly sensitive to small differences and, hence, misleading in large samples. It is suggested that instead of reading chi-square as a test statistic, one should regard it as a goodness (or badness)-of-fit measure in a sense that large chi-square values correspond to bad fit and small chi-square values to good fit (Diamantopoulos & Siguaw, 2000). The goodness-of-fit indices are based on residuals is root mean square residual (RMR), which is suitable for judging between the fit of different models to the same data; the smaller the value, the better the fit (Kline, 1993). For root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) coefficient values less than 0.05 are indicative of good fit, between 0.05 and under 0.08 of reasonable fit, between 0.08 and 0.10 of mediocre, and values fall greater than 0.10 indicates poor fit. The RMSEA is generally considered as one of the most informative fit indices (Diamantopoulos & Siguaw, 2000). Cabrera-Nguyen (2010) cited recommended cut-off values for RMSEA is  $\leq .06$ .

The goodness of fit (GFI) and adjusted goodness of fit (AGFI) are other widely used indices of goodness-of-fit indices based on residuals. The GFI should be between 0 and 1. The data probably do not fit the model if the GFI is negative or much larger than 1. The AGFI is the GFI adjusted for the degrees of freedom of the model. The AGFI should be between 0 and 1. The data probably do not fit the model if the AGFI is negative or much larger than 1 (Diamantopoulos & Siguaw, 2000). Hu and Bentler (1995) mentioned that values greater than .90 denote acceptable fit for GFI and AGFI.

Relative fit indices also known as "incremental" or "comparative" fit indices assess model fit in comparison of null model. Incremental fit index (IFI), normed fit index (NFI), non-normed fit index (NNFI), parsimonious normed fit index (PNFI), and the comparative fit index (CFI) comes under this category of relative fit indices. All the indices in this group have value range from 0 to 1, with values closer to 1 interpreted as good fit. However, NNFI can take value greater than 1. The lower value of PNFI is desirable compare do its non-parsimonious counterpart- NFI. Literature recommends that NNFI and CFI are dominantly relied upon compared to other indices of this group (Diamantopoulos & Siguaw, 2000). Values equal and greater than .95 are set as acceptable fit for CFI (Cabrera-Nguyen, 2010; Hu & Bentler, 1995) and greater than .90 for NFI (Hu & Bentler, 1995).

Akaike's Information Criterion (AIC) and Consistent Version of AIC (CAIC) which adjusts the AIC for sample size effects are comparative measures of fit are meaningful in comparing two different models. The model with the lowest value suggests the good fitted model (Hooper, Coughlan, & Mullen, 2008).

## Results

### Goodness of fit indices obtained for testing measurement model of OCQ.

Table 1  
*Goodness-of-fit statistics for a one-factor and three-factor model of OCQ (N = 426)*

Fit statistic	One-factor Model	Three-factor Model
$\chi^2$	852.68*	636.76*
Df	209	206
RMR	.10	.10
RMSEA	.09	.07
GFI	.82	.87
AGFI	.79	.84
IFI	.83	.89
NFI	.79	.85
CFI	.82	.89
AIC	1079.87	783.97
CAIC	1302.26	1021.53

Note.  $\chi^2$  = chi-square; df = degree of freedom; RMR = root mean square residual; RMSEA = root mean square error of approximation; GFI = goodness-of-fit index; AGFI = adjusted goodness-of-fit index; IFI = incremental fit index; NFI = normed fit index; CFI = comparative fit index; AIC = Akaike’s information criterion; CAIC = Consistent Version of AIC.

\* $p < .05$

Findings shown in Table 1 highlighted goodness of fit indices which indicated significant chi-square values for both models; which although is undesirable but is expected usually for large sample size (Diamantopoulos & Sigua, 2000). RMR value is not below .05 for both models. The value of RMSEA indicates a reasonable fit for three factor model and a mediocre fit for the one factor model. The values of GFI and AGFI are closer to 1; though not greater than .90, but indicate reasonable fit. Both indices are comparatively stronger for the three factor model. The values of IFI, NFI, and CFI are reasonable as ranged closer to 1 and are stronger for three factor model. To further complement the value of NFI (.85), the obtained value of Parsimony Normed Fit Index (PNFI) for three factor model is smaller (.76) than NFI, which is desirable. Similarly, for the three factor model, the PNFI (.71) is smaller than obtained value of NFI (.79). For AIC and CAIC, three factor model is comparatively better indicated through lower obtained values (Hooper, Coughlan, & Mullen,

2008). Overall, the three factor model of organizational commitment has been supported as moderately consistent with theory on sample of University teachers in Pakistan.

**Factor loadings of items with corresponding factors**

The findings as shown in Table 2 showed that items including 10, 13, and 15 are showing weak loadings for three factor model.

For the revised version of Organizational Commitment Questionnaire, Cronbach’s alpha coefficients yielded high magnitude on total scores ( $\alpha = .84$ ) and on dimension of affective commitment ( $\alpha = .83$ ). The moderate level of reliability indices have obtained for subscales of continuance commitment ( $\alpha = .61$ ), and normative commitment ( $\alpha = .64$ ). In comparison with pilot results, there is an increase in magnitude of alpha coefficient for subscale of continuance commitment from .55 to .61. Furthermore, the correlation matrix of factors revealed that affective commitment relates with normative commitment ( $r = .50, p = .01$ ) and with subscale of continuance commitment ( $r = .29, p = .01$ ); and continuance commitment relates to normative commitment ( $r = .33, p = .01$ ). The magnitude of the correlations is moderate which supports that factors should not overlap too much.

Table 2  
Factor loadings and Standard Errors for the three factor model of Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (N = 426)

Item Nos.	Variables & Item Statements	Standardized Factor Loading	SE
<b>Affective Commitment</b>			
4	I feel a strong sense of belonging to (name of organization).	<b>.73</b>	.47
2	I feel emotionally attached to (name of organization).	<b>.69</b>	.52
7	I would be happy to work at (name of organization) until I retire.	<b>.64</b>	.59
3	Working at (name of organization) is a great deal of personal interest to me.	<b>.63</b>	.60
6	I am proud to tell others that I work at (name of organization).	<b>.57</b>	.67
9	I enjoy discussing (name of organization) with people outside of it.	<b>.57</b>	.67
8	I really feel that many problems faced by (name of organization) are also my problems.	<b>.54</b>	.71
1	I do not feel like part of family (name of organization).	<b>.53</b>	.72
5	(Name of organization) does not deserve my loyalty.	<b>.49</b>	.76
<b>Continuance Commitment</b>			
12	Too much in my life would be disrupted if I decided / I wanted to leave (name of organization) now	<b>.67</b>	.54
11	It would be very hard for me to leave (name of organization) right now even if I wanted to.	<b>.51</b>	.74
14	Right now, staying with (name of organization) is a matter of necessity as much as desire.	<b>.50</b>	.75
16	One of the reasons I continue to work for (name of organization) is that leaving would require considerable sacrifices i.e., another organization may not match the overall benefits I have here.	<b>.48</b>	.77
15	One of the serious consequences of leaving (name of organization) would be the scarcity of available alternatives	.24	.94
13	It wouldn’t be too costly for me to leave (name of organization) now.	.15	.98
10	I am not concerned about what might happen if I left (name of organization) without having another position lined up.	.04	1.00
<b>Normative Commitment</b>			
21	It would be wrong to leave (name of organization) right now because of my obligation to the people in it.	<b>.70</b>	.76
20	(Name of organization) deserves my loyalty.	<b>.53</b>	.86
19	I would feel guilty if I left (name of organization) now.	<b>.49</b>	.86
22	I owe a great deal to (name of organization).	<b>.45</b>	.71
17	I do not feel any obligation to remain with (name of organization).	<b>.38</b>	.94
18	Even if it were to my advantage, I do not feel like it would be right to leave (name of organization) now.	<b>.38</b>	.77

Note: Factor loadings > .30 are in boldface.

### Discussion

The present study was aimed at examining how well a one factor and a three factor model of organizational commitment (Meyer & Allen, 1991) is supported by a sample of university teachers in the Pakistani cultural context. The findings provided somewhat a reasonable support for three factor model of organizational commitment compared to the unitary model. A previous study in Pakistan (Tayyab, 2007) on sample of public sector employees of telecommunication sector was in support of uni-dimensionality of OCQ. Assessing the sub-dimensionality, the present study suggested the refinement in continuance commitment scale (CCS). Despite of the debate about bi-dimensionality of the CCS, i.e., 'high sacrifices' as related to leaving the organization, and the 'low alternatives' due to lack of alternate employment opportunities (Meyer & Allen, 1991; Dunham, Grube, & Castenada, 1994); establishing the utility of bi-dimensionality of the CCS particularly as of its relevance with outcome correlates is questionable (Jaros, 1997). Jaros (2007) further highlighted that authors of OCQ are of view that the best retained items of CCS tend to tap the recognition of perceived cost without reference to their specific source.

The results of the confirmatory factor analysis revealed that the sub-dimension of continuance commitment showed a weak association with items including 10, 13, and 15 for both unitary and three factor models. Considering the dominant three factor model, item 15 "one of the serious consequences of leaving (name of organization) would be the scarcity of available alternatives", is comparatively showing better association with the respective factor than the other two items, although this is still below the acceptable criterion, with a low factor loading of .24 and having a marginal contribution in producing variance in responses for this factor ( $R^2 = 0.06$ ). According to definition given by the scale's authors, the dimension of 'Continuance Commitment' represents the perceived cost of leaving an organization. If evaluating the content of item 15, the "non-availability of alternatives" is dominant, that probably hinders in relating to the continuance based commitment. This perhaps indicates that teachers are also showing concern with cost of leaving the job especially with reference to the job security, indicating that it might be a case of tolerating problems at work and keeping quiet for the sake of holding one's job and associated benefits from it.

Responses given to item 13 i.e. "It wouldn't be too costly for me to leave (name of organization) now", does not seem to produce a great deal of variance in the item scores relating to the continuance commitment factor ( $R^2 = .02$ ). The content of this item may reflect the perceived cost of changing a job. This indicates that perhaps a fear of losing one's job, due to lack of alternatives, is a strong underlying motive behind many of the teachers' attitudes towards the organization. The item does not seem to produce variance in the responses of teachers commitment based on perceived

cost of leaving an organization. One of the possibilities behind this fear of losing job might be the lack of available job alternatives.

Similarly, the content of item 10 "I am not concerned about what might happen if I left (name of organization) without having another position lined up" is not contributing in producing any variance ( $R^2 = 0.00$ ) in responses towards continuance commitment dimension. Linking the content of item 10 with the main concept of continuance commitment which represents the perceived cost of leaving an organization, the item is representing the aspect of *Job Security*. This finding also draws attention to comment on the current employment situation and limited opportunities in job market in Pakistan, which is applicable for our sample of university teachers. The possible fear of losing one's job is perhaps a potential factor due to which this particular item does not seem to contribute to the factor of Continuance Commitment amongst the sample of Pakistani university teachers. This is useful and shows how cultural contexts may mean that a tool could have limited applicability in some countries or organizational settings.

The 'continuance commitment' represents the perceived cost of leaving an organization and the items in this dimension have mainly been validated on western samples and are showing contrasting differences with a sample of Pakistani university teachers. Gelade, Dobson, and Auer (2008) mentioned that potential sources of organizational commitment may depend on cultural characteristics. In the present study, cross-cultural variations with reference to costs of changing jobs and the job security are clearly visible. The responses of our participants on this factor partly reflect on the problematic job situation/job market, which seems to be directly linked with the weak Pakistani economy and political instability.

While critical evaluation of contents of rest of the retained items of Continuance Commitment revealed that deleting these items wouldn't cause any effect in assessing the indicators intended to be measured by the respective dimension. Shifting LISREL output options to unstandardized solutions, item 10 (.05), 13 (.17), and 15 (.28) are showing weak factor loadings with dimension of continuance commitment. Based on these observations, it may be concluded that confirmatory factor analyses on scores of Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (22 items) is overall well supported by the data except for the dimension of Continuance Commitment. Findings suggested reducing certain items (10, 13, and 15), which were not contributing a considerable variance in assessing the 'Continuance Commitment'. Therefore, retained items of CCS are regarded as most contributory to taps the theorized structure of the continuance commitment.

The reliability estimate also supports the refined CCS. For instance, the original form of CCS has shown Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient equivalent to .52. By deleting



poorly loaded items (10, 13, & 15), alpha coefficient rises up to .61. There is also a slight increase in overall reliability of the scale as well. The alpha reliability coefficient of scale with 22 items was .82 which rises up to .84 for scale with total of 19 items.

Keeping in view the retained items in the scale, the strength of factor loadings ranged from .73 to .38. The relatively moderate nature of strength of factor loadings might be associated with the overlap between subscales up to a substantial extent. This would help to know how some items naturally associate with one factor and could also be explaining a sizeable amount of the variance in another factor as well. For example, correlations revealed that affective commitment relates more strongly to normative commitment ( $r = .50, p = .01$ ) and comparatively lower with continuance commitment ( $r = .29, p = .01$ ); whereas continuance commitment showed moderate relevance with normative commitment ( $r = .33, p = .01$ ).

The modification in continuance commitment scale adheres to the Pakistani work context for University teachers working there. Since, commitment promotes positive outcomes for both the individual and organization (Gilbert & Ivancevich, 1999; Laka-Mathebula, 2004); therefore, management looks into ways to enhance the commitment of their employees. Meyer and Allen (2004) mentioned that commitment scores may interpret in form of profile emerged through comparison of mean scores. Based on revised version of OCQ, teachers' commitment profile is in desirable direction. The study highlighted that teachers have reported high endorsement for affective commitment ( $M = 33.15, S.D = 6.52$ ); whereas mean scores are showing low emphasis on continuance commitment ( $M = 13.62, S.D = 3.13$ ). Teachers also reported good emphasis on normative commitment ( $M = 21.20, S.D = 3.85$ ). Meyer and Allen (2004) also suggested the same pattern of academicians' profile as the optimal one. Somewhat consistent with a validation study (Cheng & Stockdale, 2003) on Meyer and Allen's model; the findings reported that Chinese sample as being the collectivistic culture used to report low on continuance commitment. Authors also mentioned that reporting high on affective commitment is considered to be linked with individualistic cultures and being low on continuance commitment seems contradictory particularly in context of masculine cultures. In the context of Pakistani culture, being high for affective based commitment and lowest on continuance based commitment may lead towards understanding the similarities and difference in broader national and particular organizational culture, e.g., academic settings. At this point, the study is pointing towards a new direction for future research that cross-cultural studies may need to consider that organization environment as being a unique culture may be in contradiction with broader national culture and thus leading to characteristic differences in employees' attitudes. Future researches may need to consider the differences in national and particular organizational cultures while

interpreting findings in context of broader national cultural classifications or cross-cultural comparisons.

### Conclusions

The findings suggest that the factor loadings for existing factorial structure of Organizational Commitment Questionnaire are generally within an acceptable range representing a considerable support. This seems to indicate that the concepts are still translating to the Pakistani culture and within the working culture of Universities too. Comparing with the earlier study on teachers (Rashid, 2000), the modification in continuance commitment showed that OCQ performs better within the group of teachers. The study demonstrated support for existing three factor structure of organizational commitment. However, there were some discrepancies with reference to the Continuance Commitment. The less supported items are culturally-bounded as especially in case of commitment where job circumstances in our culture are very much important for respondents. Hence, overall, it is satisfying to note that there still seems to be a clear factor structure, in the most part, for all of the commitment subscales and the findings have got a decent level of fit for these proposed models. The findings of the study also support the cross-cultural validity of the instrument used in source language i.e. in the English version. The study provided empirical support in examining the validation of commitment model in context of Pakistan.

### References

- Abdullah. (2011). Evaluation of Allen and Meyer's organizational commitment scale: a cross cultural application in Pakistan. *Journal of Education and Vocational Research*, 1(3), 82-86. Retrieved from [http://www.ifrnd.org/JEVR/1\(3\)%20June%202011/Evaluation%20of\\_Allen%20and%20Meyer%E2%80%99s%20Organizational%20Commitment%20Scale.pdf](http://www.ifrnd.org/JEVR/1(3)%20June%202011/Evaluation%20of_Allen%20and%20Meyer%E2%80%99s%20Organizational%20Commitment%20Scale.pdf)
- Akhtar, S., & Tan, D. (1994). Reassessing and reconceptualizing the multidimensional nature of organizational commitment. *Psychological Reports*, 75, 1379-1390.
- Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63, 1-18.
- Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1996). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: An examination of construct validity. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 49(3), 252-276.
- Angle, H. L., & Lawson, B. L. (1993). Changes in affective and continuance commitment in times of relocation. *Journal of Business Research*, 26, 3-15.

- Angle, H. L., & Perry, J. L., (1981). An empirical assessment of organizational commitment and organizational effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 26(1), 296-319.
- Armstrong, M. (1996). *Human management: Strategy and action*. London: Kogan Page.
- Becker, H. S. (1960). Notes on the concept of commitment. *American Journal of Sociology*, 66, 32-42.
- Bogler, R., & Somech, A. (2004). Influence of teacher empowerment on teachers' organizational commitment, professional commitment and organizational citizenship behavior in schools. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 20(3), 277-289.
- Cabrera-Nguyen, P. (2010). Author guidelines for reporting scale development and validation results in the journal of the society for social work and research. *Journal of the Society for Social Work and Research*, 1(2), 99-103. doi: 10. 5243/jsswr. 2010. 8.
- Chen, Z. X., & Francesco, A. M. (2003). The relationship between the three components of commitment and employee performance in China. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 62, 490-510.
- Cetin, O. (2006). The relationship between job satisfaction, occupational, and organizational commitment of academics. *Journal of the American Academy of Business*, 8, 78-88.
- Cheng, Y., & Stockdale, M. S. (2003). The validity of the three component model of organizational commitment in a Chinese context. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*. 62, 465-489.
- Chughtai, A., & Zafar, S. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of organizational commitment among Pakistani university teachers. *Applied Human Resource Management Research*, 11(1), 39-64
- Cook, J., & Wall, T. (1980). New work attitude measures of trust, organizational commitment and personal need non-fulfillment. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 53, 39-52.
- Cooper-Hamik, A., & Viswesvaran, C. (2005). The construct of work commitment: Testing an integrative framework. *Psychological Bulletin*, 131, 241-258.
- Dalal, R. S. (2005). A meta-analysis of the relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and counterproductive work behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(6), 1241-1255.
- Diamantopoulos, A., & Siguaw, J. A. (2000). *Introducing Lisrel: A guide for uninitiated*. London: Sage Publications.
- Dunham, R. B., Grube, J. A., & Castaneda, M. B. (1994). Organizational commitment: the utility of an integrative definition. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79, 370-380.
- Etzioni, A. (1975). *A comparative analysis of complex organizations*. New York: The Free Press.
- Finegan, H. (2000). The impact of person and organizational values on organizational commitment. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 73, 149- 169.
- Gelade, G. A., Dobson, P., & Auer, K. (2008). Individualism, masculinity and the sources of organizational commitment. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 39(5), 599-617.
- Gilbert, J. A., & Ivancevich, J. M. (1999). A re-examination of organizational commitment. *Journal of Social Behaviour and Personality*, 14(3), 385-397.
- Hayat, S. (2004). *Relationship between work environment and organizational commitment among employees of government banks* (Unpublished M.Sc Research Report). National Institute of Psychology, Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad, Pakistan.
- Hrebiniak, L. G., & Alutto, J. (1972). Personal and role-related factors in the development of organizational commitment. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 17, 555-572.
- Herscovitch, L., & Meyer, J. P. (2002). Commitment to organizational change: Extension of a three-component model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 474- 487.
- Hooper, D. Coughlan, J., & Mullen, M. R. (2008). Structural Equation Modelling: Guidelines for determining model fit. *Electronic Journal of Business Research Methods*, 6(1), 53-60. Retrieved from <http://ejbrm-volume6-issue1-article183.pdf>
- Hox, J. J., & Bechger, T. M. (1998). An introduction to Structural Equation Modelling. *Family Science Review*, 11, 354-373.
- Hussain, M. (2008). *Relationship between psychological contract and organizational commitment in private sector banks* (Unpublished M. Sc Research Report). National Institute Of Psychology, Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad, Pakistan.

- Hussain, S. (2004). *Relationship between perceptions of organizational politics and organizational commitment* (Unpublished M. Sc Research Report). National Institute Of Psychology, Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad, Pakistan.
- Hu, L., & Bentler, P. M. (1995). Evaluating model fit. In R. H. Hoyle (Eds.), *Structural equation modeling: Concepts, issues and applications*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Iverson, R. D., & Buttigieg, D. M. (1999). Affective, normative, and continuance commitment: Can the "right kind" of commitment be managed? *Journal of Management Studies*, 36(3), 307-334.
- Jaros, S. (2007). Meyer and Allen's model of organizational commitment: measurement issues. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 6(4), 7-25.
- Jaros, S. (1997). An assessment of Meyer and Allen's (1991) three-component model of organizational commitment and turnover intentions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 51, 319-337.
- Jaros, S. J., Jermier, J. M., Koehler, J. W., & Sincich, T. (1993). Effects of continuance, affective, and moral commitment on the withdrawal process: An evaluation of eight structural equation models. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36, 951-995.
- Karim, N. H., & Noor, N. H. (2006). Evaluating the psychometric properties of Allen and Meyer's Organizational Commitment Scale: A cross-cultural application among Malaysian academic librarians. *Malaysian Journal of Library & Information Science*, 11(1), 89-101.
- Kline, P. (1993). *An easy guide to factor analysis*. London: Routledge.
- Kushman, J. W. (1992). The organizational dynamics of teacher workplace commitment: A study of urban elementary and middle schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 28, 5-42.
- Laka-Mathebula, M. R. (2004). Modeling the relationship between organizational commitment, leadership style, HRM practices, and organizational trust. Doctoral Dissertation, Faculty of Economic and Management Sciences, University of Pretoria, South Africa. Retrieved from <http://upetd.up.ac.za/thesis/available/etd-07062004-112817/unrestricted/00thesis.pdf>
- Maruyama, G. M. (1998). *Basics of structural equation modeling*. London: Sage.
- Mathieu, I., & Zajac, D. (1990). A review and meta-analysis of the antecedents, correlates, and consequences of organizational commitment. *Psychological Bulletin*, 108, 171-194.
- Mayer, R. C., & Schoorman, F. D. (1998). Differentiating antecedents of organizational commitment: a test of March and Simon's model. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 19(1), 15 – 28.
- Mayer, R. C., & Schoorman, F. D. (1992). Predicting participation and production outcomes through a two-dimensional model of organizational commitment. *Academy of Management Journal*, 35, 671-684.
- McGee, G. M., & Ford, R. C. (1987). Two (or more?) dimensions of organizational commitment: Reexamination of the affective and continuance scales. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74, 424-432.
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1984). Testing the side-bet theory of organizational commitment: Some methodological considerations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 69, 372-378.
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of Organizational Commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1, 61-98.
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1997). *Commitment in the workplace: Theory, research, and application*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (2004). *TCM employee commitment survey academic users guide*. Ontario: University of Western Ontario
- Meyer, J. P., Allen, N. J., & Smith, C. A. (1993). Commitment to organizations and occupations: Extension and test of a three component model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78, 538-551.
- Meyer, J. P., Stanelly, D. J., Herscovitch, L., & Topolnytsky, L. (2002). Affective, Continuance, and Normative Commitment to the Organization: A meta-analysis of antecedents, correlates, and consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 61, 20-52.
- Morrow, P. C. (1993). *The theory and measurement of work commitment*. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Morrow, P. C. (1983). Concept redundancy in organizational research: The case of work commitment. *Academy of Management Review*, 8, 486-500.
- Mowday, R., Porter, L., & Steers, R. (1982). Employee-organization linkages. In P. Warr (Ed. ),

- Organizational and occupational psychology* (pp. 219-229). New York: Academic Press.
- Mowday, R., Steers, R., & Porter, L. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 14*, 224-227.
- Nasir, S. J., & Haque, M. A. (1996). Job Stress, organizational commitment and job satisfaction among government officials. *Pakistan Journal of Psychological Research, 11*(3-4), 49-58.
- O'Reilly, C., & Chatman, J. (1986). Organizational commitment and psychological attachment: The effect of compliance, identification, and internalization on prosocial behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 71*, 492-499.
- Popper, M., & Lipshitz, R. (1992). Ask not what your country can do for you: The normative basis of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 41*, 1-12.
- Rashid, S. (2000). Relationship of perceived organizational support with organizational commitment among female school teachers. Unpublished M. Sc Research Report, National Institute of Psychology, Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad, Pakistan.
- Reichers, A. E. (1985). A review of re-conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Academy of Management Review, 10*, 465-476.
- Reilly, P. N., & Orsak, C. L. (1991). A career stage analysis of career and organizational commitment in nursing. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 39*, 311-330.
- Riketta, M. (2002). Attitudinal organizational commitment and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 23*, 257-266.
- Ritzer, G., & Trice, H. M. (1969). An empirical study of Howard Becker's side-bet theory. *Social Forces, 47*, 475-479.
- Shah, A. A., Kaur, R., & Haque, A. (1992). Work values and organizational commitment in public and private sector industries. *Pakistan Journal of Psychological Research, 7*, 41-51.
- Shaw, J., & Reyes, P. (1992). School cultures: Organizational value, orientation, and commitment. *Journal of Educational Research, 85*(5), 295-303.
- Singh, K., & Billingsley, B. S. (1998). Professional support and its effects on teachers' commitment. *Journal of Educational Research, 91*(4), 229-239.
- Tayyab, S. (2007). An empirical assessment of organizational commitment measures. *Pakistan Journal of Psychological Research, 22*(1-2), 1-21.
- Tayyab, S., & Riaz, M. N. (2004). Validation of three component model of organizational commitment in Pakistan. *Pakistan Journal of Psychological Research, 19*, 123-149.
- Tayyab, S., & Tariq, P. N. (2001). Work values and organizational commitment in public and private sector executives. *Pakistan Journal of Psychological Research, 16*, 95-112.
- Tett, R. P., & Meyer, J. P. (1993). Job satisfaction, organizational commitment, turnover intentions, and turnover: Path analysis based on findings of meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology, 46*, 259-293.
- Vandenbergh, C. (1996). Assessing organizational commitment in a Belgian context. Evidence on the three-dimensional model. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 45*, 371-386.
- Vanderberg, R. J., Self, R. M., & Seo, J. H. (1994). A critical examination of the internalization, identification, and compliance commitment measures. *Journal of Management, 20*(1), 123-140.
- Wasti, S. (2002). Affective and continuance commitment to the organization: Test of an integrated model in the Turkish Context. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 26*, 525-550.
- WeiBo, Z., Kaur, S., & Jun, W. (2010). New Development of Organizational Commitment: A critical Review (1960-2009). *African Journal of Business Management, 4*(1), 012-020. Retrieved from <http://www.academicjournals.org/ajbm/PDF/pdf2010/Jan/WeiBo%20et%20al.pdf>
- Whitener, E. M., & Walz, P. M. (1993). Exchange theory determinants of affective and continuance commitment and turnover. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 42*, 265-281.
- Wiener, Y. (1982). Commitment in organizations: A normative view. *Academy of Management Review, 7*(3), 418-428.
- Wiener, Y., & Vardi, Y. (1980). Relationships between job, organization, and career commitments and work outcomes-an integrative approach. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 26*, 81-96.
- Worley, J. A., Vassar, M., Wheeler, D. L., & Barnes, L. L. (2008). Factor structure of scores from the Maslach Burnout Inventory: A review and meta analysis of

45 exploratory and confirmatory factor analytic studies, *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 68, 797 – 823.

Zadeh, Z. F., & Ghani, H. (2012). The emerging status of organizational psychology in Pakistan. Retrieved from [http://www.ijbssnet.com/journals/Vol\\_3\\_No\\_4\\_Special\\_Issue\\_February\\_2012/29.pdf](http://www.ijbssnet.com/journals/Vol_3_No_4_Special_Issue_February_2012/29.pdf)

**Received: September 28, 2012**

**Revision Received: November 22, 2012**

## **GUIDELINES FOR AUTHORS**

*Manuscript should be double-spaced typewritten (do not justify) printed on one side of 8.5 x 11 inches white paper. It should be prepared according to Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). Manuscript must include an abstract of approximately 120-150 words.*

***Key words** The authors must provide the preferred **key words** for the study.*

***References** Complete reference list must be prepared according to APA manual.*

***Double Blind Review** The manuscript will be blind reviewed by the members of the Editorial Board of FWU Journal of Social Sciences. It should not contain any clue to the author's identity. The name(s) of author(s), and affiliation should be given on the cover page.*

***Authors are requested to provide:***

*Two hard-copy printouts of the manuscript along with a soft copy through e-mail attachment file or on a computer disk*

*Soft copy of turnitin reports (if the paper is already checked for plagiarism).*

*A signed cover letter from all authors stating that the manuscript is not submitted for publication elsewhere.*

*A brief note about the author / authors. It must include postal and email addresses and departmental affiliation at the time of the study: acknowledgments / grant related information etc.*

*Permission letter for the copyrighted material included in the manuscript (e.g., tables/figures, test material) borrowed from any other source.*

**Address for manuscript submission and all correspondence:**

**The Editor  
FWU Journal of Social Sciences,  
Shaheed Benazir Bhutto Women University Peshawar  
Ph: 92-91-2593230 - Fax: 92-91-9212422  
E-Mail: mahnazirr@gmail.com  
journal@fwu.edu.pk**

FWU Journal of Social Sciences is a research journal published biannually by Shaheed Benazir Bhutto Women University Peshawar (formerly known as Frontier Women University Peshawar). Its first issue was published in 2007. The Journal provides a forum for publication of original papers on a variety of issues pertaining to social sciences. Preference is given to contributions based on empirical research. However, brief reports, book reviews and theoretical articles of immense importance / relevance for social scientists are also published. We hope that researchers in their fields of specialization will enthusiastically contribute to this journal and enable others to benefit from their empirical studies.

This Journal has, on its Editorial Board, 87 renowned experts from USA, UK, Canada Australia, Cairo and Pakistan, with expertise in different areas of social sciences, such as, Psychology, Education, Management Sciences, Social Work, Sociology, Anthropology, History, Economics, Political Science and Mass Communication. The scheme of publication employs a double-blind reviewing process. It is recognized by **Higher Education Commission** of Pakistan and is placed in category Y. The contents of FWU Journal of Social Sciences are also indexed / abstracted in ProQuest, an online service through its Social Sciences Module. The Website is <http://proquest.umi.com>. FWU Journal of Social Sciences is also included in EBSCO' Library products, USA. Journal is also available on [www.sbbwu.edu.pk](http://www.sbbwu.edu.pk)

We extend our invitation to all social scientists to make scholarly contributions to FWU Journal of Social Sciences to make it a success.

**Annual Subscription Rates**  
***Individuals***

Rs.300.00 per year in Pakistan and US \$25.00 for foreign countries

***Institutions***

Rs. 400.00 per year in Pakistan and US \$30.00 for foreign countries