

Exploratory Factor Analysis of Allen and Meyer's Three-Component Scale of Organizational Commitment in the Algerian Context

Malki Mohamed Amine^{1*}, Bouabdallah Lahcen²

¹ University Mohamed Lamine Debaghine Setif-2 (Algeria), e-mail docxpsych@gmail.com

² University Mohamed Lamine Debaghine Setif-2 (Algeria), e-mail doylettres@yahoo.fr

Received: 30 / 10 /2025

Accepted: 28 / 12 /2025

Published: 05 /03 /2026

Abstract: This study aims to analyze the factorial structure of Allen and Meyer's three-component scale of organizational commitment within a collectivist culture, with the goal of understanding the causes of discrepancies that affect the scale's validity in this context. The sample consisted of 130 individuals from various departments at Saâdna Abdel Nour University Hospital Center in Setif selected using an aleatory stratified sampling technique. The study hypothesis was tested with exploratory factor analyses and some other indices like VIF-tolerance indices and the convergent-divergent validity criterion. Statistical findings explained that the discrepancy between scale concepts specifically (affective and normative components) is due to the influence of the collectivist culture that affects individuals' realization of the three-component concept of organizational commitment rather than a misconception of the scale or a poor conceptualization by the authors.

Keywords: Allen and Meyer ; Organizational Commitment; Three-components; Exploratory Factor Analyses ; Collectivist Culture.

* Malki Mohamed Amine.

I- Introduction :

The three-component concept of organizational commitment by Allen & Meyer is regarded as the most significant concept in organizational and work psychology, the power of the concept came from its conceptual clarity, measurement accuracy, and Emic generalizability (Transcending cultural barriers), the concept includes three distinct components formulate the general attitudes of individuals towards their organizations, named “affective component” this dimension refers to individual willingness to stay and spend a Carriere in his actual organization (I want to stay); individual exhibited desire to stay within his organization with reason of lacking good alternatives and fear of losing actual benefits called “ continuance component”; the expression (I have to stay) resumes perfectly this individual mindset, the last component known as “ Normative component” refers to the sense of duty and the ethical obligation of an individual to stay within an organization to help and develop it, this mindset rooted from his high ethical-cultural norms that leads him to stay because he wants to (I should to stay).

This conceptualization drawn a lot of attention from researchers in recent years, which is why their literature has been so dominant and cross-culturally spreadable. Its importance stems from its regulatory function as a center of control for other phenomena affecting organizational stability and durability.

Studies revealed and confirmed its negative correlation with organizational turnover, as in (Meyer, Allen,1991) study entitled “ A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment” revealed that Affective commitment is a strong negative predictor of turnover intentions, followed the works done by Allen and Meyer, (Jaros,1997) conducted a study entitled “ An assessment of Meyer and Allen's (1991) three-component model of organizational commitment and turnover intentions”, the study brought an assessment for the precedent study, it demonstrated that affective commitment is most predictive of turnover intentions compared to normative and continuance commitment. Another study from (Griffeth, Hom, & Gaertner,2000) entitled “A meta-analysis of antecedents and correlates of employee turnover: Update, moderator tests, and research implications for the next millennium” analyzed a ton of studies pertaining to the two concepts using meta-analysis technique. The study showed and proved statistically that organizational commitment significantly reduces employee turnover, it recommended this finding be used as a general mechanism for evaluating this relationship as well.

Other researchers investigated the relationships of the concept of organizational commitment by Allen and Meyer with the second important variable affecting organizations, which is organizational performance (Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1979), in their work “The Measurement of Organizational Commitment.” This research paper results in the finding that committed employees (in overall components) tend to show better performance and less absenteeism in the workplace. After that, (Allen et al,1989) published “Organizational commitment and job performance: It's the nature of the commitment that counts” a scientific article with the goal of continuing to bring more clarity by investigating the correlation of organizational performance with every component (affective, continuance, normative). Separately, in short, the study acknowledged that the affective component is positively related to supervisors' ratings of performance, and it is the best predictor compared with the normative component. Moreover, we can mention a recent study by (Riketta, 2002) entitled “Attitudinal Organizational Commitment and Job Performance: A Meta-Analysis.”

The author analyzed another concept of organizational commitment named “attitudinal commitment,” which is different from Allen and Meyer’s conceptualization of commitment, although the results were similarly identical and congruent with precedent literature, so that confirmed a moderate positive correlation between organizational commitment and job performance.

Another variable also related to our concept is job satisfaction. Recent studies analyzed the mechanism effect relating those variables, and almost all of the findings suggested that job satisfaction could be a good predictor for organizational commitment, such as in (Mathieu, Zajac, 1990) study entitled “A review and meta-analysis of the antecedents, correlates, and consequences of organizational commitment,” which centered on reviewing Allen & Meyer’s proposed model of organizational commitment. Results showed a strong correlation between job satisfaction and commitment; satisfaction is often a precursor to affective commitment. Furthermore, (Lock, Crawford, 2001) interested in analyzing the cultural effect on those variables, based on data collected and compiled from several culturally diverse countries, the findings validate the EMIC dimensionality of the three-component concept of organizational commitment, that means cultural dimension doesn’t affect the relationship of the two concepts in consideration; in other words, job satisfaction and commitment are significantly and positively related across different cultural contexts.

Generally, the three-component concept of organizational commitment by Allen & Meyer doesn’t only mean individual retention and linking with his actual organization, but it builds the working forces for it that care, contribute, and participate in its future.

Despite the robustness and clarity of the concept, psychometric validation, and its ease of measurement, Allen and Meyer mentioned an important point about the lack of distinctiveness between affective commitment (AC), normative commitment (NC), and continuance commitment (CC) of organizational commitment statistically, empirical findings have shown mixed support—particularly regarding the distinction between AC and NC. CC has consistently demonstrated discriminant validity, with its items loading on separate factors and showing unique relationships with other variables. In contrast, AC and NC often display moderate to high correlations in both latent factors and scale scores also scale overlapping items (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Dunham et al, 1994). This suggests that the overlap is not simply due to measurement issues but may reflect a conceptual interference. Furthermore, few researchs has explored antecedents and outcomes that are unique to NC, leaving its distinctiveness unclear. Overall, while CC appears empirically separable, more research is needed to determine whether AC and NC are truly independent constructs (Bergman, 2006, p647).

1.Study Problem:

Confirmed by several empirical evidence from cross-cultural studies around the world, the two components (affective-normative commitment) still show a strong statistical intercorrelation, and overlapping items lead to component undifferentiation, incongruency, and bad fitting with the conceptualization of organizational commitment proposed by the authors. This study puts efforts into investigating Allen & Meyer’s concept validation by analyzing (AC- NC) components collinearity (correlation and items overlapping between factors), components factorization and the

discriminant validity of (AC-NC scale measurement) on a drawn sample from the Algerian context (collectivist culture).

2. Study hypothesis:

H₁. There is a medium correlation between the affective and normative components of organizational commitment.

H₂. The factorial structure will demonstrate a clear and distinct pattern of factor loadings for each commitment component.

H₃. The affective and normative components will exhibit evidence of divergent validity.

3. Study aims:

There are several goals to achieve through the literature exhibition of the three-component concept of organizational commitment by Allen & Meyer, besides the statistical procedures conducted in this study, which could be summarized in many points as follows:

- ✓ examining the identification of the measurement model (factorial construct of the three-component scale of organizational commitment) with the theoretical model proposed by the authors, which requires a distinguishable exploratory factor structure clean from cross-loadings in addition to the lack of items overlapping inter-factors.
- ✓ Checking empirically the problem of multicollinearity between the three components of OC with a major focus on diagnosing affective-normative relationships using the variable inflation factor, tolerance index, and correlation matrix.
- ✓ Validating the psychometric characteristics of the measurement scale represented in composite reliability, convergent and divergent validity results from a local study population, which is quite different culturally and psychologically (Algerian context) from the original study.
- ✓ Filling the gap in the studies conducted locally, which could maybe never have tackled this standing problem in organizational commitment literature, and providing more evidences from Algerian context to researchers worldwide.

4. Study importance:

Depending on the study's contribution, the significance of this research could be divided into two main categories.

First, a theoretical contribution in the field of organizational commitment precisely sheds light on the well-known concept of the three components of organizational commitment by Allen and Meyer and dives through some real, particular, imperceptible issues that impede the concept's further advancement. It's denoted that Allen and Meyer, in their model of organizational commitment, identify strict particular antecedents related separately with every single component so that the model prohibits any kind of non-logical correlation between any antecedents and non-respective components. Another complementary idea suggests that the presence of intercorrelation between organizational commitment components means that they have some shared antecedents affecting their development process, which is also not allowed by the proposed model.

Second, an important statistical contribution: by integrating a variety of statistical techniques (correlation matrix, CV-DV validity, EFA, etc.), we will have the tools required to cover every psychometric facet of the potential problems that may be found in order to extract the maximum useful, interpretable statistical information possible from the data that was collected. Subsequently, diagnosing potential problems in the exploratory measurement model (cross-validation and overlapping items) would be easier to identify and explain clearly in light of the findings of similar studies and organizational commitment literature published by Allen and Meyer.

5. Literature review of the three-component concept of organizational commitment by Allen & Meyer:

5.1 The Concept of Organizational Commitment by Allen & Meyer (1991):

Researchers consider Allen & Meyer's concept of organizational commitment to be the newest, most comprehensive, and most robust because it encompasses and surpasses all previous approaches discussed in the literature, including reciprocal, behavioral, emotional, and ethical aspects. Allen & Herscovitch (2001) argue that organizational commitment “is composed of three components that are characteristics of mind-sets that reflect separate components in terms of their nature, determinants, and outcomes.” (Paillé, 2004, p. 328)

5.2 The Concept of Organizational Commitment by Allen & Meyer (1991):

Affective Component: It refers to the individual's emotional attachment, conformity, and degree of assimilation into the organization. The individual with a high level of emotional commitment continues to work within the organization because he wants to.

Continuance Component: It refers to an individual's awareness of the costs associated with leaving the organization. An individual with a high level of continued commitment is initially associated with the organization because he or she needs to.

Normative Component: It refers to an obligated feeling to continue working and not leave the organization. Individuals with a high level of normative commitment feel obligated to stay with the organization because they are needed, and leaving it at present time will harm it.

Allen and Meyer (1991) preferred to look at organizational commitment components as a distinct compound rather than considering them as kinds or types of attitudinal or behavioral commitment. This is because the individual can experience each component at varying levels. For example, some may feel a strong need (continuous component) with compulsive necessity (normative component) without having the desire for what they do (absence of the affective component). In some other cases, individuals may feel no sense other than the desire to remain in the organization for certain reasons, such as friendships (emotional component only). (Brown, 2003, p,p 31,32)

6. The Three Components Scale of Organizational Commitment by Allen & Meyer (1991):

One of the most important reasons that made this concept dominant and popular among researchers in the field of organizational behavioral is its availability on measurement Scale, its development has completed after the addition of the normative component scale to the emotional and continuous components scales developed previously, from the first sight several problems emerged in it, including unique dimensionality of the Scale (discriminant validity problem) also some other reliability concerns, since the existence of links between components makes it not express honestly and accurately the concept developed by the researchers , in addition, we can find the emergence of the of the emotional component upon the rest in terms of levels and degrees of influence on individuals compared to the other two dimensions (Hartmann; Bambacas, 2000, p93).

To resolve this problem, Allen & Meyer (2006) modified the statements of the normative scale to express two additional sub-dimensions involved in it, namely, moral imperative and indebted obligation, because the concept of normative commitment has also been modified, so that the scale consists of six statements divided on these two dimensions equally. According to Allen and Meyer, the continuous component reflects the extent to which an individual realizes or the extent of his intelligence that his survival or his association with the organization is related to the cost of leaving it. The researchers believe that the individual's awareness of these benefits and costs is a personal and relative matter. If the perception is achieved, the connection with the organization occurs and vice versa.

Therefore, the statements of the continuous component must reflect and capture the perceived cost without referring to or capturing the sources of perception. The continuous component has also included some suggestions about the possibility of containing two sub-dimensions, namely the high sacrifice and the lack of alternatives. The scale has been modified to become six items that express these two dimensions equally, while the affective component has been verbally modified by one statement (statement 1) of the original scale, also the suppression of the last statement to become formed by seven items expressing the essence of the concept. (Jaros, 2007).

II– Methods and Materials:

1. Participants:

research population consists of all individuals working at the Saâdna Abdel Nour University Hospital Center in Setif, whose total number is estimated at 2,509 workers according to the statistics of the Human Resources Department for the year 2021. The study sample represents in 131 respondents drawn with “stratified random sampling” from all hospital departments.

2. Data analyses techniques:

This study deployed exploratory factor analyses (EFA) in goal for analyzing items cross-loading and its overlapping, this method is especially useful in the early stages of scale development or when validating constructs across new samples or cultural contexts (Costello & Osborne, 2005). Unlike Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA), which tests a pre-specified model, EFA allows patterns to emerge freely from the data (Fabrigar et al., 1999). The method has become a cornerstone in social sciences and behavioral research, aiding in the simplification of complex datasets and the discovery of latent constructs (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). Whereas, variable inflation factor and tolerance index are intended to diagnose the three components intercorrelation, the variance inflation factor (VIF) and tolerance index are statistical indicators used to assess multicollinearity in regression analysis. Multicollinearity occurs when independent variables are highly correlated (O'Brien, 2007), both indicators are essential for diagnosing and addressing multicollinearity before making inferences from regression models. While Tolerance values close to zero suggest high multicollinearity, large VIF values indicate the same concern (Kutner et al., 2005). Researchers are advised to interpret these values cautiously depending on context and model complexity (Midi et al., 2010). In addition to, covariance and correlation matrix for assessing the power and directionality of the relationships in consideration.

3. Measurement scale:

The original scale for organizational commitment components was first developed in 1990 by Allen and Meyer, consisting of 24 items equally distributed among the three components of the concept. In 1993, the scale underwent a revision, particularly focusing on the normative component, where

several items were reformulated to better align with the theoretical framework. A more precise definition of the commitment components was later provided by (Allen et al, 2006), aiming to clearly define the nature of each component.

These revisions were made to address issues related to the factorial structure and to improve the construct validity of the original scale. Based on Allen and Meyer's recommendations, an updated version of the scale was used in the study by Jaros (2007). This version involved a comprehensive revision of the wording of the scale's items and focused on ensuring the discriminant validity between the affective and normative components. The study ultimately produced a scale consisting of 19 items representing the three components of organizational commitment. (Jaros, 2007)

III- Results and discussion :

1. Correlation and covariance matrix analyses:

After data collection, coding variables, and dumping sample responses for each component, a data file was generated and submitted to analyses using SPSS v26 software. Relying on bivariate analyses, a correlation and covariance matrix for the three components was generated, and the results are demonstrated in the following table.

Table1: Pearson Correlations and Covariances Among Affective, Continuance, and Normative Components of Organizational Commitment.

		Affective component	Continuance component	Normative component
Affective component	Pearson Correlation	1	,252**	,426**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		,004	,000
	Covariance	,391	,110	,193
	N	131	131	131
Continuance component	Pearson Correlation	,252**	1	,231**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,004		,008
	Covariance	,110	,486	,117
	N	131	131	131
Normative component	Pearson Correlation	,426**	,231**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,008	
	Covariance	,193	,117	,526
	N	131	131	131

Note: **. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Source: based on personal data analyzed by SPSS v26.

The correlation matrix shows positive and statistically significant relationships among all three components of organizational commitment (affective, continuance, and normative). The highest correlation is observed between the affective and normative components ($r = .426$, $p < .01$) as predicted, suggesting a stronger link between emotional attachment and perceived obligation to remain in the organization. Meanwhile, the affective–continuance ($r = .252$) and continuance–normative ($r = .231$) relationships are also significant, though weaker.

2. VIF and Tolerance index diagnosis:

To asses multicollinearity problem among the three-component of organizational commitment, a regression model was formulated including the three-component of organizational commitment as

Exploratory Factor Analysis of Allen and Meyer's Three-Component Scale of Organizational Commitment in the Algerian Context

independent variables affect and regress on a dependent dummy variable, the following table exhibits analyses results.

Table2: Tolerance, Variable Inflation Factor Indices Among Affective, Continuance, and Normative Components of Organizational Commitment.

Model		Tolerance	VIF
Components	Affective component	,794	1,260
	Continuance component	,918	1,090
	Normative component	,802	1,246

Source: based on personal data analyzed by SPSS v26.

The table shows all components show strong independence in the model. Their VIFs are low (close to 0) and tolerance values are high (close to 0.10), indicating no significant linear dependency between them. Next step is to analyze Variance Proportions & Condition Index for components dimensionalities, this procedure helps to evaluate shared variances between components, all results displayed in this table.

Table3: Collinearity Diagnostics – Variance Proportions & Condition Index.

Dimension	Eigenvalue	Condition Index	Variance Proportions			
			(Constant)	AC	CC	NC
1	3,919	1,000	,00	,00	,00	,00
2	,038	10,144	,00	,05	,66	,36
3	,025	12,471	,06	,55	,14	,63
4	,017	14,975	,94	,40	,20	,01

Note : Eigenvalues < 0.10 (or especially < 0.01) usually indicate severe collinearity.

Condition Index : (10-20) indicates possible moderate collinearity.

Variance Proportion : Risk when > 0.50 on same dimension as high CI.

Source: based on personal data analyzed by SPSS v26.

As shown in the table above, dimension 3 has expressed a potential collinearity issue between affective -normative component. Thus, hypothesis **H₁** states “ There is a medium correlation between the affective and normative components of organizational commitment ” **approved**.

3. Exploratory Factorial Analyses results:

In this element, (EFA) results will be exposed starting with (KMO) and Bartlett's Test. The (KMO) test evaluates the appropriateness of factor analysis by examining the proportion of variance among variables that might be common variance. It compares the magnitude of observed correlation coefficients to the magnitude of partial correlation coefficients. A **KMO value above 0.60** is generally considered acceptable for conducting exploratory factor analysis (Kaiser, 1974). Whereas, Bartlett's Test helps confirm whether factor analysis is appropriate for your dataset (sample size) by assessing the overall significance of the correlation matrix (Bartlett, 1954).

Table4: KMO and Bartlett's Test for study dataset.

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		,720
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	885,187
	df	210
	Sig.	,000

Source: based on personal data analyzed by SPSS v26.

From the table above, the sampling adequacy measure of 0.720 indicates that the dataset collected from the study sample allows us to conduct (EFA). While Bartlett's Test Approx. Chi-Square of 885,187 and 0.000 significance level leads to accept the alternative hypothesis saying that variables are correlated enough to proceed with further analyses.

Concerning communalities, we can say that Affective.5 (0.633), Continuance.2 (0.754), and Continuance.8 (0.691) are among the best-represented items in the factor model. In contrast, Continuance.3 (0.045), Continuance.7 (0.084), and Moral.imper.3 (0.083) have very low communalities, indicating they are poorly explained by the extracted factors. Overall, most affective items are well represented, while some continuance and normative items may need to be reviewed or excluded. In addition, the principal component analysis extracted three components that together explain 42.3% of the total variance in the data. Before rotation, the first component accounted for 22.25%, the second for 11.88%, and the third for 8.20%. After rotation, the explained variance was more evenly distributed: Component 1 explained 18.33%, Component 2 explained 15.15%, and Component 3 explained 8.85%. This redistribution, achieved through rotation, enhances the clarity of the factor structure while preserving the total variance explained.

relying on principal components analysis with Varimax rotation solution (varimax assumes that factors are uncorrelated), a component matrix was generated including the three-components items scattered on three dimensions, the following table presents procedure outcomes.

Table5: Rotated Component Matrix with Varimax rotation solution for scale items.

Items	Component			Items	Component		
	1	2	3		1	2	3
Affective.1	,730			Continuance.5		,729	
Affective.2	,721			Continuance.6		,520	
Affective.3	,456			Continuance.7			
Affective.4			,537	Continuance.8		,811	
Affective.5			,783	indebted.obligation.1	,669		
Affective.6			,704	indebted.obligation.2	,656		
Affective.7	,665			indebted.obligation.3	,504		
Continuance.1		,705		Moral.imperative.1	,646		
Continuance.2		,823		Moral.imperative.2	,613		
Continuance.3				Moral.imperative.3			

Note: Rotation converged in 4 iterations.

Source: based on personal data analyzed by SPSS v26.

The rotated component matrix revealed a 3-factor solution using principal component analysis and Varimax rotation. Affective commitment items are split across two components (1 & 3), which is a clear expression of item overlapping; normative commitment items load with some affective items in Factor 1, and continuance commitment items form a distinct and clean factor (Factor 2). While the following items (Continuance 3-7, Moral Imperative 3) didn't load or show on any factor due to their low loading (under 0.30). A quick resume for factor description could be given as follows:

- **Factor 1:** Expressed blend of affective and normative items, indicating conceptual overlap. This includes emotional attachment and feelings of obligation (mixed and ambiguous feelings from respondents towards those concepts).
- **Factor 2:** Purely continuance items, aligned with theoretical expectations.
- **Factor 3:** Affective items (4-5-6), reflecting a clean and shorten subscale of affective commitment that is aligned with theoretical conception.

Thus, hypothesis **H2** says “ The factorial structure will demonstrate a clear and distinct pattern of factor loadings for each commitment component” disapproved.

4. Composite Reliability and Convergent Validity:

Composite reliability (CR) measures the internal consistency of a construct's indicators, similar to Cronbach's alpha, but it doesn't assume equal indicator loadings. Values above 0.70 are considered acceptable. (Hair et al, 2022). While for convergent validity (Fornell, Larcker, 1981) said that the latter occurs when indicators of a construct converge or share a high proportion of variance, typically shown by a factor loading and an average variance extracted above 0.50 for both. Results founded shown in the following table.

Table6: Composite Reliability and Convergent Validity for the three factors.

Factor	CR	AVE	$\sqrt{\text{AVE}}$
Factor 1 (AC + NC)	0.856	0.403	0.635
Factor 2 (Continuance)	0.847	0.488	0.698
Factor 3 (Affective Subcluster)	0.719	0.466	0.682

Source: calculated from (EFA) outputs by the researcher.

The table shows that all three factors have acceptable composite reliability ($\text{CR} \geq 0.70$), indicating good internal consistency for The three-component scale of organizational commitment by Allen & Meyer, while for (AVE) is showing values below 0.50 for all three factors, especially for Factor 1 (AC + NC), suggesting weak convergent validity for items formulating the measurement scale, Factor 3 considered as a subscale for affective component ,it has acceptable reliability but its convergent validity is limited due to having only 3 items (more items should be developed and included compose the factor)

5. Discriminant Validity (Fornell–Larcker Criterion):

Discriminant validity is established when the square root of AVE ($\sqrt{\text{AVE}}$) for each factor is greater than its correlations with other factors (Hensler et al, 2015).

Table7: Discriminant Validity for the three factors

		Affective component	Continuance component	Normative component
Affective subscale	Pearson Correlation	1	,252**	,426**
	($\sqrt{\text{AVE}}$)		0.682	0.682
Continuance component	Pearson Correlation	,252**	1	,231**
	($\sqrt{\text{AVE}}$)	0.698		0.698
(AC-NC) component	Pearson Correlation	,426**	,231**	1
	($\sqrt{\text{AVE}}$)	0.635	0.635	

Source: calculated from correlations, divergent validity outputs by the researcher.

From the table above, based on assumed inter-factor correlations (e.g., AC–CC $\approx$ 0.25, AC–NC $\approx$ 0.42), all three factors satisfy Fornell–Larcker Criterion and we can say that discriminant validity is

established despite the merged nature of affective and normative items. Thus, hypothesis **H3** says “The affective and normative components will exhibit evidence of divergent validity” **approved (statistically)**.

6. General discussion:

In this section, study results will be discussed thoroughly in light of precedent findings from other studies. The correlation matrix supports the three-component model of organizational commitment (affective, continuance, and normative) as distinct but related components. Affective and normative dimensions are more strongly intertwined than either is with continuance, suggesting dual commitment (emotional and ethical) may often coexist. This finding is consistent with Chen & Francesco (2003) and other cross-cultural studies, which also found stronger links between affective and normative than with continuance. Both components show strong independence in the regression model. Their VIFs are low and tolerance values are high, indicating no significant linear dependency between them, but Dimension 3 has shown moderate shared variance between them. The condition index also came with a value below the critical threshold (30), suggesting only mild collinearity. This was aligned with (Solinger et al, 2008), the study argued that a statistical independence is often observed between these components—low multicollinearity, as shown by low Variance Inflation Factors (VIFs) and high tolerance values in regression models. Furthermore, the correlation between AC and NC is often moderate but not indicative of redundancy. This supports using them as separate predictors in regression analyses.

Regarding (EFA) results, we found that the factorial structure supports the three-dimensionality supposed by Allen and Meyer, but we cannot really interpret it clearly theoretically, this finding aligned with (Snape et al , 2008); they investigated the validity of Meyer and Allen’s three-component model of organizational commitment—affective (AC), normative (NC), and continuance (CC)—among Chinese and British accountants. The study confirmed that AC and NC are conceptually distinct but empirically related, particularly in the Chinese sample. Factor analysis supported the separation of the three components, yet AC and NC were found to be moderately correlated, indicating that employees who feel emotionally attached to their profession often also feel a moral obligation to remain in it. This relationship was stronger in the Chinese context, reflecting the influence of collectivist cultural norms that emphasize loyalty, social obligation, and group harmony. The findings reinforce the idea that while AC and NC can be distinguished psychometrically, they may interact in meaningful ways influenced by cultural values.

Component matrix generated a first factor (AC-NC) that blends different mindsets and feelings into one dimension could be named “dual commitment”, the factor mixes or doesn’t separate affection of the employee towards his organization as a distinct feeling that differ from his ethical norms obligates him to stay and helps it. Besides, the convergent validity for this factor showed that the blended items from (AC-NC) failed to converge given their linguistic uniqueness formulation. This result is congruent with (Bergman, 2006) study revealed that AC and NC **items load on the same factor**, suggesting **poor discriminant validity**. Before this, (Ko et al, 1997) conducted an (EFA) study in the Korean context and found strong loading overlap between AC and NC items in their factor structure, which raised concerns about cross-cultural construct validity. Collectivist cultures emphasize group goals, social harmony, loyalty, and relational obligations over individual autonomy. People in these cultures tend to define themselves in terms of their social relationships

and group memberships (Hofstede, 1980). These values heavily influence workplace behaviors and attitudes, particularly organizational commitment. Starting from a theoretical perspective, Social Exchange Theory suggests emotional bonds often create moral obligations (Cropanzano, Mitchell, 2005); that's what clearly explains the nature of the relationship between AC and NC, especially in collectivist settings. The emotional desire to stay (AC) is often accompanied by a normative sense of duty (NC), leading to this conceptual convergence. The empirical evidences from collectivist cultures often promoted this assumption. Moreover, (Wasti , 2003) found a Stronger AC-NC correlation in Turkey (collectivist culture) than USA (individualistic culture), high AC-NC correlation was also found in China by (Chen, Francesco, 2003).

The cultural influence on the three-component concept and scale of organizational commitment by Allen & Meyer brought the construct validity challenge to the fore, (Meyer et al, 2013) recommended to use culturally adapted version of three components scale of organizational commitment and test its local structural validity with CFA before conducting any research.

IV- Conclusion:

This study has proven most of the proposed hypotheses, as the relationship between affective and normative components has a moderate positive strength, which is congruent with the theoretical closeness for those components (closeness without convergence). While the factorial structure showed that most of the items in the two components were saturated on the same factor, this indicates the duality of the concept of commitment within the collective culture, thus rejecting the second hypothesis about the cleanliness and purity of the factorial structure in its statistical part. The emergence of the third factor, called the affective subscale, beside the first basic factor of dual commitment (affective-normative) led to proving only a statistical divergent validity between those factors. That's because the factors don't reflect the initial items' composition; it presents that we have a new affective subscale of commitment (different state of mind).

The study acknowledges that these results are due to the idea of the influence of culture on the perception of organizational concepts, which most researchers consider to be transcultural or absolute. However, the study showed that collective culture has a significant influence on the researcher's perception of the emotional and normative concepts, as the individual considers them to be two sides of the same coin, which led to the lack of clarity in the factor structure of the scale.

The study recommends conducting other similar studies on larger and more functionally diverse samples and communities, with a focus on introducing cultural theory, especially Hofstede's cultural theory explaining the dimensions of culture as a variable in statistical analysis, with the goal of drawing empirical conclusions that support the argument we reached in this study.

references:

Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1990). *Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: An examination of construct validity*. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 49(3), 252–276. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-8791\(90\)90042-Z](https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-8791(90)90042-Z)

Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1996). *Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: An examination of construct validity*. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 49(3), 252–276. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.1996.0043>

Bergman, M. E. (2006). *The relationship between affective and normative commitment: Review and research agenda*. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 27(5), 645–663. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.372>

Bergman, M. E. (2006). The relationship between affective and normative commitment: Review and research agenda. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 27, 645–663. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.372>

Chen, Z. X., & Francesco, A. M. (2003). *The relationship between the three components of commitment and employee performance in China*. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 62(3), 490–510. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0001-8791\(02\)00064-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0001-8791(02)00064-7)

Costello, A. B., & Osborne, J. W. (2005). Best practices in exploratory factor analysis: Four recommendations for getting the most from your analysis. *Practical Assessment, Research, and Evaluation*, 10(1), 7. <https://doi.org/10.7275/jyj1-4868>

Fabrigar, L. R., Wegener, D. T., MacCallum, R. C., & Strahan, E. J. (1999). Evaluating the use of exploratory factor analysis in psychological research. *Psychological Methods*, 4(3), 272–299. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1082-989X.4.3.272>

Griffeth, R. W., Hom, P. W., & Gaertner, S. (2000). A meta-analysis of antecedents and correlates of employee turnover: Update, moderator tests, and research implications for the next millennium. *Journal of Management*, 26(3), 463–488. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920630002600305>

Hair, J. F., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C., & Sarstedt, M. (2022). *A Primer on Partial Least*

Henseler, J., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2015). A new criterion for assessing discriminant validity in variance-based structural equation modeling. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 43(1), 115–135. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-014-0403-8>

Jaros, S. J. (1997). An assessment of Meyer and Allen's (1991) three-component model of organizational commitment and turnover intentions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 51(3), 319–337. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.1995.1553>

Jaros, S. J. (2007). *Meyer and Allen model of organizational commitment: Measurement issues*. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(1), 161–173.

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(6), 961–973. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.82.6.961>

Kutner, M. H., Nachtsheim, C. J., & Neter, J. (2005). *Applied Linear Regression Models* (4th ed.). McGraw-Hill Irwin.

Lok, P., & Crawford, J. (2001). Antecedents of organizational commitment and the mediating role of job satisfaction. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 16(8), 594–613. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EUM000000000006302>

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://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.108.2.171>

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)

Meyer, J. P., Paunonen, S. V., Gellatly, I. R., Goffin, R. D., & Jackson, D. N. (1989). Organizational commitment and job performance: It's the nature of the commitment that counts. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74(1), 152–156. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.74.1.152>

Midi, H., Sarkar, S. K., & Rana, S. (2010). Collinearity diagnostics of binary logistic regression model. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Mathematics*, 13(3), 253–267. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09720502.2010.10700699>

Mowday, R. T., Steers, R. M., & Porter, L. W. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 14(2), 224–247. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-8791\(79\)90072-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-8791(79)90072-1)

O'Brien, R. M. (2007). A caution regarding rules of thumb for variance inflation factors. *Quality & Quantity*, 41(5), 673–690. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-006-9018-6>

Riketta, M. (2002). Attitudinal organizational commitment and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23(3), 257–266. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.141>

Snape, E., Wing-hung Lo, C., & Redman, T. (2008). The Three-Component Model of Occupational Commitment: A Comparative Study of Chinese and British Accountants. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 39(6), 765–781. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022108323789>

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://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.93.1.70>

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2013). *Using Multivariate Statistics* (6th ed.). Pearson Education.