

DEVELOPMENT OF AN INDIGENOUS ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT QUESTIONNAIRE[#]

Saadia Tayyab & Naeem Tariq

National Institute of Psychology

Centre of Excellence

Quaid-i-Azam University

Islamabad, Pakistan

The paper reports the development of an indigenous, multidimensional, factorially independent questionnaire to measure the phenomenon of commitment to the organizations in Pakistan. The questionnaire was developed and tested on a sample of 150 executives working in various public and private sector organizations located in Islamabad city. The final questionnaire consisted of 46 items with three dimensions: Identification, involvement, and loyalty. It showed a high internal consistency reliability, and construct validity. Implications of findings are discussed, future directions are suggested, and conclusions about the new questionnaire are drawn.

In the past two decades or so, the concept of organizational commitment has grown in popularity in the literature of industrial/organizational psychology. Several studies have shown that work related commitment could increase performance, reduce absenteeism, reduce turnover, and benefit both the employee and organization (e.g., Mowday, Koberg, & McArthur, 1984; Porter, Crampon, & Smith, 1976). Commitment has been operationalized in terms of careers, norms, identification, morals, work, job involvement, security, and other conceptually related variables (see, for example, Becker, 1960; Blau, 1985; McGee & Ford, 1987; Meyer & Allen, 1984; O'Reilly & Chatman, 1986; Porter, Steers, Mowday, & Boulian, 1974; Reichers, 1985; Wiener, 1982). The concept has received a great deal of empirical study both as a consequence and antecedent of work related variables.

As a consequence, organizational commitment has been linked to several personal variables, role states, and aspects of the work

[#] Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Saadia Tayyab, National Institute of Psychology, Center of Excellence, Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad, Pakistan.

environment ranging from job characteristics to dimensions of organizational structure. As an antecedent, it has been used to predict employees' absenteeism, performance, turnover, and other work related behaviors (Mathieu & Hamel, 1991; Mathieu & Zajoc, 1990; Zahra, 1984). Mowday, Porter, and Steers (1982) have suggested that gaining a greater understanding of the process related to organizational commitment has implications for employees, organizations, and the society as a whole. Employees' level of commitment to an organization may make them more eligible to receive both extrinsic and intrinsic rewards associated with membership.

Organizational commitment is conceptualized as an affective state. For example, identification with the organization and in terms of observed and intended behaviors, deciding to stay, or actually staying with the organization, and in terms of two different behavioral manifestations, a desire to retain membership in an organization and the willingness to exert extra effort on its behalf (Meyer, Allen, & Gellatly, 1990; Mottaz, 1988). Finally commitment is conceptualized as both instrumentally, i.e., as a variable that accounts for behavior in terms of expected gains and losses and normatively, as a variable that accounts for behavior in terms of values that override instrumental considerations (Allen & Meyer, 1990a).

Organizational commitment has been defined in several other ways. However, the various definitions share a common theme in that organizational commitment is considered to be a bond or linking of the individual to the organizations. For example, Porter, et al., (1976) defined Organizational Commitment (OC) as "an affective or emotional orientation to an entity: The organization. Affectivity committed employees remain with the organization for its own sake, apart from its purely instrumental worth" (p. 87).

Becker (1960) described commitment as "a disposition to engage in consistent time of activity, as a result of accumulation of side-bets that would be lost if the activity were discontinued" (p. 36). The consistent time of activity refers to maintaining membership or employment in the organization. The term 'side-bet' has been used to refer to anything of value that individual has invested e.g., time, efforts, money that would be lost at some perceived cost to the individual if he or she were to leave the organization. Such investments include contribution to pension plan, development of organizational specific skills or status, use of organizational benefits, and so on.

The 'side-bet' orientation of Becker (1960) primarily focuses on the accumulated investments an individual stands to lose if he leaves the

organization. The basic idea is that over time, leaving an organization becomes more costly because people fear losing what they have invested in organization and become concerned that they cannot replace these things. For example, people may be unwilling to leave their jobs because they are concerned about being perceived as "job hoppers" and by staking their reputation for stability on remaining in their present jobs, they make aside-bet on some aspect of themselves on continued organizational membership.

The most commonly studied type of organizational commitment has been defined according to two categories, described by Mowday, et al., (1984). These are attitudinal commitment and calculated commitment.

Attitudinal organizational commitment is generally defined as "the relative strength of an individual's identification with and involvement in a particular organization, characterized by three factors: (i) A strong belief in organizational goals and values and acceptance of these goals and values, (ii) a willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization, and (iii) a strong desire to maintain membership in the organization" (Mowday, et al., 1982, p. 27).

Becker defined calculated commitment as "a structural phenomena which occurs as a result of individual-organizational interaction and alterations in side-bets or investments overtime" (as cited in Hrebniak & Alutto, 1972, p. 556). Individuals become bound to organizations because they have sidebets, or sunk costs invested in organization and "cannot afford" to separate themselves from it. For example, a blue collar employee who undergoes an apprenticeship program and who collects seniority in the process may find that sunk costs in time and seniority commit him to the organization, that is, he cannot afford to leave and go elsewhere. However, this type of commitment does not express an employee's agreement with organizational goals or a willingness to facilitate organizational goal attainment, only that the individual feels bound to the organization. As a result of this binding process, employees typically engage in some form of psychological bolstering. That is, such employees attempt to rationalize or self-justify their situation to demonstrate to themselves that they have indeed made the right choice by joining that particular organization. However, it is important to note that attitudinal and calculated commitment are not entirely distinct concepts, because the measurement of each contains elements of the other, that is, individuals do become bound to organizations as a result of past choices but such a bound does not guarantee high levels of attitudinal commitment to the organization. Similarly, it is possible for employees to feel highly committed to an

organization attitudinally and believe in the organization's mission, yet not be irrevocably bound to remain with the organization (Mowday, et al., 1982).

Kidron (1978) made a distinction between calculative and moral commitment and concluded that work values are related more to moral than calculative commitment. He found that respondents with higher Protestant work values tended to express high moral commitment, while those with low Protestant work values tended to express low moral commitment. However, respondents who expressed high moral commitment tended to have high calculative commitment as well. His findings indicated that there was a convergence between the two types of commitment, and that values appeared related, mainly to the identification of the participants with the organization and internalization of its values and goals. Values, however, were not related to the decision to leave the organization given some better alternatives in other position outside the organization.

A review of organizational commitment literature indicates that in the West, there are several scales available for the measurement of organizational commitment (for example, Allen & Meyer, 1990a; Buchanan, 1974; Ferris & Aranya, 1983; Porter, et al., 1974; Mathieu, 1991). But there has been only two attempts to date to measure it as a multidimensional concept. Porter et al. (1974) developed the first such scale. The scale consisted of fifteen items, with five items to measure each of the organizational commitment dimensions: Identification, Involvement, and Loyalty. While the overall alpha reliability coefficient has been reported to be moderate, the subscale reliabilities were also not that strong (mostly around .50). The subscales did not seem to be factorially independent. In addition, later studies (e. g., Ferris & Aranya, 1983; Mowday et al., 1982) reported it to be a uni-dimensional scale, measuring a single underlying construct.

Later on, O'Reilly and Chatman (1986) attempted to develop their own understanding of organizational commitment by identifying conceptually different dimensions of psychological attachment. They argued that three dimensions (internalization, identification, and compliance) are the bases for organizational commitment. To test their approach to organizational commitment, they developed a 12-item instrument examining these three dimensions of organizational commitment. O'Reilly and Chatman (1986), on the basis of factor analysis of the three dimensions, argued that their test of instrument showed support for their conceptualization of the organizational commitment. But a further validity study on O'Reilly and Chatman's instrument by Sutton and Harrison (1993) did not find any support for O'Reilly and Chatman's three

factor theory of organizational commitment. In their study factor analysis was used to determine if the three *a priori* dimensions of internalization, identification, and compliance were found in the O'Reilly and Chatman measure. Results of the factor analysis and obtained reliabilities suggested that, at best, the O'Reilly and Chatman (1986) measure tap two separate components, one containing both the internalization and identification constructs and a second weaker component that may be related to compliance. Internalization and identification were simply not found to exist as a separate dimension in this study.

In fact, sufficient attention has never been paid on the construct validation of the measures of organizational commitment. Some studies have measured commitment in terms of calculated commitment alone while others have described it as moral or normative commitment and completely ignored the global concept of commitment that may take into account all the relevant conceptualizations of organizational commitment (Allen & Meyer, 1990b; Meyer & Allen, 1984).

Considering these limitations of earlier scales developed in the West, the present research is an attempt at developing an indigenous, psychometrically sound instrument to measure the phenomenon of commitment to the organizations in Pakistan.

METHOD

The research was carried out in two phases. Phase I describes the item generation process followed by the Phase II which gives details about the evaluation of reliability and factorial validity of the questionnaire.

Phase I: Item Development Process

Theoretical Construct Definition

Following Porter et al. (1974, p.87) organizational commitment was defined in terms of three dimensions, namely:

- (i) Identification refers to a strong belief in, and acceptance of the organization's goals and values, pride in organization.
- (ii) Involvement refers to a willingness to invest personal efforts as a member of the organization, for the sake of organization.
- (iii) Loyalty refers to devotion for, and attachment to the organization and a strong desire to remain member of the organization.

Item Generation

A deductive approach was followed for item development (Hinkin, 1992). On the basis of definitions mentioned above, 68 items were constructed pertaining to three dimensions of organizational commitment, i.e., Identification (23 items), Involvement (24 items), and Loyalty towards organization (21 items). Statements were framed in such a manner as to portray the respondents that the statements he or she selected need not be based on truth, but could have elements of pretence in them.

Item Review and Content Validation

The items were reviewed and judged at this stage for content validity. For this purpose, three professional psychologists along with four heads of different public and private sector organizations served as judges to evaluate each of the 68 items to be identified in three dimensions. This exercise was also geared toward recommending modifications, changes, drop or add items; and for identification of unclear, overlapping, or inappropriate items. One of the major task of the judges was to sort the various statements, on the basis of item content, as belonging to one of the three dimensions of commitment. The statement on which there was an agreement of 80% or more as belonging to a dimension was taken as an item of that dimension. In this way, the scale finally retained 63 items for empirical evaluation, i.e., Identification (21 items), Involvement (23 items), and Loyalty towards organization (19 items).

Phase II: Psychometric Properties of the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire

Sample

Two samples, one of 75 men business executives from the private sector and the other of 75 men executives namely, civil servants from the public sector were drawn randomly from Islamabad city. The mean age of the sample was 43.7 years and their average tenure in the organization was 15.6 years. The respondents were representative of top and middle management in both sectors.

Procedure

The organizations were requested to grant permission for data collection. Once the permission was obtained, the respondents were

contacted individually during working hours. The Organizational Commitment Questionnaire was administered and collected at their convenience. Respondents were briefed regarding the nature of research being carried out, to obtain their consent and cooperation. Participation in research was volunteer and a complete anonymity of the individual responses was guaranteed. The completed questionnaires were checked and the scores were subjected to statistical analysis for the determination of the factor structure and the reliability of the questionnaire.

Data Analyses

Principal Component Factor Analysis followed by Varimax Factor Analysis was carried out to extract the dimensions of Organizational Commitment and to select items for the final questionnaire. The internal consistency of the scale was established by computing alpha coefficients for the full scale and its sub-dimensions. Inter-correlations between the subscales of Organizational Commitment questionnaire were also calculated to determine how much each dimension contributed to the construct of Organizational Commitment.

RESULTS

Factorial Validity

The Organizational Commitment Questionnaire was subjected to Principal Component Factor Analysis followed by Varimax Rotated Factor Analysis, which yielded three factors. The solution was obtained by using the criterion of Eigen value greater than or equal to 1.00. Whereas, factor loading of .35 and above was used as criterion for inclusion of items in a single factor and bearing no cross loading greater than .25 (Table 1 shows the item loading on three factors). Accordingly, thirty items were selected for factor I, seven were selected for factor II, and nine for factor III. Seventeen items having a factor loading of less than 0.35 were excluded from the scale. Finally, the scale retained 46 items.

Table 1

Loadings of Scale Items on Three Factors Extracted by Rotated Factor Matrix

No.	Items	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
1.	This organization really inspires the very best in me in the way of job performance.	.71	-	-
2.	Most of the times organization tries to be honest and fair in dealing with its employees.	.70	-	-
3.	I am proud to tell others that I am part of this organization.	.68	-	-
4.	The record of this organization is an example of what dedicated people can achieve.	.65	-	-
5.	For me, this is the best of all possible organizations for which to work.	.65	-	-
6.	This organization has a poor way of handling employees complaints.	.65	-	-
7.	I have warm feelings toward this organization as a place to live and work.	.65	-	-
8.	I talk of this organization to my friends as a great organization to work for.	.64	-	-
9.	Management fails to take the actions on our complaints.	.61	-	-
10.	I feel a sense of pride in working for this organization.	.60	-	-
11.	I find my values and the organization's values are very similar.	.59	-	-
12.	I have always felt that this organization was cold, unfriendly place to work.	.59	-	-
13.	Over the years I have grown fond of this organization as a place to live and work.	.59	-	-
14.	I would advise a young college graduate to choose a management career in this organization.	.57	-	-
15.	This organization has a fine tradition of public service.	.57	-	-
16.	If I had my life to live over again, I would still choose to work for this organization.	.56	-	-
17.	Management fails to take actions on our complaints	.55	-	-
18.	Often, I find it difficult to agree with the organization's policies on important matters relating to its employees.	.55	-	-

Table 1. Continued...

No.	Items	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
19.	There are good opportunities here for those who want to get ahead.	.53	-	-
20.	The longer you work here the more you feel you belong.	.51	-	-
21.	I feel a strong sense of loyalty toward this organization.	.50	-	-
22.	The organizational rules operative in this company are made so that everyone gets a fair break on the job.	.48	-	-
23.	Many of the rules here are annoying.	.46	-	-
24.	I really feel as if this organization's problems are my problems.	.42	-	-
25.	There is not too much to be gained by sticking with this organization indefinitely.	.38	-	-
26.	I am extremely glad that I chose this organization to work for than the other I was considering at the time I was joining.	.37	-	-
27.	I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that expected in order to help this organization to be successful.	.37	-	-
28.	The major satisfaction in my life comes from my job.	.37	-	-
29.	I plan to work here until I retire.	.37	-	-
30.	Deciding to work for this organization was a definite mistake on my part.	.36	-	-
31.	My job gives me a chance to do the things that I do best.	-	.75	-
32.	I very much like the type of work that I am doing.	-	.69	-
33.	My work is my most rewarding experience.	-	.58	-
34.	My work area is a pleasant place to be.	-	.52	-
35.	I am given a lot of freedom to decide how I do my own work.	-	.47	-
36.	Where I work, management asks workers first about changing anything that effects them.	-	.43	-
37.	I would accept almost any type of job assignment in order to keep working for this organization.	-	.38	-
38.	If another organization offered me more money for the same kind of work, I would almost certainly accept.	-	-	.67

Table 1. Continued...

No.	Items	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
39.	I sometimes feel like leaving this employment for good.	-	-	.60
40.	Generally speaking, my career in this organization has been satisfactory.	-	-	.54
41.	I have no particular feelings nor sentiments toward this organization at all.	-	-	.54
42.	If I had a chance I would change to some other organization.	-	-	.51
43.	I feel that promotions are not handled fairly.	-	-	.46
44.	I feel very little loyalty to this organization.	-	-	.45
45.	I am not willing to put myself out just to help the organization.	-	-	.43
46.	Although there are probably reasons for this, it is too bad salaries at our agency are so low.	-	-	.40

Table 2

Eigen Values and Variance Explained by Three Factors

Factors	Eigen Value	Percentage of Variance	Percentage of Total Variance
1	14.23	22.6	22.6
2	3.63	5.8	28.4
3	2.97	4.7	33.1

The factor loadings and percentage of variance explained by all the three factors have been reported in Table 2. Each factor was considered to be the indicator of individual's commitment to the organization. A label was assigned to each factor on the basis of commonality of item in the factor. The description and operational

definitions of these factors on the basis of relevant items appear to be as following:

Factor 1: Identification

Identification is viewed as a pride in organization and internalization of organizational goals. Significant loading on this factor suggests that the executives possess a well defined sense of pride in organization and they really care about the fate of their organization. They accept organizational goals and values for the sake of organization and have a strong belief in exerting a great deal of efforts in order to help the organization to be successful beyond that expected. This factor had thirty items and eigen value of 14.23%, indicating a clear distinction from the remaining two factors. So this factor may be regarded as major factor for the measurement of organizational commitment.

Factor 2: Involvement

Involvement is viewed as a willingness to invest personal effort as a member of the organization. Significant loading on this factor suggest that executives have a strong sense of attachment to their organization and they can accept any type of job assignment in order to keep working with their organization. This factor had seven items.

Factor 3: Loyalty

The significant positive loading on this factor reveal that executives have a desire to maintain membership in the organization for long time and they talk of their organization to others as a great place to work for. They are proud to tell others about their membership with their organization. Nine items showed significant positive loadings on this factor.

Internal Consistency

In order to estimate the reliability of Organizational Commitment Scale and its three sub-scales, as obtained after factor analysis, alpha coefficients were computed. The results provided sufficient evidence for the internal consistency of the questionnaire. The 46 items of final Organizational Commitment Questionnaire yielded a reliability coefficient of .93, while the three sub-scales of Organizational Commitment Questionnaire yielded a reliability coefficient of .95 for Identification, .89 for Involvement, and .94 for

Loyalty dimension. These high values of alpha coefficients support the relevant sampling of the content as well as indicate the appropriate phrasing of items. Table 3 shows the alpha coefficients of the three dimensions.

Table 3

Alpha Coefficients of the Three Dimensions

Scales	No. of Items	Alpha Coefficients
Identification	30	.95*
Involvement	7	.89*
Loyalty	9	.94*
Total OCQ	46	.93*

* $p < .000$

In order to examine the relationship between various dimensions of the questionnaire, inter-correlations were computed. The results indicate a high positive relationship between all the dimensions of the questionnaire. According to the results, the strongest relationship exists between Identification and Involvement ($r = .66; p < .000$). The results also indicate that lowest relationship exists between Loyalty and Involvement ($r = .49; p < .000$). Table 4 presents the correlation between different dimensions of organizational commitment.

Table 4

Inter-correlation between Subscales of Organizational Commitment Questionnaire

Subscales	Identification	Involvement	Loyalty	Total
Identification	-	.66*	.57*	.95*
Involvement		-	.49*	.78*
Loyalty			-	.73*

* $p < .000$

DISCUSSION

The main objective of the present study was to develop an indigenous, psychometrically sound questionnaire to measure the phenomenon of organizational commitment in Pakistan. As no attempt has been made so far to measure this phenomenon in the country, the present Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) is the first instrument of its kind developed in Pakistan. The final measure that emerged was a 46-item questionnaire, with three independent factors: Identification, Involvement, and Loyalty. The internal consistency of the scale was established with the help of alpha coefficient, which was found to be .93 for the full scale. While the reliability coefficients of the three subscales ranged between .89 and .95, thus showing a high internal consistency among items. As items were generated empirically, they satisfied the criteria of content validation, which requires the representative sampling of items from the specific content domain. During the construction of OCQ, attempt has been made to include full range of attitudes and behaviors that might reveal one's commitment to organization. The items were written with sufficient details as to ensure that all the respondents understand them clearly. The factorial validity of the questionnaire has been demonstrated through factor analysis, which has been regarded as one of the most important methods for the construction of the test, and to see whether or not the items measure the construct they are supposed to measure. A review of literature on the organizational commitment measures disclose that OCQ differs from the earlier measures (e.g., Cook, Wall, & Warr, 1981; Meyer, & Allen, 1984) in a way that it is the first one to identify the multidimensionality of the construct, and secondly, it is based on factorially independent subscales.

Although the findings of present study provide a favorable evidence of construct validity of the OCQ, before considering it conclusive, it should be replicated. Construct validation is an ongoing and dynamic process of revising the definitions and measurements of the construct and it is hard to achieve construct validity in a single study. As there exists much diversity of situations and populations, it is suggested that further research should focus on comparing this instrument to other measures to determine the convergent and discriminant validity. In order to assess the temporal stability of the measure, the questionnaire needs to be administered on larger samples in diverse organizations. Moreover, presence of women and lower order management may provide some new

directions for further investigation of the phenomena of commitment to the organizations.

To conclude, one may observe that work related commitment stems from its demonstrated linkage with such behaviorally related outcomes as performance, turnovers, employee retention, absenteeism, motivation, and job satisfaction. The OCQ may be used to conduct studies in this regard and thus can play a role in exploring the extent to which employees have a willingness to identify themselves with organization and its goals and desire to invest personal efforts as a member of the organization, for the sake of organization.

REFERENCES

- Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1990a). Affective and continuance commitment to the organization: Evaluation of measures and analysis of concurrent and time-lagged relations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71, 116-120.
- Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1990b). The measurement and antecedents of the affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63, 1-18.
- Becker, H. (1960). Notes on the concept of commitment. *American Journal of Sociology*, 66, 32-40.
- Blau, G. J. (1985). The measurement and prediction of career commitment. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 58, 277-288.
- Buchanan, B. (1974). Building organizational commitment: The socialization of managers in work organizations. *Administrative Sciences Quarterly*, 19, 533-546.
- Ferris, K. R., & Aranya, N. (1983). A comparison of organizational commitment scales. *Personnel Psychology*, 36, 87-98.
- Hinkin, T. (1992). *Guidelines for scale development for study of behavior in the organizations*. Proceeding of the Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management, Las Vegas, Nevada.
- Hrebniak, G., & Alutto, J. A. (1972). Personal and role related factors in the development of organizational commitment. *Administrative Sciences Quarterly*, 17, 555-573.
- Kidron, A. (1978). Work values and organizational commitment. *Academy of Management Journal*, 21, 239-247.

- Mathieu, J. E. (1991). A cross-level non-recursive model of the antecedents of organizational commitment and satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 76*, 607-618.
- Mathieu, J. E., & Hamel, K. (1991). A causal model of antecedents of organizational commitment among professionals and non-professionals. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 34*, 299-317.
- Mathieu, J. E., & Zajoc, D. M. (1990). A review and meta-analysis of the antecedents, correlates and consequences of organizational commitment. *Psychological Bulletin, 108*, 171-194.
- McGee, G. W., & Ford, R. C. (1987). Two or more dimensions of organizational commitment: Re-examination of the affective and continuance commitment scales. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 72*, 638-641.
- 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., & Gellatly, I. R. (1990). Affective and continuance commitment to the organizations: Evaluation of the measures and analysis of the concurrent and time-lagged relations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 75*, 710-720.
- Mottaz, C. J. (1988). Determinants of organizational commitment. *Human Relations, 41*, 467-482.
- Mowday, R. T., Koberg, C. S., & McArthur, A. W. (1984). The psychology of withdrawal processes: A cross validation of Mobely's intermediate linkages models of turnover in two samples. *Academy of Management Journal, 27*, 79-94.
- Mowday, R. T., Porter, I. M., & Steers, R. M. (1982). *Employee-organization linkages: The psychology of commitment, absenteeism, and turnover*. NY: Academic Press.
- Mowday, R. T., Steers, R. M., & Porter, L. W. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 14*, 224-247.
- O'Reilly, C. A., & Chatman, J. (1986). Organizational commitment and psychological attachment: The effects of compliance, identification, and internalization on pro-social behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 71*, 492-499.

- Porter, L. W., Crampon, W. J., & Smith, F. J. (1976). Organizational commitment and managerial turnover: A longitudinal study. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 15, 87-98.
- Porter, L. W., Steers, R. M., Mowday, R. T., & Boulian, P. V. (1974). Organizational commitments, job satisfaction, and turnover among psychiatric technicians. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 59, 603-609.
- Reichers, A. E. (1985). A review and re-conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Academy of Management Review*, 10, 465-470.
- Sutton, D. S., & Harrison, D. W. (1993). Validity assessment of compliance, identification, and internalization as dimensions of organizational commitment. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 53, 217-223.
- Wiener, Y. (1982). Commitment in organizations: A normative view. *Academy of Management Review*, 7, 418-428.
- Zahra, S. (1984). Antecedents and consequences of organizational commitment: An integrative approach. *Akron Business and Economics Review*, 15 (3), 26-32.

Received: November, 21, 2000.