

**TCM Employee Commitment Survey
User's Guide
2025**

Academic Version

John P. Meyer and Natalie J. Allen
Department of Psychology
The University of Western Ontario
meyer@uwo.ca nallen@uwo.ca

Table of Contents

The TCM Commitment Survey	3
Background	3
Why is commitment important?	3
Using the TCM Survey: Frequently Asked Questions	4
Which version of the TCM measures should I use?	4
How do I use the TCM survey?	4
How should I analyze my data?	4
Can I alter the scales to suit my purposes?	6
Number of items	6
Response scale	6
Customizing the items for the participating organization	6
Reversing negatively-keyed items	7
Adapting the scales to measure commitment to other foci	7
Translation	7
References	7
Appendix A: Commitment Scales	11
Appendix B: Commitment Scales for International Research	14
Appendix C: Translations	16

THE TCM COMMITMENT SURVEY

Background

Based on the Three-Component Model (TCM) of commitment (Meyer & Allen, 1991; 1997), the *TCM Employee Commitment Survey* measures three forms of employee commitment to an organization: desire-based (affective commitment), obligation-based (normative commitment) and cost-based (continuance commitment). The survey includes three well-validated scales, the Affective Commitment Scale (ACS), the Normative Commitment Scale (NCS) and the Continuance Commitment Scale (CCS). Each is scored separately and can be used to identify the “commitment profile” of employees within an organization.

This academic version of the TCM Commitment Survey was prepared for those who intend to use the commitment scales for academic research purposes. The original (Allen & Meyer, 1990) and revised (Meyer, Allen, & Smith, 1993; Meyer & Powell, 2004) versions of the scales are provided in Appendix A. This guide provides background information on the development of the commitment scales and addresses general issues pertaining to their use.

The TCM Survey was initially written in English but has since been translated for research in other languages. To facilitate translations, Meyer, Barak, and Vandenberghe (1996) prepared the slightly modified version of the scales presented in Appendix B. Appendix C in this User’s Guide includes some of the translations. These translations were provided by knowledgeable bilingual scholars for use in academic research. Each translation is accompanied by a description of the translation process, information regarding the psychometric properties of the scales, and references to research in which the scales were used. The researchers who provided the translations are identified and contact information is provided for those wanting more information. *Note that this User’s Guide is a ‘living document’ and we encourage researchers who have translated the measures, or are aware of translations not included in this Guide, to contact us.*

Why is commitment important?

Commitment implies an intention to persist in a course of action. Therefore, organizations often try to foster commitment in their employees to achieve stability and reduce costly turnover. It is commonly believed that committed employees will also work harder and be more likely to “go the extra mile” to achieve organizational objectives. Research has consistently demonstrated that commitment is indeed associated with lower turnover intentions and turnover (see Tett & Meyer, 1993; Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch, & Topolnytsky, 2002). But, there is a caveat to the assumption regarding its implications for performance.

Research conducted to test the three-component model of commitment has demonstrated that commitment can be characterized by different mindsets – desire, obligation, and perceived cost (see Allen, 2016; Meyer, 2021, 2025; Meyer & Allen, 1991, 1997). Employees with a strong affective commitment (high ACS scores) stay because they *want to*, those with strong normative commitment (high NCS scores) stay because they feel they *ought to*, and those with strong continuance commitment (high CCS scores) stay because they *have to* do so.

When the commitment mindsets are considered individually, research consistently shows that employees who want to stay (high AC) tend to perform at a higher level than those who do not (low AC). Employees who remain out of obligation (high NC) also tend to out-perform those who feel no such obligation (low NC), but the effect on performance is not as strong as that observed for desire. Finally, employees who have to stay primarily to avoid losing something of value (e.g., benefits, seniority) may have little incentive to do anything more than is required to retain their positions.

More recent research investigating the commitment mindsets in combination, using profile analyses, suggests some qualifications to the foregoing findings. This research illustrates that the individual commitment mindsets can combine in different ways (for more detail, see Meyer & Morin, 2016; Meyer, Stanley, & Vandenberg, 2013). Profiles characterized by strong AC tend to be associated with more positive outcomes than those with low AC, regardless of the strength of NC or CC. Importantly, however, the implications of NC and CC vary across profiles, with both being associated with more positive outcomes when AC is also strong. Indeed, the most positive outcomes, including retention, performance, and employee well-being tend to be associated with a ‘fully committed profile’ characterized by strong AC, NC, and CC. Thus, having a sense of obligation to the organization (NC), and recognizing the costs associated with leaving (CC), can be positive bases of commitment when combined with a desire to remain (AC), and there may be synergistic effects when AC, NC and CC combine.

Using the TCM Survey: Frequently Asked Questions

Which version of the TCM measures should I use?

The original version of the ACS, NCS and CCS each include eight items. The revised scales include six items. The two versions of the ACS and CCS are very similar – the choice between the two might best be made on the basis of desired length. The greatest difference between the original and revised versions will be seen in the NCS. Briefly, the NCS measures employees’ feeling of obligation to remain with the organization. Theoretically, this obligation can arise from two primary sources: socialization experiences and receipt of “benefits” from the organization that require reciprocation on the part of the employee. Items in the original version of the NCS tend to include information about the basis for the obligation, whereas those in the revised version focus more specifically on the feeling of obligation without specifying the basis. The choice between these two versions might best be made on the basis of whether information about the basis for feeling of obligation is relevant. A note of caution is in order here, however. Making inferences about the basis for normative commitment from the original version of the scale might require interpretation of responses to one or a subset of the items. The NCS was not developed for this purpose and scores on single items can be unreliable.

A further revision of the CCS was introduced by Powell and Meyer (2004) based on accumulating evidence that the original scale reflects two underlying dimensions, personal sacrifice and lack of alternatives (see McGee & Ford, 1987; Meyer, Allen, & Gellatly, 1990; Meyer et al., 2002). The personal sacrifice dimension (commonly referred to as high sacrifice – CCS:HS) corresponds more closely to the original conceptualization of the continuance commitment construct based on Becker’s (1960) side-bet theory of commitment. The lack of alternatives dimension (CC:LA) might best be considered an antecedent of CC. The revised CCS:HS includes six items and the CCS:LA includes three items. This new version of the CCS is presented along with the original scales in Appendix A. For more information concerning its development and psychometric properties, see Powell and Meyer (2004).

Finally, as noted previously, Meyer et al. (1996) revised many of the TCM commitment items, and wrote additional items, to facilitate translation into other languages. These items are provided in Appendix B; there are 9 items each for AC and NC and 10 items for CC. The inclusion of additional items in this version was intended to provide flexibility in the selection of items for translation.

How do I use the TCM Survey?

The TCM Commitment Survey includes statements (items) pertaining to employees’ perception of their relationship with the organization and their reasons for staying. After reading each item, employees indicate the strength of their agreement by selecting a number from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). The items in Appendix A are grouped according to scale: ACS,

NCS, and CCS. For purposes of survey administration, we recommend that the items from the three scales be mixed. For scoring purposes, employees' responses to all of the items *within* a scale are averaged to yield an overall score for each of the three components of commitment (see below for more detail). Although it is also possible to sum the item scores rather than averaging, this can create problems if employees fail to respond to some items. The existence of *missing data* will have a much greater impact on total scores than on average scores. Of course, if employees fail to respond to a large number of the items (e.g., more than two or three per scale), their scores will be suspect and probably should not be interpreted.

Note that some of the items in the commitment scales have been worded such that strong agreement reflects a lower level of commitment. These are referred to as "reverse-keyed" items (identified by "R" after the statement) and are included to encourage respondents to think about each statement carefully rather than mindlessly adapting a pattern of agreeing or disagreeing with the statements. Ratings for these must be re-coded (i.e., 1 = 7, 2 = 6, ... 7 = 1) prior to computing scale scores. Scores for the ACS, NCS, and CCS should be computed separately; scores should NOT be combined as an index of overall organizational commitment. Proper scoring will yield three scores, one each for the ACS, NCS, and CCS, for each respondent. These scores should range in value from 1 to 7 (see below for more information regarding use of alternative response scales).

Finally, for best results, the commitment survey should be completed anonymously, or accompanied by instructions encouraging respondents to answer honestly and assuring them that there will be no negative repercussions for doing so. The content of the scales can be quite sensitive and, under some circumstances, employees might be reluctant to respond honestly if they believe that they can be identified.

How should I analyze my data?

How the commitment scales are used for research purposes depends on the nature of the questions being asked. In the simplest case, researchers might be interested in whether scores on the ACS, NCS, and/or CCS for a sample are high, moderate, or low, or what proportion of a sample fit into these categories. Answering such questions requires the use of cut scores. Cut scores are problematic because, among other things, they can result in individuals with very similar scores around the cut point being assigned to different level categories. Although we advise against the use of cut scores for anything more than descriptive purposes, one approach to creating cut scores is to use the normative data reported by Meyer, Stanley, Jackson, McInnis, Maltin, & Sheppard. (2012). These normative data include meta-analytic estimates of the means and standard deviations for AC, NC, and CC overall, as well as for selected countries and geographic regions. Using the overall or selected country/region data, researchers can select the appropriate mean and standard deviation estimates to assign individuals to low, moderate, and high commitment categories. Again, we advise that cut scores be used only for descriptive purposes, and not when the objective is to investigate relations between commitment and other variables.

The most common approach used in research linking commitment to other variables that are presumed to be antecedents, correlates or consequences has been to use correlation- or regression-based analytic techniques. Other strategies involve the use of ANOVA to compare commitment levels across groups. In the remainder of this section we focus on approaches you might take to examine the behavioral consequences of employee commitment.

Although the vast majority of studies using the TCM commitment measures has examined the independent or additive effects of the three components on outcomes of interest (e.g., turnover intention, turnover, attendance, job performance, organizational citizenship behavior), in the original formulation of the theory, Meyer and Allen (1991) proposed that the three component of commitment might interact to influence behavior (also see Johnson, Groff, & Taing, 2009, and Meyer & Herscovitch, 2001). If so, the nature of the relation between any single component of commitment and an outcome of interest might vary depending on the strength of the other

components. Only a few studies to date have tested for, and found, interaction effects (e.g., Gellatly, Meyer, & Luchak, 2006; Jaros, 1997; Johnson et al., 2009; Somers, 1995). This evidence for interaction effects suggests that interpretation of zero-order correlations might be somewhat misleading. Therefore, we recommend that researchers interested in examining relations between the commitment components and various “outcome” measures consider testing for interactions using moderated multiple regression analyses (for more information on this analytic strategy, see Aiken and West, 1991). There is also some, albeit limited, evidence for non-linear relations between the commitment components and outcomes (see Luchak & Gellatly, 2007). Therefore, researchers might also consider testing for non-linearity by including exponent terms in their regression analyses where considered appropriate.

Another approach to examining the joint effects of the commitment components on behavior is to conduct commitment profile comparisons (see Meyer & Morin, 2016, for more detailed discussion of the rationale for investigating commitment profiles). Early approaches to investigate the implications of commitment profiles involved the use of midpoint splits to create the eight potential combinations of high and low scores on the ACS, NCS, and CCS (e.g., Gellatly et al., 2006). However, this approach has been supplanted by the use of cluster analysis (e.g., Sinclair, Tucker, Cullen, & Wright, 2005; Wasti, 2005) and latent profile analysis (e.g., Meyer, Stanley, & Parfyonova, 2012; Kam, Morin, Meyer, & Topolnytsky, 2016; Pinho, Meyer, Espinoza, & Oliveira, 2021; Stanley, Vandenberghe, Vandenberg, & Bentein, 2013) to identify naturally occurring profiles within a sample. This approach does not require the use of arbitrary cut points and allows for moderate as well as high and low scores on the components within profiles (see Meyer et al., 2013, and Meyer & Morin, 2016, for more detail). As noted previously, research examining relations between commitment profiles and various outcomes reveals that the components, especially NC and CC, can relate differently depending on the relative strength of the other components.

Can I alter the scales to suit my purposes?

It is possible to alter the scales without having a major impact on reliability and validity. The strength of the impact, however, will depend on the nature and extent of the revision. The most common revisions, and their potential effects, are described briefly below. Initial evidence for reliability and validity of the TCM measures was based largely on the use of the scales in unaltered form (see Allen & Meyer, 1996, 2000). Therefore, we cannot guarantee that the findings will apply when the scales are modified, and can only speculate on what the impact will be in any given situation.

Number of items. One common modification is to reduce the number of items on each of the three scales, typically as a way of reducing overall survey length. Our experience has been that each of the scales can be reduced in length to as few as three or four items without a major impact on reliability (for examples, see Gellatly et al., 2006; Meyer, Morin, Stanley, & Maltin, 2019). If scale length is an issue, it might be wise to conduct a pilot investigation to assess reliability before conducting the full-scale study. Of course, reliability is only one factor that can affect validity, so even if it can be demonstrated that the reliabilities of shortened scales are acceptable, there is no guarantee that the validity will not be affected. For more information on strategies for scale reduction, see Cortina et al. (2020).

Response scale. Another common modification is to alter the response scale. In our experience, a 5-point disagree-agree scale works quite well. Reducing the number of response options below five is not advised. Researchers wanting to compare their findings with that of studies using a different response scale should consult the Appendix to Meyer, D. Stanley et al. (2012) for a procedure to convert scores to a percentage of the maximum possible.

Customizing the items for the participating organization. The items in the TCM Commitment survey refer to “the organization.” In cases where there may be some confusion about what the organization is, as for example when respondents work for a large subsidiary of an even larger organization, it may be advisable to substitute the relevant organization’s name in the item. In

cases where respondents' organizational affiliations may not be known in advance (e.g., when collecting data through a professional association or a crowdsourcing platform), it is advisable to modify the instructions to inform respondent as to how they should interpret the term "organization" for purposes of the survey.

Reversing the negatively keyed-items. The use of negatively keyed items in attitude surveys is intended, among other things, to control for acquiescence response bias (i.e., the tendency to respond affirmatively to items regardless of their content) and to encourage greater attention to item content. While careless responding and acquiescence response bias can be problems, there is evidence that using reverse-keyed items can create confusion for some respondents. One study using the TCM commitment scales indeed found evidence for a small "keying factor" resulting from the use of reverse keyed items (see Magazine, Williams, & Williams, 1996). Therefore, some users prefer to reword the reverse-keyed items to minimize potential confusion. There has yet to be a systematic investigation of the impact of doing so, but we believe that it will be minimal. Therefore, we suggest that the reverse-keyed items be reworded if there is any reason to be concerned that they might be a problem for the respondent sample.

Adapting the scales to measure commitment to other foci. Researchers sometimes want to measure commitment to foci other than the organization itself (e.g., occupation, supervisor, work team, customers) and inquire as to whether it is appropriate to simply replace "organization" in the commitment items with a descriptor of the relevant target. We agree with the importance of acknowledging the multi-dimensionality of all workplace commitments, but do not advocate this simple target-substitution approach. The terms of a commitment can be very different depending on the target. For example, staying might be a relevant behavioral outcome of commitment to an organization or occupation, but is less relevant when the target is a supervisor or customer, and not at all relevant when the target of the commitment is a goal or change initiative. Meyer and Herscovitch (2001) recently explained how the TCM can be adapted for the study of other workplace commitments. They also describe a strategy for developing measures of the three components of these commitments. (For examples of research that has applied the TCM to other foci, see Becker & Kernan, 2003; Bentein, Stinglhamber, & Vandenberghe, 2002; Clugston, Howell, & Dorfman, 2000; Herscovitch & Meyer, 2002; Meyer et al., 1993; Stinglhamber, Bentein, & Vandenberghe, 2002; Vandenberghe, Stinglhamber, Bentein, & Delhaise, 2001.)

Translation. As noted previously, some users might want to administer the commitment scales in languages other than English. In Appendix B, we provide a set of items for the three commitment scales developed specifically for purposes of translation (Meyer et al., 1996). We also provide some existing translations along with information about the translation process, psychometric properties, and relevant references. These might serve as useful examples for researchers wanting to translate the items to other languages. For additional information regarding translation, see Allen and Meyer (2000). We invite individuals who have conducted, or are aware of, rigorous translations of the commitment scales to contact us.

References

- Aiken, L.S., & West, S.G. (1991). *Multiple regression: Testing and interpreting interactions*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Allen, N.J. (2016). Commitment as a multi-dimensional construct. In J.P. Meyer (Ed.) *The Handbook of Employee Commitment* (pp 28-42). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- 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. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 49, 252-276.
- Allen, N.J., & Meyer, J.P. (2000). Construct validation in organizational behavior research: The

case of organizational commitment. In R. D. Goffin and E. Helms (Eds.), *Problems and solutions in human assessment: Honoring Douglas N. Jackson at seventy* pp. 286-314). Kluwer Academic.

Becker, H. S. (1960). Notes on the concept of commitment. *American Journal of Sociology*, 66, 32– 42.

Becker, T.E., & Kernan, M. (2003). Matching commitment to supervisors and organizations to in-role and extra-role performance. *Human Performance*, 16, 327-348.

Bentein, K., Stinglhamber, F., & Vandenberghe, C. (2002). Organization-, supervisor-, and workgroup-directed commitments and citizenship behaviors: A comparison of models. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 11, 341-362.

Clugston, M., Howell, J.P., & Dorfman, P.W. (2000). Does cultural socialization predict multiple bases and foci of commitment? *Journal of Management*, 26, 5-30.

Cortina, J. M., Sheng, Z., Keener, S. K., Keeler, K. R., Grubb, L. K., Schmitt, N., Tonidandel, S., Summerville, K. M., Heggstad, E. D., & Banks, G. C. (2020). From alpha to omega and beyond! A look at the past, present, and (possible) future of psychometric soundness in the *Journal of Applied Psychology*. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 105(12), 1351–1381. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000815>

Tonidandel, S., Summerville, K.M., Heggstad, E.D., & Banks, G.C. (2020). From alpha to omega and beyond! A look at the past, present, and (possible) future of psychometric soundness in the *Journal of Applied Psychology*. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 105(12), 1351-1381.

Gellatly, I.R., Meyer, J.P., & Luchak, A.A. (2006). Combined effects of the three commitment components on focal and discretionary behaviors: A test of Meyer and Herscovitch's proposition. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*. 69, 331-345.

Herscovitch, L., & Meyer, J.P. (2002). Commitment to organizational change: Extension of a three-component model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 474-487.

Jaros, S. (1997). An assessment of Meyer & Allen's three-component model of organizational commitment and turnover intentions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 51, 319-337.

Johnson, R.E., Groff, K.W., & Taing, M.U. (2009). Nature of interactions among commitments: Complementary, competitive, or synergistic. *British Journal of Management*, 20, 431-447.

Kam, C., Morin, A.J.S., Meyer, J.P., & Topolnytsky, L. (2016). Are commitment profiles stable and predictable? A latent transition analysis. *Journal of Management*, 42, 1462-1490.

Luchak, A.A., & Gellatly, I.R. (2007). A comparison of linear and nonlinear relations between organizational commitment and work outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(3), 786-793.

Magazine, S.L., Williams, L.J., & Williams, M.L. (1996). A confirmatory factor analysis examination of reverse coding effects in Meyer and Allen's Affective and Continuance Commitment Scales. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 56(2), 241–250.

Meyer, J.P. (2021). Commitment at work: Past, present, and future. In P. Graf & D.J.A. Dozois (Eds.), *Handbook on the State of the Art in Applied Psychology* (pp. 19-49). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Meyer, J.P. (2025). *A concise introduction to workplace commitments*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Meyer, J.P., & Allen, N.J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1, 61-89.

- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1997). *Commitment in the workplace: Theory, research, and application*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Meyer, J.P., Allen, N.J., & Gellatly, I.R. (1990). Affective and continuance commitment to the organization: Evaluation of measures and analysis of concurrent and time-lagged relations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75, 710-720.
- Meyer, J.P., Allen, N.J., & Smith, C.A. (1993). Commitment to organizations and occupations: Extension and test of a three-component conceptualization. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78, 538-551.
- Meyer, J.P., Barak, I., and Vandenberghe, C. (1996). *Revised Measures of Affective, Continuance, and Normative Commitment to Organizations*. London: University of Western Ontario.
- Meyer, J.P., & Herscovitch, L. (2001). Commitment in the workplace: Toward a general model. *Human Resource Management Review*, 11, 299-326.
- Meyer, J.P., & Morin, A.J.S. (2016). A person-centered approach to commitment research: Theory, research, and methodology. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 36, 584-612.
- Meyer, J.P., Morin, A.J.S., Stanley, L.J., & Maltin, E.R. (2019). Teachers' dual commitment to the organization and occupation: A person-centered investigation. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 77, 100-111.
- Meyer, J.P., & Parfyonova, N.M. (2010). Normative commitment in the workplace: A theoretical analysis and re-conceptualization. *Human Resource Management Review*, 20, 283-294.
- Meyer, J.P., Stanley, D.J., Herscovitch, L., & Topolnysky, 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.
- Meyer, J.P., Stanley, D.J., Jackson, T.A., McInnis, K.J., Maltin, E.R., & Sheppard, L. (2012). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment levels across cultures: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 80, 225-245.
- Meyer, J.P., Stanley, L.J., & Parfyonova, N.M. (2012). Employee commitment in context: The nature and implications of commitment profiles. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 80, 1-16.
- Meyer, J.P., Stanley, L.J., & Vandenberg, R.M. (2013). A person-centered approach to the study of commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 23, 190-202.
- Pinho, A.B.M., Meyer, J.P., Espinoza, J.A., & Oliveira, E.R.S. (2021). HRM practices and organizational commitment profiles in Brazil. *Current Psychology*, 43, 13051-13071.
- Powell, D., & Meyer, J.P. (2004). Becker's side-bet theory revisited: A test of the theory within the context of Meyer and Allen's three-component model of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 65, 157-177.
- Sinclair, R. R., Tucker, J. S., Cullen, J. C., & Wright, C. (2005). Performance differences among four organizational commitment profiles. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90, 1280-1287.
- Somers, M. J. (1995). Organizational commitment, turnover and absenteeism: An examination of direct and interaction effects. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 16, 49-58.
- Stanley, L., Vandenberghe, C., Vandenberg, R., & Bentein, K. (2013). Commitment profiles and employee turnover. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 82, 176-187.
- Stinglhamber, F., Bentein, K., & Vandenberghe, C. (2002). Extension of the three-component model of commitment to five foci: Development of measures and substantive test. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, 18, 123-138.

Tett, R.P., & Meyer, J.P. (1993). Job satisfaction, organizational commitment, turnover intention, and turnover: Path analyses based on meta-analytic findings. *Personnel Psychology*, 46, 259-293.

Vandenberghe, C., Stinglhamber, S., Bentein, K., & Delhaise, T. (2001). An examination of the cross-cultural validity of a multidimensional model of commitment in Europe. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 32, 322-347.

Wasti, S. A. (2005). Commitment profiles: Combinations of organizational commitment forms and job outcomes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 67(2), 290-308.

APPENDIX A

Commitment Scales

Instructions

Listed below is a series of statements that represent feelings that individuals might have about the company or organization for which they work. With respect to your own feelings about the particular organization for which you are now working, please indicate the degree of your agreement or disagreement with each statement by circling a number from 1 to 7 using the scale below.

- 1 = strongly disagree
- 2 = disagree
- 3 = slightly disagree
- 4 = undecided
- 5 = slightly agree
- 6 = agree
- 7 = strongly agree

Original Version (Allen & Meyer, 1990)

Affective Commitment Scale

- 1) I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization.
- 2) I enjoy discussing my organization with people outside it.
- 3) I really feel as if this organization's problems are my own.
- 4) I think that I could easily become as attached to another organization as I am to this one. (R)
- 5) I do not feel like 'part of the family' at my organization. (R)
- 6) I do not feel 'emotionally attached' to this organization. (R)
- 7) This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me.
- 8) I do not feel a strong sense of belonging to my organization. (R)

Continuance Commitment Scale

- 1) I am not afraid of what might happen if I quit my job without having another one lined up. (R)
- 2) It would be very hard for me to leave my organization right now, even if I wanted to.
- 3) Too much in my life would be disrupted if I decided I wanted to leave my organization now.
- 4) It wouldn't be too costly for me to leave my organization now. (R)
- 5) Right now, staying with my organization is a matter of necessity as much as desire.
- 6) I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving this organization.
- 7) One of the few serious consequences of leaving this organization would be the scarcity of available alternatives.

- 8) One of the major reasons I continue to work for this organization is that leaving would require considerable personal sacrifice - another organization may not match the overall benefits I have here.

Normative Commitment Scale

- 1) I think that people these days move from company to company too often.
- 2) I do not believe that a person must always be loyal to his or her organization. (R)
- 3) Jumping from organization to organization does not seem at all unethical to me. (R)
- 4) One of the major reasons I continue to work for this organization is that I believe that loyalty is important and therefore feel a sense of moral obligation to remain.
- 5) If I got another offer for a better job elsewhere I would not feel it was right to leave my organization.
- 6) I was taught to believe in the value of remaining loyal to one's organization.
- 7) Things were better in the days when people stayed with one organization for most of their careers.
- 8) I do not think that wanting to be a 'company man' or 'company woman' is sensible anymore. (R)

Revised Version (Meyer, Allen, & Smith, 1993)

Affective Commitment Scale

1. I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization.
2. I really feel as if this organization's problems are my own.
3. I do not feel a strong sense of "belonging" to my organization. (R)
4. I do not feel "emotionally attached" to this organization. (R)
5. I do not feel like "part of the family" at my organization. (R)
6. This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me.

Continuance Commitment Scale

1. Right now, staying with my organization is a matter of necessity as much as desire.
2. It would be very hard for me to leave my organization right now, even if I wanted to.
3. Too much of my life would be disrupted if I decided I wanted to leave my organization now.
4. I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving this organization.
5. If I had not already put so much of myself into this organization, I might consider working elsewhere.
6. One of the few negative consequences of leaving this organization would be the scarcity of available alternatives.

Normative Commitment Scale

1. I do not feel any obligation to remain with my current employer. (R)
2. Even if it were to my advantage, I do not feel it would be right to leave my organization now.
3. I would feel guilty if I left my organization now.
4. This organization deserves my loyalty.
5. I would not leave my organization right now because I have a sense of obligation to the people in it.
6. I owe a great deal to my organization.

Modified Continuance Commitment Scale (Powell & Meyer, 2004)

1. I have invested too much time in this organization to consider working elsewhere.
2. Leaving this organization now would require considerable personal sacrifice.
3. For me personally, the costs of leaving this organization would be far greater than the benefits.
4. I would not leave this organization because of what I would stand to lose.
5. If I decided to leave this organization, too much of my life would be disrupted.
6. I continue to work for this organization because I don't believe another organization could offer the benefits I have here/

References

- 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.
- Meyer, J.P., Allen, N.J., & Smith, C.A. (1993). Commitment to organizations and occupations: Extension and test of a three-component conceptualization. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78, 538-551.
- Powell, D., & Meyer, J.P. (2004). Becker's side-bet theory revisited: A test of the theory within the context of Meyer and Allen's three-component model of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 65, 157-177.

APPENDIX B

COMMITMENT SCALES FOR INTERNATIONAL RESEARCH

Meyer, J.P., Barak, I., & Vandenberghe, C.

The items in this Appendix were adapted or written by Meyer, Barak, and Vandenberghe (1996) to facilitate translation for international research purposes. The items were intended to reflect the affective, normative, and continuance commitment constructs as defined by Allen and Meyer (1990; Meyer & Allen, 1991; Meyer, Allen, & Smith, 1993). They are not intended to comprise the three scales per se. Rather, researchers are invited to select the subsets of items that are most suited to translation for their purposes.

Note: The items comprising the Organizational Commitment Scales for International Study are not presented to respondents in the order shown, but, rather selected items (see above) are mixed together to form one 18-item series. Each item is presented with a 7-point response scale (1=strongly disagree and 7=strongly agree). Reversed scored items are indicated with an (R). Instructions are presented below.

Listed below is a series of statements that represent feelings that individuals might have about the company or organization for which they work. With respect to your own feelings about the particular organization for which you are now working, please indicate the degree of your agreement or disagreement with each statement by circling a number from 1 to 7.

* indicates items adapted from those in the 1990 and 1993 version; ** indicates items adapted from the 1990 version only; all remaining items were written specifically for international research.

AFFECTIVE COMMITMENT SCALE

1. I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization. *
2. I really feel as if this organization's problems are my own. *
3. I do not feel a strong sense of "belonging" to my organization. (R) *
4. I do not feel "emotionally attached" to this organization. (R) *
5. I do not feel like "part of the family" at my organization. (R) *
6. This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me. *
7. I am proud to belong to this company.
8. I really feel that I belong in this company.
9. I don't feel comfortable in this company. (R)

CONTINUANCE COMMITMENT SCALE

1. Right now, staying with my organization is a matter of necessity. *
2. I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving this organization. *

3. I have invested too much in this organization to consider working elsewhere.
4. One of the few negative consequences of leaving this organization would be the scarcity of available alternatives. *
5. I have no choice but to stay with this organization.
6. What keeps me working at this company is the lack of opportunities elsewhere.
7. For me personally, the costs of leaving this organization would be far greater than the benefits.
8. I would not leave this organization because of what I would stand to lose.
9. If I decided to leave this organization, too much of my life would be disrupted.
10. I continue to work for this organization because I don't believe another organization could offer me the benefits I have here.

NORMATIVE COMMITMENT SCALE

1. I do not feel any moral obligation to remain with my current organization. (R) *
2. I do not feel that it would be right to leave my organization now, even if it were to my advantage. *
3. I would feel guilty if I left my organization now. *
4. This organization deserves my loyalty. *
5. I would not leave my organization right now, because I have a sense of obligation to certain people who work there. *
6. If I got another offer for a better job elsewhere, I would not feel it was right to leave my organization. **
7. I would violate a trust if I quit my job with this organization now.
8. I feel a personal responsibility to continue working for this organization.
9. It would not be morally right for me to leave this company now.

APPENDIX C

Translations

French translation	17
Greek translation	22
Korean translation	26
Turkish translation	29
Other translations	36

French Versions of the Three-Component Organizational Commitment (TCM) Scales

Christian Vandenberghe and Kathleen Bentein

HEC Montréal Université du Québec à Montréal

christian.vandenberghe@hec.ca bentein.kathleen@uqam.ca

Commitment Scales with Translation

Affective Commitment		
AC1	I really feel that I belong in this organization.	J'éprouve vraiment un sentiment d'appartenance à mon organisation
AC2	This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me.	Mon organisation représente beaucoup pour moi.
AC3	I am proud to belong to this organization.	Je suis fier d'appartenir à cette organisation.
AC4	I feel emotionally attached to this organization.	Je me sens affectivement attaché à mon organisation.
	I do not feel emotionally attached to this organization. (reverse keyed)	Je ne me sens pas affectivement attaché à mon organisation.
AC5	I feel like part of the family at my organization.	J'ai le sentiment de "faire partie de la famille" dans mon organisation.
	I do not feel like part of the family at my organization. (reverse keyed)	Je n'ai pas le sentiment de "faire partie de la famille" dans mon organisation
AC6	I really feel as if this organization's problems are my own	Je ressens vraiment les problèmes de mon organisation comme si c'était les miens.
Normative Commitment		
NC1	It would not be morally right for me to leave this organization now.	Il ne serait pas moralement correct de quitter mon organisation actuelle maintenant.
NC2	It would not be right to leave my current organization now, even if it were to my advantage	Il ne serait pas correct de quitter maintenant mon organisation actuelle, même si j'y trouvais avantage.
NC3	I think I would be guilty if I left my current organization now	J'estime que je serais coupable si je quittais maintenant mon organisation actuelle.
NC4	I would violate a trust if I left my current organization now.	Je trahirais la confiance que l'on me fait si je quittais maintenant mon organisation actuelle.
NC5	If I got another offer for a better job elsewhere, I would not feel it was right to leave my organization.	Si on m'offrait un poste dans une autre organisation, je ne trouverais pas correct de quitter mon organisation actuelle.

NC6	I would not leave my organization right now, because I have a sense of obligation to certain people who work there.	Je ne quitterais pas mon organisation maintenant parce que j'estime avoir des obligations envers certaines personnes qui y travaillent.
Continuance Commitment: High Sacrifice		
CC:HS1	I would not leave this organization because of what I would stand to lose.	Je ne voudrais pas quitter mon organisation actuelle parce que j'aurais beaucoup à y perdre.
CC:HS2	For me personally, the costs of leaving this organization would be far greater than the benefits.	Pour moi personnellement, quitter mon organisation actuelle aurait beaucoup plus d'inconvénients que d'avantages.
CC:HS3	I continue to work for this organization because I don't believe another organization could offer me the benefits I have here.	Je continue à travailler pour cette organisation parce que je ne pense pas qu'une autre organisation pourrait m'offrir les mêmes avantages.
Continuance Commitment: Low Alternatives		
CC:LA1	I have no choice but to stay with this organization.	Je n'ai pas d'autre choix que de rester dans mon organisation actuelle.
CC:LA2	I stay with this organization because I can't see where else I could work	Je reste dans mon organisation actuelle parce que je ne vois pas où je pourrais aller ailleurs
CC:LA3	I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving this organization.	J'estime mes possibilités de choix trop limitées pour envisager de quitter mon organisation actuelle.

Translation and Structure of the Measures

The translation of the scales from English to French was conducted by Christian Vandenberghe and Lynne Herscovitch in 1999. We compared our respective French translations, which were conducted independently, and resolved any disagreement on specific words through a brief discussion. This work was done based on the English versions of the TCM measures developed by Meyer, Barak, and Vandenberghe (1996). The translation process resulted in 6-item scales for affective, continuance, and normative commitment.

All the studies conducted on French-speaking samples of employees (French Belgium and French Canada) found evidence for the superiority of a four-factor structure over a three-factor structure of the TCM scales using confirmatory factor analyses. Specifically, while the 6-item scales of affective and normative commitment were found to be unidimensional, the 6-item scale of continuance commitment was found to split into two sub-components: (a) perceived sacrifice, reflecting commitment based on the sacrifice that employees would experience if they were leaving, and (b) perceived lack of employment alternatives, referring to commitment based on the perception that few alternatives to current employment would be available. This two-factor structure of continuance commitment is consistent with early work on this scale (McGee & Ford, 1987; Meyer, Allen, & Gellatly, 1990).

Below, we list five articles that have used and validated the French versions of the TCM scales. In all the studies and samples reported in these five articles, commitment items were rated on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). In two of the articles (Bentein, Vandenberg, Vandenberghe, & Stinglhamber, 2005; Vandenberghe, Bentein, Michon, Chebat, Tremblay, & Fils, 2007), two affective commitment items were negatively keyed (affective commitment # items 4 and 5; see below) while in the three other articles (Panaccio & Vandenberghe, 2009; Vandenberghe, Panaccio, & Ben Ayed, 2011; Vandenberghe, Mignonac, & Manville, 2015), these items were positively keyed.

Alpha Reliabilities

Affective commitment: .78, .81, .83 (Bentein et al., 2005); .78 (Vandenberghe et al., 2007); .89 (Panaccio & Vandenberghe, 2009); .90 (Vandenberghe et al., 2011); .91, .86 (Vandenberghe et al., 2015).

Normative commitment: .91, .92, .92 (Bentein et al., 2005); .84 (Vandenberghe et al., 2007); .90 (Panaccio & Vandenberghe, 2009); .89 (Vandenberghe et al., 2011); .90, .79 (Vandenberghe et al., 2015).

Continuance commitment—perceived sacrifice: .74, .78, .81 (Bentein et al., 2005); .73 (Vandenberghe et al., 2007); .78 (Panaccio & Vandenberghe, 2009); .78 (Vandenberghe et al., 2011); .72 (3-item scale used in only one of the two samples: Vandenberghe et al., 2015).

Continuance commitment—perceived lack of alternatives: .81, .83, .83 (Bentein et al., 2005); .77 (Vandenberghe et al., 2007); .76 (Panaccio & Vandenberghe, 2009); .74 (Vandenberghe et al., 2011); .76, .71 (Vandenberghe et al., 2015).

Intercorrelations among TCM components

Affective commitment – Normative commitment: .25 to .38 (Bentein et al., 2005); .52 (Vandenberghe et al., 2007); .53 (Panaccio & Vandenberghe, 2009); .40 (Vandenberghe et al., 2011); .54, .48, .55 (Vandenberghe et al., 2015).

Affective commitment – Continuance commitment—perceived sacrifice: .08 to .21 (Bentein et al., 2005); .30 (Vandenberghe et al., 2007); .22 (Panaccio & Vandenberghe, 2009); .40 (Vandenberghe et al., 2011); .51, .40, .39 (Vandenberghe et al., 2015).

Affective commitment – Continuance commitment—perceived lack of alternatives: -.11 to -.23 (Bentein et al., 2005); -.27 (Vandenberghe et al., 2007); -.15 (Panaccio & Vandenberghe, 2009); -.08 (Vandenberghe et al., 2011); .03, -.13, .17 (Vandenberghe et al., 2015).

Normative commitment – Continuance commitment—perceived sacrifice: -.01 to .14 (Bentein et al., 2005); .42 (Vandenberghe et al., 2007); .13 (Panaccio & Vandenberghe, 2009); .34 (Vandenberghe et al., 2011); .58, .22, .69 (Vandenberghe et al., 2015).

Normative commitment – Continuance commitment—perceived lack of alternatives: -.05 to -.11 (Bentein et al., 2005); -.12 (Vandenberghe et al., 2007); .02 (Panaccio & Vandenberghe, 2009); .17 (Vandenberghe et al., 2011); .29, .05, .39 (Vandenberghe et al., 2015).

Continuance commitment—perceived sacrifice – Continuance commitment—perceived lack of alternatives: .18 to .29 (Bentein et al., 2005); .14 (Vandenberghe et al., 2007); .21 (Panaccio & Vandenberghe, 2009); .35 (Vandenberghe et al., 2011); .47, .22, .54 (Vandenberghe et al., 2015).

Correlations with Antecedents and Outcomes

Negative affectivity (Vandenberghe et al., 2011)	
Affective commitment: -.11	
Normative commitment: .11	
Continuance commitment—perceived sacrifice: .08	
Continuance commitment—perceived lack of alternatives: .31	
Risk aversion (Vandenberghe et al., 2011)	
Affective commitment: -.11	
Normative commitment: .02	
Continuance commitment—perceived sacrifice: .23	
Continuance commitment—perceived lack of alternatives: .26	
Role ambiguity (Panaccio & Vandenberghe, 2009)	
Affective commitment: -.25	
Normative commitment: -.04	
Continuance commitment—perceived sacrifice: -.01	
Continuance commitment—perceived lack of alternatives: .14	
Role conflict (Panaccio & Vandenberghe, 2009)	
Affective commitment: -.19	
Normative commitment: .06	
Continuance commitment—perceived sacrifice: -.11	
Continuance commitment—perceived lack of alternatives: .01	
Role overload (Panaccio & Vandenberghe, 2009)	
Affective commitment: .11	
Normative commitment: .15	
Continuance commitment—perceived sacrifice: .07	
Continuance commitment—perceived lack of alternatives: -.09	
Perceived organizational support (Panaccio & Vandenberghe, 2009)	
Affective commitment: .63	
Normative commitment: .34	
Continuance commitment—perceived sacrifice: .20	
Continuance commitment—perceived lack of alternatives: -.25	
Well-being (Panaccio & Vandenberghe, 2009)	
Affective commitment: .43	
Normative commitment: .08	
Continuance commitment—perceived sacrifice: .13	
Continuance commitment—perceived lack of alternatives: -.33	
Emotional exhaustion (Vandenberghe et al., 2015)	
Affective commitment: -.16, -.23	
Normative commitment: -.01, .00	
Continuance commitment—perceived sacrifice: -.13, -.16	
Continuance commitment—perceived lack of alternatives: .18, .23	
Psychological distress (Vandenberghe et al., 2015)	
Affective commitment: -.25, -.17	
Normative commitment: .04, .06	
Continuance commitment—perceived sacrifice: -.12, -.14	
Continuance commitment—perceived lack of alternatives: .01, .27	
Turnover intention (Bentein et al., 2005)	
Affective commitment: -.26 to -.42	
Normative commitment: -.18 to -.28	
Continuance commitment—perceived sacrifice: -.22 to -.33	
Continuance commitment—perceived lack of alternatives: -.01 to .08	

Turnover (Bentein et al., 2005; Vandenberghe et al., 2011)
 Affective commitment: -.02 to -.13 (Bentein et al.); -.26 (Vandenberghe et al.)
 Normative commitment: -.03 to -.15 (Bentein et al.); -.09 (Vandenberghe et al.)
 Continuance commitment—perceived sacrifice: -.13 to -.27 (Bentein et al.); -.23 (Vandenberghe et al.)
 Continuance commitment—perceived lack of alternatives: -.04 to -.12 (Bentein et al.); -.01 (Vandenberghe et al.)

Customer-rated service quality: employee self-presentation (Vandenberghe et al., 2007)
 Affective commitment: -.10
 Normative commitment: -.02
 Continuance commitment—perceived sacrifice: .04
 Continuance commitment—perceived lack of alternatives: -.10

Customer-rated service quality: employee helping behavior (Vandenberghe et al., 2007)
 Affective commitment: -.10
 Normative commitment: -.04
 Continuance commitment—perceived sacrifice: .18
 Continuance commitment—perceived lack of alternatives: -.12

Supervisor-rated task proficiency (Vandenberghe et al., 2015)
 Affective commitment: .36
 Normative commitment: .32
 Continuance commitment—perceived sacrifice: .25
 Continuance commitment—perceived lack of alternatives: .04

Supervisor-rated task adaptivity and proactivity (Vandenberghe et al., 2015)
 Affective commitment: .28
 Normative commitment: .27
 Continuance commitment—perceived sacrifice: .23
 Continuance commitment—perceived lack of alternatives: .13

References

- Bentein, K., Vandenberg, R.J., Vandenberghe, C., & Stinglhamber, F. (2005). The role of change in the relationship between commitment and turnover: A latent growth modeling approach. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*(3), 468-482. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.90.3.468>
- McGee, G. W., Ford, R. C. (1987). Two (or more?) dimensions of organizational commitment: Reexamination of the affective and continuance commitment scales. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 72*(4), 638-641. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.72.4.638>
- Meyer, J. P., Allen, N. J., & Gellatly, I. R. (1990). Affective and continuance commitment to the organization: Evaluation of measures and analysis of concurrent and time-lagged relations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 75*(6), 710-720. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.75.6.710>
- Meyer, J. P., Barak, I., & Vandenberghe, C. (1996). *Revised measures of affective, continuance, and normative commitment to organizations*. Unpublished measure, Western University, London, ON, Canada.
- Panaccio, A.-J., & Vandenberghe, C. (2009). Perceived organizational support, organizational commitment and psychological well-being: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 75*(2), 224-236. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2009.06.002>

Greek Translation of the TCM Scales

Yannis Markovits

Independent Authority of Public Revenue (IAPR), Thessaloniki, Greece

i.markovits@yahoo.com

Commitment Scales with Translation

Affective Commitment		
AC1	I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization	Θα ήμουν πολύ χαρούμενος/η να αφιερώσω το υπόλοιπο της καριέρας μου σε αυτό τον οργανισμό
AC2	I really feel as if this organization's problems are my own	Πραγματικά νιώθω τα προβλήματα αυτού του οργανισμού ως και δικά μου προβλήματα
AC3	I do not feel a strong sense of "belonging" to my organization	Δεν έχω ένα ισχυρό αίσθημα «ύπαρξης» για τον οργανισμό που εργάζομαι
AC4	I do not feel "emotionally attached" to this organization	Δεν νιώθω «συναισθηματικά δεμένος/η» με αυτό τον οργανισμό
AC5	I do not feel like "part of the family" at my organization	Δεν αισθάνομαι ότι είμαι «μέλος της οικογένειας» αυτού του οργανισμού
AC6	This organization has a great deal of personal meaning to me	Αυτός ο οργανισμός σημαίνει πάρα πολλά για μένα
Normative Commitment		
NC1	I do not feel obligation to remain with the current organization	Δεν νιώθω καμία υποχρέωση να παραμείνω στον υπάρχοντα οργανισμό
NC2	Even if it were to my advantage, I do not feel it would be right to leave my organization now	Ακόμη και αν ήταν για το δικό μου όφελος, θεωρώ ότι δεν είναι σωστό να φύγω από αυτό τον οργανισμό
NC3	I would feel guilty if I left my organization now	Θα ένιωθα ένοχος/η εάν έφευγα τώρα από τον οργανισμό που εργάζομαι
NC4	This organization deserves my loyalty	Αυτός ο οργανισμός δικαιούται την αφοσίωσή μου
NC5	I would not leave my organization right now because I have a sense of obligation to the people in it	Δεν θα έφευγα τώρα από αυτό τον οργανισμό, γιατί νιώθω υποχρεωμένος προς τους ανθρώπους του
NC6	I owe a great deal to my organization	Χρωστώ πάρα πολλά στον οργανισμό που εργάζομαι
Continuance Commitment		
CC1	Right now, staying with my organization is a matter of necessity as much as desire	Αυτό τη στιγμή, το να παραμείνω σε αυτό τον οργανισμό είναι ζήτημα ανάγκης και επιθυμίας
CC2	It would be very hard for me to leave my organization right now, even if I wanted to	Θα ήταν πολύ δύσκολο να φύγω τώρα από τον οργανισμό που εργάζομαι, ακόμη και αν το ήθελα πολύ
CC3	Too much of my life would be disrupted	Θα δημιουργούνταν μεγάλη αναστάτωση

	if I decided I wanted to leave my organization now	στη ζωή μου, αν αποφάσιζα να φύγω τώρα από αυτό τον οργανισμό
CC4	I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving this organization	Αισθάνομαι ότι έχω πολύ λίγες εναλλακτικές επιλογές για να σκεφτώ να φύγω από αυτό τον οργανισμό
CC5	If I had not already put so much of myself into this organization, I might consider working elsewhere	Αν δεν είχα επενδύσει τόσα πολλά από τον εαυτό μου σε αυτό τον οργανισμό, μπορεί και να σκεφτόμουν να πάω κάπου αλλού
CC6	One of the few negative consequences of leaving this organization would be the scarcity of available alternatives	Μία από τις λίγες αρνητικές επιπτώσεις της αποχώρησής μου από αυτό τον οργανισμό, θα ήταν και η ανεπάρκεια των εναλλακτικών μου επιλογών (δηλαδή, οι λίγες καλές δουλειές αλλού)

Translation Procedure

The translation of the scales from English to Greek was conducted by Yannis Markovits in 2004, from the original scales by Meyer, Allen, & Smith (1993) and the three CC items from Powell and Meyer (2004). The translation process resulted in 6-item scales for affective, normative, and continuance commitment. The Greek translation was necessary in order to use the TCM, as part of the doctoral research completed at Aston Business School, since all respondents were employees working in Greek private and public sector organizations. The various studies conducted as requirements of the doctoral research, resulted in nine peer-reviewed papers. The adoption of the 7-point Likert type response scale offered an acceptable and extended choice to the respondents to express their true and unrestricted feelings. The agreement/disagreement scale had the following options: 1 = Strong disagreement, 2 = Disagreement, 3 = Slight disagreement, 4 = I am not sure, 5 = Slight agreement, 6 = Agreement, 7 = Strong agreement.

Psychometric Properties

Six studies were conducted by Markovits and colleagues with Greek-speaking samples of employees. The 6-item scales of affective, normative, and continuance commitment were found to be unidimensional.

Scale reliabilities across these six studies ranged from .80 to .88 for AC, .74 to .87 for NC, .58 to .86 for CC.

The range of correlations among the commitment scales are as follows:

AC-NC: .66 to .79

AC-CC: .05 to .29

NC-CC: .21 to .41

Correlations with Antecedent Variables

Positive affectivity

Affective commitment: from .16 to .35

Normative commitment: from .16 to .25

Continuance commitment: from -.04 to .00

Negative affectivity

Affective commitment: from -.08 to -.04

Normative commitment: from -.04 to -.04
Continuance commitment: from .00 to .08

Correlations with Outcome Variables

Job Satisfaction

Affective commitment: from .52 to .66
Normative commitment: from .47 to .61
Continuance commitment: from .02 to .19

Extrinsic Satisfaction

Affective commitment: from .40 to .60
Normative commitment: from .43 to .57
Continuance commitment: from .05 to .23

Intrinsic Satisfaction

Affective commitment: from .51 to .64
Normative commitment: from .43 to .58
Continuance commitment: from -.01 to .13

Pay Satisfaction

Affective commitment: from .26 to .40
Normative commitment: from .25 to .33
Continuance commitment: from .04 to .12

Job security

Affective commitment: from .37 to .40
Normative commitment: from .28 to .35
Continuance commitment: from .06 to .22

Prevention focus

Affective commitment: from -.05 to .21
Normative commitment: from -.07 to .29
Continuance commitment: from .15 to .31

Promotion focus

Affective commitment: from .06 to .35
Normative commitment: from .14 to .41
Continuance commitment: from .02 to .21

Emotional exhaustion

Affective commitment: -.52
Normative commitment: -.43
Continuance commitment: -.01

Depersonalization

Affective commitment: -.34
Normative commitment: -.24
Continuance commitment: -.04

Interpersonal helping

Affective commitment: .29
Normative commitment: .34
Continuance commitment: .12

Individual initiative

Affective commitment: .36
Normative commitment: .32
Continuance commitment: -.04

Personal industry

Affective commitment: .43
Normative commitment: .41
Continuance commitment: .19

Loyal boosterism

Affective commitment: .64
Normative commitment: .58
Continuance commitment: .24

References

- Markovits, Y., Boer, D., Gerbers, S., and Van Dick, R. (2017). The impact of lasting economic crisis on employee attitudes: A follow-up and extension. *Athens Journal of Business and Economics*, 3(2), 85-99.
- Markovits, Y., Boer, D., and Van Dick, R. (2014). Economic crisis and the employee: The effects of economic crisis on employee job satisfaction, commitment, and self-regulation. *European Management Journal*, 32, 413-422.
- Markovits, Y. (2013). A regulatory focus typology: Relationships between self-regulation, satisfaction and commitment. *International Journal of the Academy of Organizational Behavior Management*, 4, 79-104.
- Markovits Y. (2013). The two ‘faces’ of continuance commitment: The moderating role of job satisfaction on the continuance commitment – organizational citizenship behaviour relationship. *International Journal of the Academy of Organizational Behavior Management*, 3, 62-82.
- Markovits, Y. (2012). The development of regulatory foci characters and moderation effects on satisfaction and commitment. *International Journal of Psychology and Behavioral Sciences*, 2(4), 71-80.
- Markovits, Y. (2011). Normative commitment and loyal boosterism: Does job satisfaction mediate this relationship? *MIBES Transactions*, 5(1), 73-89.
- Markovits, Y., Davis, A.J., Fay, D., & Van Dick, R. (2010). The link between job satisfaction and organizational commitment – Differences between public and private sector employees. *International Public Management Journal*, 13(2), 177-196.
- Markovits, Y., Ullrich, J., Van Dick, R., and Davis, A.J. (2008). Regulatory foci and organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 73(3), 485-489.
- Markovits, Y., Davis, A.J., and Van Dick, R. (2007). Organizational commitment profiles and job satisfaction among Greek private and public sector employees. *International Journal of Cross-Cultural Management*, 7(1), 77-99.

Korean Translation of the TCM Scales

Kibeom Lee

University of Calgary

kibeom@ucalgary.ca

Commitment Scales with Translation

Affective Commitment		
AC1	I really feel as if this organization's problems are my own.	나는 우리 회사의 문제를 진정 내 자신의 문제로 느낀다
AC2	I do not feel a strong sense of belongingness to my organization. (R)	나는 이 회사에 강한 소속감이 없는 편이다 (R)
AC3	I do not feel emotionally attached to this organization. (R)	나는 이 회사에 감정적인 애착을 느끼지 못한다 (R)
AC4	I do not feel like part of the family at my organization. (R)	나는 이 회사의 가족 성원이라는 느낌이 들지 않는다(R)
AC5	This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me.	이 회사는 나에게 개인적으로 매우 큰 의미가 있다
Continuance Commitment		
CC1	I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving this organization.	지금 회사를 옮기려고 하기에는 선택의 폭이 너무 적다
CC2	One of the negative consequences of leaving this organization would be the scarcity of available alternatives.	지금 회사를 그만두는데 따른 나쁜 결과중 하나는 다른 대안이 너무 없다는 것이다
CC3	For me personally, the costs of leaving this organization would be far greater than the benefit.	지금 개인적 사정을 고려해 볼 때, 이 회사를 그만 두는데 따른 잇점보다는 손해가 훨씬 크다
CC4	I would not leave this organization because of what I would stand to lose.	나는 이직을 함으로써 잃게 되는 것들 때문에 이 회사를 떠나기 어렵다
CC5	If I decided to leave this organization, too much of my life would be disrupted.	내가 이 회사를 떠나기로 결정한다면 내 삶에 너무 많은 부분이 혼란스럽게 될 것이다
Normative		
NC1	I do not feel any obligation to remain with my current employer. (R)	나는 이 회사에 남아 있어야 한다는

		도덕적인 의무감을 느끼지 못한다 (R)
NC2	Even if it were to my advantage, I do not feel it would be right to leave my organization now.	나에게는 당장 유리하더라도, 지금 이 회사를 옮기는 것은 옳지 않다고 느낀다
NC3	I would not feel guilt if I left this organization now. (R)	지금 당장 이 회사를 떠나더라도, 아무런 죄책감을 느끼지 못할 것이다 (R)
NC4	If I got another offer for a better job elsewhere, I would not feel it was right to leave my organization.	다른 회사에서 더 나은 조건의 입사 요청이 있더라도 지금 이 회사를 떠나는 것이 옳다고 느끼지 않는다
NC5	I would violate a trust if I quit my job with this organization now.	지금 이 회사를 그만두는 것은 신뢰를 저버리는 것이라고 느낀다

Translations Process

Early Korean translations of the original TCM scales (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Meyer, Allen, & Smith 1993) revealed some psychometric issues (e.g., Ko, Price, & Mueller, 1997; Lee et al., 2001; Study 1). Specifically, the CCS showed somewhat low internal consistency reliability, and some items in the CCS and NCS loaded rather modestly on the designated factors.

Therefore, in 1996, an item pool consisting of the original TCM items and a new set of items written by Meyer, Barak, and Vandenberghe (1996) was administered to a sample of Korean nurses. The latter items were written to be more amenable to translation to other languages. Based on the results obtained from the sample, Lee et al. (2001) selected 15 items from the item pool, which showed improved psychometric properties (see Lee et al., 2001, pp. 601-603, for details). The Lee et al. translations of the TCM scales were used subsequently in a study conducted by Oh (2019) in several Korean organizations.

Psychometric Properties

Lee et al. (2001, Study 2) and Oh (2019) provided evidence that the ACS, NCS, and CCS items represented distinct constructs. In a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA), Lee et al. found that a four-factor solution provided the best fit. The fourth factor resulted from a split of CC into two factors reflecting perceived lack of alternatives (CC-LA: CC1, CC2) and perceived sacrifice (CC-HS: CC3, CC4, CC5). This finding is consistent with research conducted in North America (see Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch, & Topolnytsky, 2002).

Reliability estimates for the 5-item ACS, NCS, and CCS were .84, .84, and .77, respectively, in the Lee et al. (2001) study and .88, .75, and .91, respectively, in the Oh (2019) study. Correlations between the ACS, NCS, and CCS and turnover intention reported by Lee et al. were -.44, -.37, and -.27, respectively. When treated as a two-dimensional construct, CC-HS correlated -.38 with turnover intention, and CC-LA correlated -.03. Oh (2019) found that turnover intention correlated -.48 with AC, -.26 with NC, and -.09 with CC.

References

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.

- Ko, J. W., Price, J. L., & Mueller, C. W. (1997). Assessment of Meyer and Allen's three-component model of organizational commitment in South Korea. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82, 961-973.
- Lee, K., Allen, N. J., Mever, J. P., & Rhee, K. Y. (2001). The three-component model of organisational commitment: an application to South Korea. *Applied Psychology*, 50(4), 596-614.
- Meyer, J. P., Allen, N. J., & Smith, C. A. (1993). Commitment to organizations and occupations: Extension and test of a three-component conceptualization. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78, 538-551.
- Meyer, J. P., Barak, I., & Vandenberghe, C. (1996). *Revised measures of affective, continuance, and normative commitment to organizations*. Unpublished measure, Western University, London, ON, Canada.
- Meyer, J. P., Stanley, 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.
- Oh, H.S. (2019). Organizational commitment profiles and turnover intention: Using a person-centered approach in the Korean context. *Frontiers in Psychology*, doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2019.01499

Turkish Translation and Adaptation

S. Arzu Wasti

Sabancı University

arzu.wasti@sabanciuniv.edu

Commitment Scales with Translation

Table 1

Affective Commitment		
AC1	I do not feel a strong sense of belonging to my organization (R).	Kuruluşuma karşı güçlü bir aitlik hissim yok. (R)
AC2	This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me.	Bu kuruluşun benim için çok kişisel (özel) bir anlamı var.
AC3	I do not feel emotionally attached to this organization. (R)	Bu kuruluşu kendimi “duygusal olarak bağlı” hissetmiyorum. (R)
AC4	I do not feel like part of the family at my organization. (R)	Kendimi kuruluşumda “ailenin bir parçası” gibi hissetmiyorum. (R)
AC5	I really feel as if this organization's problems are my own.	Bu kuruluşun meselelerini gerçekten de kendi meselelerim gibi hissediyorum.
AC6	I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization.	Meslek hayatımın kalan kısmını bu kuruluşta geçirmek beni çok mutlu eder. (*)
	<i>I feel like this job here is like running my own business.</i>	<i>Buradaki işimi kendi özel işim gibi hissediyorum.</i>
	<i>I think it is a source of pride to be an employee of this organization.</i>	<i>Bu kuruluşun bir çalışanı olmanın gurur verici olduğunu düşünüyorum.</i>
	<i>I embrace the goals of this organization.</i>	<i>Bu kuruluşun amaçlarını benimsiyorum.</i>
Normative Commitment		
NC1	I do not feel any obligation to remain with my current employer (R).	Mevcut işverenimle kalmak için hiçbir manevi yükümlülük hissetmiyorum. (R)
NC2	Even if it were to my advantage, it would not be right to leave my current organization now.	Benim için avantajlı da olsa, kuruluşumdan şu anda ayrılmanın doğru olmadığını hissediyorum.
NC3	I would feel guilty if I left my current organization now.	Kuruluşumdan şimdi ayrılısam kendimi suçlu hissederim.
NC4	I owe a great deal to my organization.	Kuruluşuma çok şey borçluyum.
NC5	This organization deserves my loyalty.	Bu kuruluş benim sadakatimi hak ediyor. (*)
NC6	I would not leave my organization right now, because I have a sense of obligation to the people in it.	Buradaki insanlara karşı yükümlülük hissettiğim için kuruluşumdan şu anda ayrılmazdım.

	<i>It would not be right to leave this workplace and disrupt the personal relationships I have built here.</i>	<i>Bu işyerinden ayrılıp burada kurduğum kişisel ilişkileri bozmam doğru olmaz.</i>
	<i>I believe it is my duty to show loyalty to this organization.</i>	<i>Bu kuruluşa sadakat göstermenin görevim olduğunu düşünüyorum.</i>
	<i>Even if my organization were financially struggling, I would stay until the end.</i>	<i>Kuruluşum maddi olarak zor durumda olsa bile, sonuna kadar kalırdım.</i>
	<i>I earn my livelihood thanks to this organization; therefore, I must show loyalty in return.</i>	<i>Bu kuruluş sayesinde ekmek parası kazanıyorum, karşılığında sadakat göstermeliyim.</i>
	<i>I would not want to leave my current organization and let down the people I work with.</i>	<i>Mevcut kuruluşumdan ayrılıp birlikte çalıştığım insanları yarı yolda bırakmak istemem.</i>
Continuance Commitment		
CC1	Too much of my life would be disrupted if I decided I wanted to leave my organization now.	Şu anda kuruluşumdan ayrılmak istediğime karar versem, hayatımın çoğu alt üst olur.
CC2	If I had not already put so much of myself into this organization, I might consider working elsewhere.	Eğer bu kuruluşa kendimden bu kadar çok vermiş olmasaydım, başka yerde çalışmayı düşünebilirdim.
CC3	It would be very hard for me to leave my organization right now even if I wanted to.	İstesem de, su anda kuruluşumdan ayrılmak benim için çok zor olurdu
CC4	I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving this organization.	Bu kuruluşu bırakmayı düşünemeyeceğim kadar az seçeneğim olduğunu düşünüyorum (*)
CC5	One of the few negative consequences of leaving this organization would be the scarcity of available alternatives.	Bu kuruluştan ayrılmanın az sayıdaki olumsuz sonuçlarından biri alternatif kıtlığı olurdu.(*)
CC6	Right now, staying with my organization is a matter of necessity as much as desire.	Şu anda kuruluşumda kalmak istek meselesi olduğu kadar mecburiyetten. (*)
	<i>It would be difficult for me to adapt to a new workplace.</i>	<i>Yeni bir işyerine alışmak benim için zor olurdu.</i>
	<i>There is no guarantee that another workplace would be better than here; at least I know this place.</i>	<i>Başka bir işyerinin buradan daha iyi olacağını garanti yok, burayı hiç olmazsa biliyorum.</i>
	<i>I would not want to leave this workplace and start over elsewhere.</i>	<i>Bu işyerinden ayrılıp başka bir yerde sıfırdan başlamak istemezdim.</i>

	<i>As time goes by, I feel that leaving my current organization becomes increasingly difficult.</i>	<i>Zaman geçtikçe mevcut kuruluştan ayrılmanın gittikçe zorlaştığını hissediyorum.</i>
--	---	--

Note. Items without numbers (e.g. AC1) were written by the author to be culture-specific. The items denoted with (*) were dropped from the etic-emic version of the scales, i.e., the versions of the scales that were composed of both Meyer et al. (1993) items and the emic items that demonstrated satisfactory psychometric properties in the Turkish context. CC6 was dropped in Wasti (2005) with the argument that it was double-barreled. Meyer et al. (1996) have also rewritten it to read “Right now, staying with my organization is a matter of necessity”, which would translate to Turkish as “Şu anda kuruluştan kalmamın sebebi mecburiyet.”

Translation Process

The three-component measures of organizational commitment developed by Meyer, Allen and Smith (1993) were translated into Turkish by Wasti, and two bilingual academicians back-translated the instruments. The items that had discrepancies were corrected and back-translated once again. The final versions, which were reviewed by all translators, were determined to be in substantial agreement with the original items. These items are presented in Table 1 (AC1-AC6, NC1-NC6, CC1-CC6).

Considering that instruments composed of items reflecting Western conditions may not necessarily be reliable or valid in a different culture, Wasti also generated emic (culture-specific) items through in-depth interviews, so as to attain a better (i.e., culturally adapted) measurement of the variables of interest. These items were also tested through exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses (reported in detail in Wasti, 2003) and the final set that was used in the Turkish context are also provided in Table 1 in italics. Given there is no systematic analysis of how well the emic items have worked in Turkey beyond Wasti (2003), researchers in need of Turkish versions of the scales may be advised to adopt the translations of the original Meyer et al. (1993) scales.

Psychometric Properties of the Meyer et al. (1993) Scales

The validity and the generalizability of the Meyer et al. (1993) scales were assessed with two samples in Turkey (one from the public sector, Sample 1, one from the private sector, Sample 2). Scale reliabilities across the two samples were .79 and .78 for AC and .75 and .80 for NC; however, the reliabilities for the full 6-item CC scale were .58 and .60.

Using the same samples, the fit of the three-factor model was compared with the fit of three alternative models using confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). In the first model, all items were hypothesized to load onto a single factor. Based on previous studies which found a high correlation between AC and NC, in the second model, a two-factor model where AC and NC items would load onto one factor, while CC items would load onto a second factor, was proposed. Finally, in line with the evidence that CC is not unidimensional but consists of two sub-factors—one reflecting commitment due to investments made in the organization (High sacrifice, HS; items CC1, CC2 and CC3 above) and the other commitment due to a lack of job alternatives (Lack of alternatives, CC:LA; items CC4, CC5 and CC6 above)—a four-factor model was proposed. The results (presented in Table 2) revealed that the four-factor model yielded the best fit. However, the three-item CC subscales had subpar reliability coefficients in both samples (CC:HS .45 and .54, increasing to .59 when CC2 is dropped in Sample 1 and .56 in Sample 2, and CC:LA .47 and .46, increasing to .57 when CC6 is dropped in Sample 1 and .48 in Sample 2). Table 3 presents the correlations between the commitment components.

Table 2

Confirmatory Factor Analysis Results

Sample 1 Public Sector (N=318)						Sample 2 Private Sector (N=791)				
Model	χ^2/df	CFI	TLI	SRMR	RMSEA	χ^2/df	CFI	TLI	SRMR	RMSEA
1-factor	4.08	.72	.68	.09	.09	8.71	.77	.74	.08	.09
2-factor (AC-NC, CC)	3.60	.76	.73	.10	.09	7.89	.80	.77	.09	.09
3-factor (AC, NC, CC)	3.14	.81	.77	.09	.08	7.21	.82	.79	.09	.08
4-factor (AC, NC, HPS, LA)	2.80	.84	.81	.08	.07	6.32	.85	.82	.08	.08

Table 3

Correlations between commitment components (Sample 1 and Sample 2)

	AC	NC	CC	CC: HPS	CC: LA
AC	1	.668**	.160**	.386**	-.154**
NC	.580**	1	.333**	.490**	.019
CC	.109*	.268**	1	.834**	.781**
CC: HPS	.132*	.282**	.880**	1	.318**
CC: LA	.027	.142**	.776**	.390**	1

Note. The correlations below the diagonal are from Sample 1 (public sector), and the correlations above are from Sample 2 (private sector). * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.

Table 4 presents correlations with turnover intentions, which were measured with the 6-item Job Withdrawal scale developed by Hanisch and Hulin (1990; 1991). The scale is composed of two factors, one measuring desirability of quitting and the other the ease of quitting. Higher scores reflect higher levels of turnover intentions (i.e., desirability and perceived ease).

Table 4

Correlations with Turnover Intentions (Sample 1 and Sample 2)

		AC	NC	CC	CC: HPS	CC: LA
Desirability of quitting	Sample 1	-.396**	-.400**	-.219**	-.299**	-.030
	Sample 2	-.533**	-.550**	-.123**	-.272**	.094**
Ease of quitting	Sample 1	.003	-.197**	-.504**	-.550**	-.261**
	Sample 2	-.250**	-.329**	-.371**	-.319**	-.286**

Finally, the survey for Sample 2 had several other variables of interest. These are presented in Table 5. Employees' perceptions of the fairness of interpersonal treatment in their work environment, an antecedent to commitment, was assessed by an abbreviated version (14 items reflecting supervisor treatment) of the Perceptions of Fair Interpersonal Treatment (PFIT) scale by Donovan et al (1998). Four outcomes in addition to turnover intentions were also measured. Job stress was assessed using the Stress in General Scale (SIG; Smith, Sademan, & McCrary, 1992). Work withdrawal was measured with the scale developed by Hanisch and Hulin (1990; 1991). Two subscales of organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB), namely altruism towards colleagues and organizational identification or "loyal boosterism" were also included (Moorman & Blakely, 1995). For each measure, higher scores indicate higher levels of endorsement.

Table 5

Correlations with other Antecedents and Outcomes (Sample 2)

	AC	NC	CC	CC: HPS	CC: LA
Perceptions of Fair Interpersonal Treatment	.472**	.413**	-.032	.080*	-.155**
Work Withdrawal	-.292**	-.273**	-.078*	-.168**	.050
OCB-Interpersonal Helping	.227**	.225**	.088*	.145**	-.015
OCB-Loyal Boosterism	.474**	.395**	.115**	.231**	-.053

Modifications to the scale

In other administrations of the Turkish translation of the scale, some minor modifications have been made. In a cross-cultural study of organizational commitment (Smith et al., 2014, 5-item versions of AC and NC subscales were used due to concerns regarding overall survey length (AC6 and NC6 were dropped). The remaining items were rephrased to avoid reverse-coding. NC2, NC5 and NC6 were replaced with items from Meyer and colleagues (1996), which were developed for international use (see below). Finally, the word “guilty” in NC3 was replaced with “embarrassed” (*mahcubiyet*) based on cross-cultural research which suggested emotions in collectivist cultures more grounded in assessments of social worth and self-other relationships (e.g., Mesquita, 2001).

Wasti (2005) also replaced NC4 with NC1_alternative below. In addition, to measure CC as constituting of High Perceived Sacrifice and not Lack of Alternatives, as the latter arguably represents an antecedent rather than a component of commitment, Wasti (2005) adopted several CC items by Meyer and colleagues (1996; items CC1_alternative to CC4_alternative) and added one developed for the study (CC5_alternative). These versions of the scales were also validated using confirmatory factor analyses, and the three-factor model was found to be significantly better than all other models ($\chi^2/df = 2.24$; GFI = .97; AGFI = .94; CFI = .97, RMSEA = .06). These alternative items are provided below.

NC1_alternative	I would violate a trust if I left my current organization now.	Bu kuruluştaki işimden şimdi ayrılısam bana olan güveni ihlal ederdim
NC2_alternative	I feel a personal responsibility to continue working for this organization.	Bu kuruluştaki çalışmaya devam etmek konusunda kişisel bir sorumluluk hissediyorum
NC3_alternative	If I got another offer for a better job elsewhere, I would not feel it was right to leave my organization.	Başka yerden daha iyi bir teklif alsam da kuruluşumu bırakmamın doğru olmadığını hissedirim
CC1_alternative	I have invested too much in this organization to consider working elsewhere.	Başka yerde çalışmayı düşünemeyecek kadar bu kuruluşa yatırım yaptım.

CC2_alternative	For me personally, the costs of leaving this organization would be far greater than the benefit.	Kişisel olarak bu kuruluştan ayrılmamın maliyeti getirisinden çok daha fazla.
CC3_alternative	I would not leave this organization because of what I would stand to lose.	Kaybedeceklerim açısından bu kuruluştan ayrılmazdım.
CC4_alternative	If I decided to leave this organization, too much of my life would be disrupted.	Kuruluşumdan ayrılmaya karar versem hayatımın çoğu alt üst olur.
CC5_alternative	I would be at a disadvantage if I quite this organization.	Bu kuruluştan ayrılmak benim için dezavantajlı olurdu.

Other Translations

The translations identified below are available from the authors. Information regarding the development and psychometric properties of the measures are available from the articles listed.

Chinese

Felfe, J., Yan, W. & Six, B. (2008). The impact of individual collectivism on commitment and its influence on organizational citizenship behaviour and turnover in three countries. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, 8(2), 211–237.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/1470595808091790>

Felfe, J., & Yan, W.H. (2009). The impact of workgroup commitment on organizational citizenship behaviour, absenteeism and turnover intention: The case of Germany and China. *Asia Pacific Business Review*, 15(3), 433-450.

German

Felfe, J., Yan, W. & Six, B. (2008). The impact of individual collectivism on commitment and its influence on organizational citizenship behaviour and turnover in three countries. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, 8(2), 211–237.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/1470595808091790>

Felfe, J., & Yan, W.H. (2009). The impact of workgroup commitment on organizational citizenship behaviour, absenteeism and turnover intention: The case of Germany and China. *Asia Pacific Business Review*, 15(3), 433-450.

Romanian

Felfe, J., Yan, W. & Six, B. (2008). The impact of individual collectivism on commitment and its Influence on organizational citizenship behaviour and turnover in three countries. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, 8(2), 211–237.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/1470595808091790>