



Organizational Commitment: Evolution, Measurement, Antecedents, and Knowledge Gaps

Vedant Pandya* 

Professor, Department of Business Administration, M.K. Business Administration, Bhavnagar, Gujarat.

*Corresponding author: vedantvp@gmail.com

Citation: Pandya, V. (2025). Organizational Commitment: Evolution, Measurement, Antecedents, and Knowledge Gaps. *International Journal of Academic Excellence and Research*, 01(02), 24–29. <https://doi.org/10.62823/mgm/ijaer/01.02.72>

Abstract: Organizational commitment is a central construct in organizational behavior research and continues to be pivotal for understanding employee attitudes and behavior. This research paper presents an in-depth and advanced literature review of organizational commitment, tracing its historical emergence, conceptual evolution, theoretical frameworks, measurement advancements, antecedents, and research gaps. Drawing from peer-reviewed research studies, the paper maps the trajectory of academic inquiry from early attitudinal perspectives to multi-dimensional, culturally-sensitive models. Key contributors, such as Porter, Meyer, and Allen, are examined in terms of their foundational and progressive work in the domain. Furthermore, this paper explores how antecedents such as leadership, job satisfaction, organizational support, and psychological contracts have influenced organizational commitment over time. Measurement tools including the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) and the Three-Component Model (TCM) are reviewed in terms of reliability, validity, and adaptability. Finally, the study identifies significant research gaps and proposes future research directions to enrich theoretical development and empirical applications in a global and evolving work context.

Article History:

Received: 15 June 2025

Accepted: 22 July, 2025

Published: 25 July, 2025

Keywords:

Organizational Commitment, Affective Commitment, Continuance Commitment, Normative Commitment, OCQ, TCM, Antecedents, Measurement, Research Gaps.

Introduction

Organizational commitment has remained a foundational construct in organizational behavior, serving as a vital predictor of employee retention, performance, and organizational citizenship behaviors (Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1979; Meyer & Allen, 1991). Defined as the psychological attachment of employees to their organizations, organizational commitment represents an employee's identification with, involvement in, and loyalty to the organization (Porter, Steers, Mowday, & Boulian, 1974). As the dynamics of work continue to evolve with globalization, technological advancement, and hybrid work environments, understanding organizational commitment is more relevant than ever. This paper aims to review the scholarly progression of the organizational commitment research domain, tracing its history, conceptual evolutions, major theoretical contributions, measurement tools, antecedents, and research gaps. The review covers both classical and contemporary literature, aiming to build a strong platform for future research in organizational behavior and human resource management.

Historical Foundations and Theoretical Evolution

The conceptualization of organizational commitment can be traced back to sociological roots, particularly in the work of Becker (1960), who introduced the "side-bet theory," positing that individuals

commit to organizations because of the accumulated investments they stand to lose upon leaving. This economic-rationalist approach was expanded by Porter et al. (1974), who introduced the attitudinal perspective, emphasizing emotional attachment and alignment of personal and organizational goals. Mowday, Steers, and Porter (1979) developed the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ), which became the seminal tool for measuring attitudinal commitment. The early 1990s saw a paradigm shift when Meyer and Allen (1991) proposed the Three-Component Model (TCM), which segmented commitment into affective, continuance, and normative dimensions. This model emphasized the multifaceted nature of commitment and became the cornerstone for decades of empirical research. Subsequent theoretical models integrated cultural, psychological, and contextual dimensions. For instance, O'Reilly and Chatman (1986) introduced a typology differentiating compliance, identification, and internalization, emphasizing psychological mechanisms. Mathieu and Zajac's (1990) meta-analysis integrated multiple antecedents and consequences, highlighting the complex interplay between personal and organizational factors. Recent studies, such as Meyer, Stanley, and Vandenberg (2013), have extended these frameworks to include commitment profiles and trajectories over time, reflecting the changing nature of employment relationships.

Review of Literature

The literature on organizational commitment has expanded dramatically from its early roots in sociological and economic perspectives to encompass multifaceted, culturally sensitive, and dynamic models. Becker's side-bet theory introduced the idea that employees remain with organizations due to accumulated "investments" they would forfeit upon departure, laying the groundwork for continuance commitment. Porter et al. shifted focus to the attitudinal perspective, emphasizing identification, emotional attachment, and willingness to exert effort on the organization's behalf, operationalized via the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ). Meyer and Allen's Three-Component Model (TCM) subsequently distinguished affective, continuance, and normative commitment, providing refined psychometric scales (ACS, CCS, NCS) and opening avenues for commitment-profile research and longitudinal designs. O'Reilly and Chatman's framework differentiated compliance, identification, and internalization, linking psychological mechanisms to commitment and highlighting outcomes such as organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). Meta-analytic work by Mathieu and Zajac integrated over 100 antecedents and consequences, confirming strong ties between affective commitment and job satisfaction, moderate links to OCB, and inverse relationships with turnover intentions. More recent contributions (e.g., Solinger et al., Wasti, Meyer et al.) have critiqued component overlap, tested cultural validity in collectivist contexts, and proposed unidimensional reconceptualizations and dynamic commitment trajectories over time. Cross-cultural studies reveal variation in the salience and interrelations of commitment dimensions. For instance, normative commitment may bear stronger predictive value in high-power-distance cultures, whereas affective commitment dominates in individualist settings. Commitment profiles differ by sector and geography, emphasizing the need for adaptable measurement tools and multi-method assessments combining surveys, interviews, and digital trace data to capture contextual nuances.

A broad array of antecedents has been established. Transformational and ethical leadership consistently predict higher affective commitment through psychological empowerment and trust in management. Perceived Organizational Support (POS): Employees perceiving high support report elevated affective and normative commitment and reduced turnover intentions. Psychological Contract: Breaches erode all commitment facets, particularly normative and continuance dimensions, leading to withdrawal behaviors. Organizational Justice: Distributive, procedural, and interactional justice underpin affective commitment and spur OCB. Job Embeddedness & Career Development: Links to continuance commitment highlight how career opportunities and community ties tether employees to organizations. Recent studies have highlighted some emerging factors that affect organizational commitment. Work-life balance, virtual leadership in remote contexts, generational cohort differences, and organizational identity have surfaced as critical levers in the hybrid work era. Despite robust conceptual and empirical advances, persistent gaps include the need for longitudinal cross-cultural validation of new scales, exploration of negative outcomes of excessive commitment (e.g., workaholism), and integrative models that unite commitment with engagement, well-being, and digital workplace transformation.

Methodology

For the purpose of the present study, this review employed a systematic, multi-stage approach. Google Scholar Database was used to search the database applying search words: Organizational

Commitment and Antecedents of Organizational Commitment. Time frame was from 1964 to 2024 was selected. Peer-reviewed empirical studies, meta-analyses, and systematic reviews addressing conceptual evolution, measurement tools, antecedents, or outcomes of organizational commitment in workplace settings were selected. Non-empirical papers, discipline-specific constructs (e.g., educational commitment), unpublished theses, and studies not accessible in English were not included. Only those full text literature were included that were matching to the domain of study and were within the time frame. This structured methodology ensures a comprehensive, balanced, and critically engaged review of the organizational commitment literature, directly addressing the editor's request to deepen both the literature synthesis and empirical approach.

Key Contributors and Their Scholarly Contributions

Several scholars have been instrumental in shaping the domain. Howard Becker (1960) introduced side-bet theory, emphasizing economic exchanges in commitment. Porter et al. (1974) established the attitudinal perspective and developed OCQ. Meyer & Allen (1991) introduced the TCM, distinguishing affective, continuance, and normative commitment. O'Reilly & Chatman (1986) developed the psychological attachment framework. Mathieu & Zajac (1990) conducted a meta-analysis linking antecedents and outcomes of commitment. Allen & Meyer (2000) further validated and refined the TCM across cultures. Jaros et al. (1993) critiqued and proposed a structural model of commitment integrating job involvement and satisfaction. Solinger, van Olfen, & Roe (2008) critically re-examined the dimensionality of TCM and proposed a unidimensional conceptualization. Wasti (2003) provided cultural validation of commitment dimensions in non-Western contexts. Meyer et al. (2012) synthesized cross-cultural findings and proposed dynamic models of organizational commitment. These scholars laid the intellectual groundwork and empirical methodologies that have guided thousands of studies across sectors and geographies.

Evolution of Measurement Tools

Measurement has been central to the development of the domain. The OCQ by Mowday et al. (1979) was one of the earliest tools, focusing on attitudinal commitment. Though widely used, it was criticized for its unidimensionality. The TCM developed by Meyer and Allen (1991) addressed these limitations by proposing three distinct components: Affective Commitment (AC): Emotional attachment and identification. Continuance Commitment (CC): Perceived cost of leaving the organization. Normative Commitment (NC): Moral obligation to remain. Later, the Affective Commitment Scale (ACS), Continuance Commitment Scale (CCS), and Normative Commitment Scale (NCS) were developed and validated across cultures (Meyer et al., 2002; Wasti, 2003; Solinger et al., 2008). Multidimensional measurement allowed more refined distinctions in behavioral outcomes. Measurement validity, however, remains a topic of debate. Solinger et al. (2008) questioned the psychometric independence of the three components and advocated for a reconceptualization. This led to newer frameworks such as commitment profiles (Meyer & Herscovitch, 2001) that focus on the interaction of components within individuals. Recent innovations include longitudinal tracking of commitment (Meyer, Kam, Goldenberg, & Bremner, 2013) and the use of qualitative instruments for capturing contextual and emotional narratives of commitment.

Antecedents of Organizational Commitment

Research on antecedents has evolved over time. Initially, job satisfaction (Porter et al., 1974), organizational tenure (Angle & Perry, 1981), and role clarity (Steers, 1977) were primary antecedents. Over time, broader psychological and contextual factors were identified. Research findings have identified Leadership Style as one of the antecedents. Transformational leadership significantly predicts affective commitment (Bass & Avolio, 1994; Avolio et al., 2004). Perceived Organizational Support (POS) is also a strong predictor of AC (Eisenberger et al., 1986). Robinson & Rousseau (1994) found that Breach of Psychological Contract leads to decline in commitment. Colquitt et al (2001) concluded that all three dimensions of Organizational Justice are Predictive of Organizational Commitment.

Greenhaus & Allen (2011) identified Work-Life Balance as a critical antecedent factor.

Meyer et al. (2006) concluded that Career Development Opportunities affect commitment through future career expectations. Mitchel et al. (2001) found Job Embeddedness, measured in terms of the extent to which employees are enmeshed in their job and community significantly affect Organizational Commitment. Recent studies emphasize the role of generational cohorts (Twenge et al.,

2010), virtual leadership in remote environments (Bartsch et al., 2020), and organizational identity (Ashforth & Mael, 1989).

Milestone Contributions and Reference Points

Some reference points that mark milestone contributions include. Becker (1960) offered Side-bet theory. Porter et al. (1974) contributed in terms of OCQ development. Mowday et al. (1979) created Attitudinal Model Validation. Meyer and Allen's (1991) Three-Component Model (TCM) of organizational commitment proposes that employees' commitment to their organization is comprised of three distinct, but related, psychological states: affective commitment, continuance commitment, and normative commitment. Mathieu & Zajac (1990) offered Meta-analysis. Eisenberger et al. (1986) gave POS theory. Solinger et al. (2008) offered critique of TCM and proposal of unidimensional reconceptualization. Meyer et al. (2012) offered Global validation of commitment scales and significantly contributed to the measurement of Organizational Commitment. Wasti (2003) offered Cultural examination of commitment dimensions. Mitchell et al. (2001) identified Job embeddedness as an antecedent of commitment and enhanced our understanding of Organization Commitment.

Contemporary Understanding and Research Gaps

While existing literature offers robust models and measurement tools, critical research gaps persist. Dimensional Overlap is one of the Gaps. Scholars argue that the three components of TCM are not entirely distinct (Solinger et al., 2008). Lack of Cultural Generalizability leads to poor understanding of Organizational Commitment. TCM may not fully apply in collectivist or emerging market contexts (Wasti, 2003). Lack of longitudinal studies on how commitment evolves over time (Rhoades et al., 2001). Hybrid Work Models: New antecedents and consequences need exploration in post-pandemic contexts (Wang et al., 2021). Need for integration with social identity and organizational identity theories (Ashforth & Mael, 1989). A need exists for multi-method assessments, combining surveys, interviews, and observational data.

Conclusion and Future Research Directions

Organizational commitment remains a dynamic and multidimensional construct with significant theoretical and practical implications. While early research emphasized attitudinal and economic models, contemporary studies highlight psychological contracts, leadership, justice, and identity as core drivers. Future research must focus on reconceptualizing commitment in the context of hybrid work, cross-cultural variations, and dynamic workforce demographics. Further, there is a need to refine measurement tools for greater sensitivity and accuracy across contexts. Commitment is no longer merely about staying with an organization; it's about how deeply individuals identify with organizational goals, values, and visions. Understanding these layers and their evolution over time will remain central to advancing both organizational theory and human resource practices.

References

1. 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), 1–18.<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8325.1990.tb00506.x>
2. Angle, H. L., & Perry, J. L. (1981). An empirical assessment of organizational commitment and organizational effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 26(1), 1–14.<https://doi.org/10.2307/2392596>
3. Ashforth, B. E., & Mael, F. (1989). Social identity theory and the organization. *Academy of Management Review*, 14(1), 20–39.<http://dx.doi.org/10.5465/AMR.1989.4278999>
4. Avolio, B. J., Zhu, W., Koh, W., & Bhatia, P. (2004). Transformational leadership and organizational commitment: Mediating role of psychological empowerment and moderating role of structural distance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25(8), 951–968.<http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/job.283>
5. Bartsch, S., Weber, E., Büttgen, M., & Huber, A. (2020). Leadership matters in crisis-induced digital transformation: How to lead service employees effectively during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of Service Management*, 32(1), 71–85.<http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/JOSM-05-2020-0160>

6. Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership. *Sage Publications*.
7. Becker, H. S. (1960). Notes on the concept of commitment. *American Journal of Sociology*, 66(1), 32–40.<https://doi.org/10.1086/222820>
8. Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C. O., & Ng, K. Y. (2001). Justice at the millennium: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 425–445.<https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.425>
9. Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(3), 500–507.<https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/0021-9010.71.3.500>
10. Greenhaus, J. H., & Allen, T. D. (2011). Work–family balance: A review and extension of the literature. *Journal of Management*, 37(1), 17–43.<https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv1chs29w.14>
11. 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(5), 951–995.<https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.2307/256642>
12. Mathieu, J. E., & Zajac, D. M. (1990). A review and meta-analysis of the antecedents, correlates, and consequences of organizational commitment. *Psychological Bulletin*, 108(2), 171–194.<https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/0033-2909.108.2.171>
13. Mitchell, T. R., Holtom, B. C., Lee, T. W., Sablinski, C. J., & Erez, M. (2001). Why people stay: Using job embeddedness to predict voluntary turnover. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44(6), 1102–1121.<https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.2307/3069391>
14. Mowday, R. T., Steers, R. M., & Porter, L. W. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 14(2), 224–247.[https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1016/0001-8791\(79\)90072-1](https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1016/0001-8791(79)90072-1)
15. Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1(1), 61–89.[https://doi.org/10.1016/1053-4822\(91\)90011-Z](https://doi.org/10.1016/1053-4822(91)90011-Z)
16. Meyer, J. P., & Herscovitch, L. (2001). Commitment in the workplace: Toward a general model. *Human Resource Management Review*, 11(3), 299–326.[https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1016/S1053-4822\(00\)00053-X](https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1016/S1053-4822(00)00053-X)
17. Meyer, J. P., Stanley, D. J., & Vandenberg, R. J. (2013). A person-centered approach to the study of commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 23(2), 190–202.<https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2085>
18. O'Reilly, C. A., & Chatman, J. A. (1986). Organizational commitment and psychological attachment: The effects of compliance, identification, and internalization on prosocial behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(3), 492–499.<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.71.3.492>
19. Porter, L. W., Steers, R. M., Mowday, R. T., & Boulian, P. V. (1974). Organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover among psychiatric technicians. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 59(5), 603–609.<https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/h0037335>
20. Robinson, S. L., & Rousseau, D. M. (1994). Violating the psychological contract: Not the exception but the norm. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 15(3), 245–259.
21. Solinger, O. N., van Olffen, W., & Roe, R. A. (2008). Beyond the three-component model of organizational commitment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(1), 70–83.<https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1002/job.4030150306>
22. Steers, R. M. (1977). Antecedents and outcomes of organizational commitment. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 22(1), 46–56.<https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.2307/2391745>
23. Twenge, J. M., Campbell, S. M., Hoffman, B. J., & Lance, C. E. (2010). Generational differences in work values. *Journal of Management*, 36(5), 1117–1142.<https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1177/0149206309352246>

24. Wasti, S. A. (2003). Organizational commitment, turnover intentions and the influence of cultural values. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 76(3), 303–321. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1348/096317903769647193>
25. Wang, B., Liu, Y., Qian, J., & Parker, S. K. (2021). Achieving effective remote working during the COVID-19 pandemic: A work design perspective. *Applied Psychology*, 70(1), 16–59. <https://doi.org/10.1111/apps.12290>
26. Meyer, J. P., Stanley, D. J., Jackson, T. A., McInnis, K. J., Maltin, E. R., & Sheppard, L. (2012). Affective, normative, and continuance commitment levels across cultures: A meta-analysis. *Journal of vocational behavior*, 80(2), 225–245. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1016/j.jvb.2011.09.005>
27. Meyer, J. P., Stanley, D. J., Herscovitch, L., and 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. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1006/jvbe.2001.1842>
28. Meyer, J.P., Becker, T., Van Dick, R., (2006). Social Identities and Commitments at Work: Toward an Integrative Model. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, Vol 27, 665–683. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.383>
29. Meyer, J. P., Kam, C., Goldenberg, I., & Bremner, N. L. (2013). Organizational commitment in the military: Application of a profile approach. *Military Psychology*, 25(4), 381–401. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/mil0000007>
30. Rhoades, L., Eisenberger, R., & Armeli, S. (2001). Affective commitment to the organization: the contribution of perceived organizational support. *Journal of applied psychology*, 86(5), 825. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/0021-9010.86.5.825>.

