FUTURITY OF SOCIAL SCIENCE

DOI: https://doi.org/10.57125/FS.2026.09.20.06

How to cite: Zalova-Nuriyeva, U., Mammadova, R., Ahmadova, K., Yunis, M., Asgerova, N., & Ahmadova, I. (2026). Validation of the organisational commitment scale in Azerbaijan: links with job satisfaction, work engagement, and anxiety. *Futurity of Social Sciences, 4*(3), 110–127. https://doi.org/10.57125/FS.2026.09.20.06

Validation of the Organisational Commitment Scale in Azerbaijan: Links with Job Satisfaction, Work Engagement, and Anxiety

Ulkar Zalova-Nuriyeva

PhD Candidate -Head of Personality Laboratory, Psychology Scientific Research Institute, Baku, Azerbaijan, https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6192-2007

Rahila Mammadova

Research Assistant, Psychology Scientific Research Institute, Baku, Azerbaijan, https://orcid.org/0009-0006-4050-1944

Khayala Ahmadova

Psychology Scientific Research Institute, Baku, Azerbaijan, https://orcid.org/0009-0006-5207-7941

Mahizar Yunis

Psychology Scientific Research Institute, Baku, Azerbaijan, https://orcid.org/0009-0003-5374-8987

Nigar Asgerova

Psychology Scientific Research Institute, Baku, Azerbaijan, https://orcid.org/0009-0009-0468-1214

©Copyright 2026 by the author(s) This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

Inara Ahmadova

Psychology Scientific Research Institute, Baku, Azerbaijan, https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8233-3615

****Corresponding author:** ulkar.z@psixologiyainstitutu.az.*

Received: May 16, 2026 | **Accepted:** August 12, 2026 | **Published:** September 4, 2026

Abstract: Organisational commitment is a key determinant of employee well-being and organisational effectiveness. This study aimed to translate, culturally adapt, and evaluate the psychometric properties of Meyer and Allen's Organisational Commitment Scale in the Azerbaijani context. A total of 237 employees participated in this cross-sectional study. The scale was translated using the forward–backward translation method and evaluated through exploratory factor analysis, standardised factor loadings of the revised two-factor model, item parameters from the Graded Response Model, reliability analysis, and construct validity testing. The findings supported a revised two-factor structure comprising affective commitment and continuance commitment, whereas the normative commitment dimension was not retained. The final 12-item scale demonstrated acceptable internal consistency (Cronbach's α = .78) and satisfactory item discrimination. Affective commitment was positively associated with work engagement and job satisfaction and negatively associated with anxiety, whereas continuance commitment showed weaker positive associations and no significant relationship with anxiety. Overall, the Azerbaijani version of the Organisational Commitment Scale demonstrated satisfactory reliability and construct validity, providing a useful instrument for assessing organisational commitment among Azerbaijani employees.

Keywords: Organisational commitment, psychometric validation, Azerbaijan.

Introduction

Organisational commitment is one of the most extensively studied constructs in organisational psychology because it explains the psychological bond that connects employees to their organisations (Kelman, 1958). It reflects employees' identification with organisational goals, their willingness to contribute to organisational success, and their desire to remain members of the organisation (Meyer & Herscovitch, 2001). Organisational commitment has consistently been associated with employees' motivation, personality characteristics, values, emotional attitudes, and psychological well-being (Ajzen, 1991). Over the past three decades, numerous empirical studies have shown that organisational commitment is a significant predictor of employee attitudes and behaviours, including job performance, organisational citizenship behaviour, absenteeism, turnover intention, and productivity (Felfe, 2006; Rosenstiel, 2015). Furthermore, research examining the psychometric properties of Meyer and Allen's Organisational Commitment Scale has consistently supported the construct validity of the three-component model, making it the most extensively

©Copyright 2026 by the author(s) This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

validated framework of organisational commitment to date (Dunham et al., 1994; Lease, 1998; Meyer, 1997; Meyer & Allen, 1997).

Research Problem

Organisational commitment is a key factor influencing employee well-being, work engagement, job satisfaction, and organisational performance. Although Meyer and Allen's Organisational Commitment Scale has been widely validated across different cultural contexts, no psychometrically validated Azerbaijani version has been available. The absence of a culturally adapted and validated instrument has limited research on organisational commitment in Azerbaijan and restricted the ability of researchers and practitioners to assess employees' organisational commitment using a reliable and valid measure. Therefore, validating the Organisational Commitment Scale for the Azerbaijani context is essential to support both scientific research and organisational practice.

Research Focus

This study focuses on the cultural adaptation and psychometric validation of Meyer and Allen's Organisational Commitment Scale among Azerbaijani employees. Specifically, it examines the scale's factor structure, reliability, and construct validity while investigating relationships among organisational commitment, work engagement, job satisfaction, and anxiety.

Research Aim

This study aimed to translate, culturally adapt, and evaluate the psychometric properties of Meyer and Allen's Organisational Commitment Scale in the Azerbaijani context. Specifically, the study examined the scale's factor structure, internal consistency, item characteristics, and construct validity, as well as its associations with work engagement, job satisfaction, and anxiety.

Research Questions

RQ1. Is the Azerbaijani adaptation of the Organisational Commitment Scale (OCS) a valid instrument for assessing organisational commitment among Azerbaijani employees?

RQ2. Does the adapted Organisational Commitment Scale demonstrate adequate reliability in measuring organisational commitment among Azerbaijani employees?

RQ3. What are the relationships between organisational commitment, job satisfaction, work engagement, and anxiety among Azerbaijani employees?

Literature Review

In today's rapidly changing labour market, globalisation, technological advances, and the widespread adoption of remote and hybrid work arrangements have altered traditional employment relationships. Employees are increasingly willing to change organisations, resulting in higher recruitment and training costs, loss of organisational knowledge, and reduced continuity in organisational performance. Consequently, understanding organisational commitment has become

©Copyright 2026 by the author(s) This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

increasingly important for both researchers and practitioners. Previous studies have consistently shown that employees with stronger organisational commitment are significantly less likely to leave their organisations (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Riketta, 2002; Tett & Meyer, 1993). Organisational commitment also contributes to organisational sustainability by reducing turnover intentions and improving work performance (Yücel, 2012). At the same time, workplace commitment has important implications for employees' psychological health, as emotional exhaustion, occupational stress, and well-being are closely associated with the nature of employees' commitment to their organisations (Wegge et al., 2006; Zalova-Nuriyeva et al., 2026).

The relationship between organisational commitment and employee well-being can be better understood through the perspective of Self-Determination Theory. According to this theory, employees' psychological functioning depends largely on satisfying three fundamental psychological needs: autonomy, competence, and relatedness (Baumeister & Leary, 1995; deCharms, 1968; Ryan & Deci, 2000; White, 1959; Zalova-Nuriyeva et al., 2025). Work environments that support these needs encourage autonomous motivation, whereas environments characterised by external pressure and control are more likely to undermine well-being. Organisational practices such as providing meaningful choices, constructive feedback, clear expectations, and emotional support facilitate autonomous regulation and contribute to employees' physical and psychological well-being while reducing occupational strain (Meyer & Maltin, 2010). Consequently, understanding different forms of organisational commitment is essential for explaining how workplace conditions influence employee well-being (Panaccio & Vandenberghe, 2010).

Employee loyalty pertains to an individual's integration within a specific organisation, encompassing their level of commitment and acceptance of the organisation’s goals and objectives (Rustamov et al., 2024). Self-esteem has been identified as an important personal resource that contributes to employees’ confidence, motivation, and organisational attitudes, with individuals who possess higher self-esteem tending to exhibit stronger commitment and more positive workplace behaviours (Aliyev et al., 2025). Furthermore, procrastination has been associated with unfavourable workplace outcomes, as employees who frequently postpone work-related tasks tend to demonstrate lower levels of organisational commitment and reduced work effectiveness (Aliyev et al., 2024; Asadov et al., 2024).

Among existing theoretical approaches, Meyer and Allen's (1997) Three-Component Model of Organisational Commitment is the most widely accepted framework for explaining employees' attachment to organisations. The model proposes that organisational commitment consists of three distinct yet related dimensions: affective commitment, continuance commitment, and normative commitment. These dimensions reflect different psychological reasons for remaining with an organisation and have been shown to predict important organisational outcomes, including employee turnover, organisational citizenship behaviour, absenteeism, lateness, and job performance (Meyer et al., 2002).

Affective commitment (AC) reflects employees' emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in their organisation. Employees with strong affective commitment stay because

©Copyright 2026 by the author(s) This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

they genuinely want to. Previous studies have demonstrated that affective commitment is negatively associated with occupational stress and burnout while promoting career development and resilience against workplace stressors (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007; Cohen, 1998; Hobfoll & Shirom, 2001; Lazarus & Folkman, 1984; Miller et al.). Employees with high affective commitment are also more likely to experience work environments that satisfy their basic psychological needs.

Continuance commitment (CC) refers to employees' decision to remain in an organisation because of the perceived costs associated with leaving. Research indicates that continuance commitment is generally associated with lower levels of well-being and higher psychological strain (Meyer & Allen, 1991). It has also been linked to negative emotional experiences and health complaints (Somers, 2009). When continuance commitment becomes the dominant form of attachment, intrinsic motivation may gradually decline, resulting in passive work behaviours, reduced creativity and initiative, lower productivity, and negative organisational outcomes (Meyer & Allen, 1997).

Normative commitment (NC) reflects employees' perceived moral obligation to remain with their organisation. Although normative commitment may protect against workplace stress when experienced as an internalised sense of responsibility, it may also contribute to emotional exhaustion when employees remain primarily because they feel obligated. Evidence from studies conducted among Chinese employees suggests that normative commitment may reflect culturally shaped expectations of loyalty and duty, which can increase the risk of burnout under demanding working conditions.

Because of its strong theoretical foundation and extensive empirical support, the Three-Component Model of Organisational Commitment has been translated and validated in numerous cultural contexts. Previous studies have reported successful adaptations in countries including China (Cheng & Stockdale, 2003) and South Korea (Yong Rhee, 2001), demonstrating the model’s cross-cultural applicability. Nevertheless, despite growing interest in organisational commitment research, no validated Azerbaijani version of the Organisational Commitment Scale is currently available.

The absence of a culturally appropriate and psychometrically sound instrument limits both organisational research and evidence-based human resource practices in Azerbaijan. Without a valid measure, it is difficult to evaluate employees' organisational commitment, identify factors associated with occupational well-being, or develop interventions to improve employee satisfaction, retention, and organisational effectiveness.

Therefore, this study aimed to translate and culturally adapt Meyer and Allen's Three-Component Organisational Commitment Scale into Azerbaijani and examine its psychometric properties. Specifically, the study evaluated the scale's factorial validity, reliability, and construct validity to determine whether it is an appropriate instrument for assessing organisational commitment among Azerbaijani employees.

©Copyright 2026 by the author(s) This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

Methods

Participants

The present study included a sample of 237 adults from Azerbaijan. Participants were recruited using convenience sampling, and data were collected through an online survey. Of the total sample, 214 participants (90.3%) were female, and 23 (9.7%) were male. The mean age was 27.88 years (*SD* = 8.32). Regarding marital status, 115 participants (48.5%) were single, 117 (49.4%) were married, and 5 (2.1%) were divorced. Concerning the number of children, 135 participants (57.0%) reported having no children, 30 (12.7%) had one child, 56 (23.6%) had two children, and 16 (6.8%) had more than two children. In terms of educational attainment, 23 participants (9.7%) had completed secondary education, 38 (16.0%) had vocational or technical education, 137 (57.8%) held a bachelor's degree, 37 (15.6%) held a master's degree, and 2 (0.8%) had a doctoral degree. Regarding the employment sector, 20 participants (8.4%) were self-employed or owned a business, 52 (21.9%) worked in the public sector, and 165 (69.6%) worked in the private sector. Regarding work arrangement, 203 participants (85.7%) worked on-site, 20 (8.4%) worked remotely (online), and 14 (5.9%) worked in a hybrid format. Regarding daily working hours, 36 participants (15.2%) worked 1–4 hours per day, 159 (67.1%) worked 5–8 hours, and 42 (17.7%) worked 9–14 hours. In terms of weekly workload, 26 participants (11.0%) worked 1–4 days per week, 54 (22.8%) worked 5 days, 138 (58.2%) worked 6 days, and 19 (8.0%) reported working every day (Table 1).

Table 1

Demographic Characteristics of the Participants (N = 237)

Variable	**Category**	**n**	**%**
Gender	Female	214	90.3
	Male	23	9.7
Education Level	Secondary education	23	9.7
	Vocational/Technical	38	16.0
	Bachelor's degree	137	57.8
	Master's degree	37	15.6
	PhD	2	0.8
Employment Sector	Self-employed/Business	20	8.4
	Public sector	52	21.9
	Private sector	165	69.6
Current Work Mode	On-site	203	85.7

©Copyright 2026 by the author(s) This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

	Online	20	8.4
	Hybrid	14	5.9
Daily Working Hours	1–4 hours	36	15.2
	5–8 hours	159	67.1
	9–14 hours	42	17.7
Working Days per Week	1–4 days	26	11.0
	5 days	54	22.8
	6 days	138	58.2
	Every day	19	8.0

Translation process

The scale was adapted into Azerbaijani following the forward–backward translation procedure, a method widely used in international research practice. First, two independent experts translated the original items into Azerbaijani. The version that most accurately reflected the content and best fit the local cultural context was then selected. Next, three experts reviewed the translated version and provided necessary revisions and recommendations. An independent bilingual expert then back-translated the revised version into English and compared it with the original scale to verify semantic equivalence. A pilot study involving 10 participants was conducted to evaluate the clarity and comprehensibility of the scale items. Based on the results, no further modifications were deemed necessary.

Measure

The Organisational Commitment Scale

(OCS) was developed by Meyer and Allen (1991) to assess employees' organisational commitment. The scale consists of 24 items organised into three subscales representing the core dimensions of organisational commitment: Affective Commitment (8 items), Continuance Commitment (8 items), and Normative Commitment (8 items). Each item is rated on a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

The Utrecht Work Engagement Scale

(UWES) was developed by Schaufeli, Salanova, et al. (2002). The UWES items are organised into three subscales that represent the primary dimensions of work engagement: VI (6 items), DE (5 items), and AB (6 items). Each item is rated on a 7-point frequency scale, with responses ranging from 0 (never) to 6 (always). Nahmatova, Aliyeva, Rustamova, Nuriyeva, and Rustamov (2024) adapted the scale into Azerbaijani. In the adaptation process, the scale's linguistic validity, cultural

©Copyright 2026 by the author(s) This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

relevance, and psychometric properties were tested and confirmed. The adapted version maintains the original three-factor structure and demonstrates high internal consistency and construct validity in the Azerbaijani context (Nahmatova et al., 2024).

Generic Job Satisfaction Scale

(GJSS) Macdonald and MacIntyre (1997) developed it to assess employees' overall job satisfaction. The scale consists of 10 items designed to measure individuals' subjective satisfaction with various aspects of their work (e.g., *"I get along with my supervisor"* and *"I feel good about my job"*). Respondents rate items on a 5-point Likert scale, from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Higher scores indicate greater levels of job satisfaction. In addition to providing an overall measure of job satisfaction, the scale captures satisfaction with specific aspects of work, such as salary, the work environment, supervision, and relationships with colleagues. Previous studies have demonstrated that the scale has good internal consistency, with Cronbach's alpha coefficients typically ranging from .80 to .90 across different populations.

The Generalised Anxiety Disorder-7

(GAD-7) was developed by Spitzer et al. to identify probable cases of generalised anxiety disorder and assess symptom severity. The scale consists of seven items measuring common anxiety symptoms, such as *"Feeling afraid, as if something awful might happen."* Responses are rated on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from 0 (*not at all*) to 3 (*nearly every day*). The overall GAD-7 has demonstrated excellent internal consistency, with a Cronbach's α coefficient of 0.895, exceeding the recommended threshold of 0.80. The Azerbaijani version of the GAD-7 was adapted and psychometrically validated by Aliyev et al. in the study *Adaptation of the Generalised Anxiety Disorder Scale for Azerbaijan: Its Relationship with Well-Being, Interpersonal Support, Depression, and Stress* (Aliyev et al., 2025), and was used in the present study.

Data Analysis

All statistical analyses were conducted using R and SPSS software. The suitability of the sample for factor analysis was initially assessed using the Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin (KMO) measure and Bartlett's test of sphericity. The factor structure of the scale was examined using exploratory factor analysis (EFA), based on parallel analysis and the minimum residual extraction method. Standardised factor loadings of the revised two-factor model were subsequently examined to evaluate the adequacy of the final factor structure. The scale's internal consistency was evaluated using Cronbach's alpha coefficient. Item-level characteristics were examined through descriptive statistics, item-total correlations, and item parameters estimated using the Graded Response Model (GRM). Construct validity was assessed by examining relationships among organisational commitment, work engagement, job satisfaction, and anxiety using Pearson correlation analysis.

Ethics

The study was carried out in accordance with the ethical principles of the Declaration of Helsinki. The Ethics Committee of the Psychology Scientific Research Institute in Baku, Azerbaijan,

©Copyright 2026 by the author(s) This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

granted ethical approval in advance. Participation was voluntary, and informed consent was obtained from all subjects involved.

Results

The Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin (KMO) measure was calculated to assess sample adequacy for factor analysis. The overall KMO value was 0.77, indicating acceptable sampling adequacy and suggesting that the correlations among the items were sufficiently compact to identify underlying latent factors. In addition, Bartlett's test of sphericity was statistically significant, $\chi^2(120) = 1065.95$, $p < .001$, indicating that the correlation matrix differed significantly from an identity matrix. This result indicates that the items were sufficiently correlated and that the data were suitable for conducting factor analysis. Therefore, the results supported proceeding with exploratory factor analysis (EFA) (Table 2).

Table 2

Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin (KMO) Measure and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity

Measure	Value
Overall KMO	0.77
Bartlett's χ^2	1065.95
df	120
p	< .001

Note. The overall KMO value of 0.77 indicates acceptable sampling adequacy. Bartlett's test of sphericity was statistically significant, $\chi^2(120) = 1065.95$, $p < .001$, suggesting that the correlation matrix was appropriate for factor analysis.

Although the original scale was developed with a three-factor structure, the exploratory factor analysis (EFA) conducted on the Azerbaijani sample supported a two-factor solution. During factor extraction, items were retained only if they demonstrated adequate factor loadings (≥ .30), conceptual consistency with the underlying construct, and a clear loading on a single factor. Items with low factor loadings, substantial cross-loadings, or failure to load meaningfully on any factor were excluded from the final solution. As a result, Items Q4, Q5, Q9, and Q12 were removed because they did not meet these criteria. In addition, all items representing the Normative Commitment dimension did not emerge as a distinct factor and were therefore excluded from the final version of the scale. These findings suggest that, within the Azerbaijani cultural context, the normative commitment dimension was not empirically distinguishable from the other dimensions of organisational commitment.

The retained two-factor structure appears to reflect better how Azerbaijani participants conceptualise organisational commitment. The first factor, Affective Commitment, consisted of six items (Q1, Q2, Q3, Q6, Q7, and Q8), with standardised factor loadings ranging from .521 to .794.

©Copyright 2026 by the author(s) This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

The highest loading was observed for Q1 (β = .794), indicating that this item was the strongest indicator of the affective commitment construct, whereas Q6 showed the lowest loading (β = .521). Nevertheless, all loadings exceeded the commonly recommended minimum threshold of .30, indicating acceptable relationships between the items and their underlying latent factor.

The second factor, Continuance Commitment**,** also consisted of six items (Q10, Q11, Q13, Q14, Q15, and Q16), with standardised factor loadings ranging from .321 to .850. Q10 demonstrated the strongest association with the latent construct (β = .850), whereas Q14 exhibited the lowest loading (β = .321). Although Q14's loading was relatively low, it exceeded the minimum acceptable criterion (.30) and was retained because it represented an important conceptual aspect of continuance commitment. Overall, the factor loadings indicate that the retained items adequately represent their respective latent dimensions (Table 3).

Table 3

Standardised Factor Loadings of the Revised Two-Factor Model

Item	**Factor**	**Standardized loading (β)**
Q1	Affective commitment	0.794
Q2	Affective commitment	0.577
Q3	Affective commitment	0.661
Q6	Affective commitment	0.521
Q7	Affective commitment	0.641
Q8	Affective commitment	0.537
Q10	Continuance commitment	0.850
Q11	Continuance commitment	0.729
Q13	Continuance commitment	0.494
Q14	Continuance commitment	0.321
Q15	Continuance commitment	0.568
Q16	Continuance commitment	0.662

The internal consistency reliability of the Azerbaijani version of the scale was examined using Cronbach's alpha coefficient. The results showed acceptable internal consistency, with a Cronbach's alpha of .78. The standardised Cronbach's alpha was also .78, indicating that the reliability estimate remained stable after item standardisation. The average inter-item correlation was .23, suggesting adequate homogeneity among the items while indicating that they assess related but not redundant aspects of the construct. Furthermore, the 95% confidence interval for Cronbach's alpha ranged

©Copyright 2026 by the author(s) This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

from .74 to .82, demonstrating that the reliability coefficient was consistently within the acceptable range. Overall, these findings indicate that the 12-item Azerbaijani version of the scale possesses satisfactory internal consistency and can be considered a reliable instrument for assessing organisational commitment (Table 4).

Table 4

Overall Reliability of the Revised 12-Item Scale

Statistic	**Value**
Number of items	12
Sample size (N)	237
Cronbach's α	0.78
Standardized α	0.78
Average inter-item correlation	0.23
95% CI for α	0.74–0.82

The GRM results indicated that item discrimination parameters ranged from 0.412 to 2.743, suggesting that most items demonstrated acceptable to high discrimination capacity. The strongest discrimination was observed for Q10 (a = 2.743), followed by Q1 (a = 1.741) and Q11 (a = 1.618). These items differentiated individuals with different levels of the latent trait. Several items showed moderate discrimination, including Q6 (*a* = 0.837), Q8 (*a* = 0.864), and Q13 (*a* = 0.823). Item Q14 demonstrated the lowest discrimination (*a* = 0.412), indicating limited ability to distinguish respondents across different levels of the measured construct. The threshold parameters showed an ordered progression across response categories, indicating that the Likert response options functioned appropriately (Table 5).

Table 5

Item parameters from the Graded Response Model

Item	**Discrimination (a)**	**b1**	**b2**	**b3**	**b4**
Q1	1.741	−2.110	−1.297	0.132	1.269
Q2	1.154	−2.190	−1.422	0.364	1.575
Q3	1.327	−1.987	−1.016	0.167	1.578
Q6	0.837	−3.086	−1.527	0.081	1.490
Q7	1.428	−2.380	−1.543	−0.048	1.416

©Copyright 2026 by the author(s) This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

Q8	0.864	−3.411	−1.822	0.081	1.593
Q10	2.743	−1.476	−0.740	0.167	1.319
Q11	1.618	−2.076	−0.996	0.381	1.508
Q13	0.823	−3.730	−2.019	0.413	2.747
Q14	0.412	−4.944	−2.213	1.615	7.620
Q15	0.998	−2.475	−1.228	0.496	3.007
Q16	1.448	−1.991	−0.991	0.535	2.142

Note. a = item discrimination parameter; *b1–b4* = threshold parameters between adjacent response categories.

Pearson correlation analysis revealed that affective commitment was moderately and positively correlated with work engagement ($r = .533$, $p < .001$) and job satisfaction ($r = .587$, $p < .001$). Continuance commitment showed weak-to-moderate positive correlations with work engagement ($r = .337$, $p < .001$) and job satisfaction ($r = .394$, $p < .001$). Anxiety symptoms were significantly and negatively correlated with affective commitment ($r = −.322$, $p < .001$), work engagement ($r = −.319$, $p < .001$), and job satisfaction ($r = −.299$, $p < .001$). However, no statistically significant association was found between anxiety and continuance commitment ($r = −.053$, $p = .41$). The strongest correlation was observed between work engagement and job satisfaction ($r = .777$, $p < .001$), indicating a strong positive relationship between these two constructs (Table 6).

Table 6

Pearson Correlations Among the Study Variables

Variable	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
1. Affective commitment	1				
2. Continuance commitment	.414**	1			
3. Anxiety	−.322**	−.053	1		
4. Work engagement	.533**	.337**	−.319**	1	
5. Generic Job Satisfaction	.587**	.394**	−.299**	.777**	1

Note. $p < .05$, $p < .01$.

Discussion

Investigating employees' organisational commitment and their attitudes toward the workplace is essential for understanding organisational behaviour, employee motivation, job satisfaction, and organisational performance. Organisational commitment is a key psychological construct reflecting employees' attachment to their organisation. It is closely associated with employees' intention to

©Copyright 2026 by the author(s) This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

remain in the organisation, work attitudes, and organisational effectiveness. In this regard, the Organisational Commitment Scale is one of the most widely used instruments for assessing employees' commitment to their organisation. The scale has been extensively applied and culturally adapted in numerous countries, including Turkey (İlhan, 2006), India (Meyer & Allen, 1991), China (Lam & Hui, 1995), Brazil (Meyer et al., 1993), Russia (Voronov, 2005), and others. Findings from these adaptation studies have consistently demonstrated that the scale is a reliable and valid instrument for assessing organisational commitment across different cultural settings. Therefore, the present study aimed to adapt the Organisational Commitment Scale into Azerbaijani and to examine its factor structure, internal consistency, and psychometric properties in the Azerbaijani cultural and organisational context.

The findings demonstrated that the Azerbaijani version of the scale possesses satisfactory psychometric properties. The internal consistency coefficient (Cronbach's α = .78) exceeded the minimum recommended threshold of .70 (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994), indicating good reliability. Although the original instrument proposes a three-factor structure consisting of affective, continuance, and normative commitment, the normative commitment dimension did not emerge as a distinct factor in the Azerbaijani sample.

Although the internal consistency coefficient (Cronbach's α = .78) was slightly lower than those reported in some previous cross-cultural adaptation studies, it exceeded the recommended minimum threshold of .70 and therefore indicates acceptable reliability for research purposes (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). The relatively modest reliability coefficient may reflect cultural differences in interpreting organisational commitment, particularly after removing the normative commitment dimension, as well as the heterogeneous characteristics of the study sample.

This discrepancy may reflect cultural differences in how organisational commitment is conceptualised. In collectivistic and transition-economy contexts such as Azerbaijan, feelings of moral obligation toward the organisation may be more closely intertwined with employees' emotional attachment or perceived costs of leaving the organisation rather than functioning as an independent construct. Consequently, the two-factor structure identified in the present study appears to provide a more culturally appropriate representation of organisational commitment in the Azerbaijani context.

Furthermore, the correlation analyses provided additional evidence of the scale’s construct validity. Affective commitment was moderately and positively associated with work engagement and job satisfaction, suggesting that employees with stronger emotional attachment to their organisation tend to be more engaged in their work and experience higher levels of job satisfaction. Continuance commitment also demonstrated positive, although weaker, associations with these variables. In contrast, anxiety was negatively associated with affective commitment, work engagement, and job satisfaction but showed no significant relationship with continuance commitment. This finding suggests that continuance commitment is influenced primarily by the perceived costs of leaving the organisation rather than employees' psychological well-being. Overall, the observed pattern of

©Copyright 2026 by the author(s) This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

correlations was consistent with theoretical expectations and further supports the construct validity of the Azerbaijani version of the Organisational Commitment Scale.

The findings of the present study are broadly consistent with previous cross-cultural adaptations in China (Cheng & Stockdale, 2003), South Korea (Yong Rhee, 2001), and Türkiye (İlhan, 2006), which also supported the applicability of Meyer and Allen's organisational commitment framework across different cultural settings. However, unlike several previous studies that retained the original three-factor structure, the Azerbaijani adaptation supported a two-factor solution, suggesting that the normative commitment dimension may be interpreted differently within the Azerbaijani cultural context. This finding highlights the importance of considering cultural characteristics when adapting organisational commitment measures.

Limitation

Several limitations should be considered when interpreting this study's findings. Data were collected through an online survey, limiting control over the conditions under which participants completed the questionnaire. In addition, the sample consisted predominantly of young, highly educated female employees recruited through convenience sampling, which may limit the generalizability of the findings to the broader Azerbaijani workforce. Finally, interpret the results within Azerbaijan's specific sociocultural and organisational context, as organisational commitment may be conceptualised differently across cultures.

Conclusion

The Azerbaijani version of the Organisational Commitment Scale demonstrated satisfactory reliability and construct validity. The findings suggest that a two-factor structure may represent organisational commitment in the Azerbaijani cultural context. The adapted instrument provides researchers and practitioners with a reliable tool for assessing organisational commitment and may facilitate future research and organisational interventions in Azerbaijan.

Future Research Suggestions

Future studies should examine the psychometric properties of the Azerbaijani version of the Organisational Commitment Scale using larger and more diverse samples from different occupational sectors. Longitudinal studies and measurement invariance analyses across demographic groups are also recommended.

Acknowledgments

There are no acknowledgements.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

©Copyright 2026 by the author(s) This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

Funding

The authors received no financial support for the research, authorship, or preparation of this manuscript.

References

Aliyev, B., Rustamov, E., Zalova Nuriyeva, U., Huseinova, L., Yusifova, T., & Mammadova, R. (2025). Adaptation of the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale for use among Azerbaijani adults: Psychometric evaluation and associations with life satisfaction, resilience, depression, anxiety, and stress. *ISRG Journal of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences, 3*(2), 341–350. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15266368

Aliyev, B., Asadov, F., Mammadova, R., Asgerova, N., Isayeva, L., Zalova Nuriyeva, U., & Rustamov, E. (2024). An Azerbaijani adaptation of the Tuckman Procrastination Scale*: Its association with academic motivation and self-efficacy*. *International Journal of Contemporary Educational Research, 11*(4), 525–536. https://doi.org/10.33200/ijcer.744

Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behaviour. *Organisational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes, 50*(2), 179–211. https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(91)90020-T

Aliyev, B., Zalova-Nuriyeva, U., Isayeva, L., Huseynova, L., Mekhtiyeva, N., & Mammadova, R. (2026). Adaptation of the Generalised Anxiety Disorder Scale for Azerbaijan: Its relationship with well-being, interpersonal support, depression, and stress. *Psychiatry, Psychotherapy and Clinical Psychology, 17*(1), 8–17. https://doi.org/10.34883/PI.2026.17.1.001

Asadov, F., Kazımzade, C., Asgerova, N., Rustamova, N., Nahmatova, U., & Rustamov, E. (2024). Assessing the Azerbaijani Professional Identity Scale for Counsellors*: An exploration of relationships with professional identity, mental well-being, job satisfaction, and psychological distress*. *Technium Education and Humanities, 9*. https://doi.org/10.47577/teh.v9i.11546

Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The Job Demands–Resources model: State of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 22*(3), 309–328. https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940710733115

Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin, 117*(3), 497–529. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.117.3.497

Cheng, Y., & Stockdale, M. S. (2003). The validity of the Three-Component Model of organisational commitment in a Chinese context. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour, 62*(3), 465–489. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0001-8791(02)00063-5

Cohen, A. (1998). An examination of the relationship between commitments and culture among five cultural groups of Israeli teachers. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 29*(2), 256–275. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022198292003

©Copyright 2026 by the author(s) This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

deCharms, R. (1968). *Personal causation: The internal affective determinants of behaviour*. Academic Press.

Dunham, R. B., Grube, J. A., & Castaneda, M. B. (1994). Organisational commitment: The utility of an integrative definition. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 79*(3), 370–380. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.79.3.370

Felfe, J. (2006). *Organisationspsychologie: Mitarbeiterbindung und Führung* (2. Aufl.). Hogrefe.

Hobfoll, S. E., & Shirom, A. (2001). Conservation of resources theory: Applications to stress and management in the workplace. In R. T. Golembiewski (Ed.), *Handbook of organisational behaviour* (2nd ed., pp. 57–80). Marcel Dekker.

Kelman, H. C. (1958). Compliance, identification, and internalisation: Three processes of attitude change. *Journal of Conflict Resolution, 2*(1), 51–60. https://doi.org/10.1177/002200275800200106

Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S. (1984). *Stress, appraisal, and coping*. Springer.

Lease, S. H. (1998). Annual review, 1993–1997: Work attitudes and outcomes. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour, 53*(2), 154–183. https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.1998.1662

Mathieu, J. E., & Zajac, D. M. (1990). A review and meta-analysis of the antecedents, correlates, and consequences of organisational commitment. *Psychological Bulletin, 108*(2), 171–194. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.108.2.171

Meyer, J. P. (1997). Organisational commitment. In C. L. Cooper & I. T. Robertson (Eds.), *International review of industrial and organisational psychology* (Vol. 12, pp. 175–228). John Wiley & Sons.

Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualisation of organisational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review, 1*(1), 61–89. https://doi.org/10.1016/1053-4822(91)90011-Z

Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1997). *Commitment in the workplace: Theory, research, and application*. Sage Publications.

Meyer, J. P., & Herscovitch, L. (2001). Commitment in the workplace: Toward a general model. *Human Resource Management Review, 11*(3), 299–326. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1053-4822(00)00053-X

Meyer, J. P., & Maltin, E. R. (2010). Employee commitment and well-being: A critical review, theoretical framework and research agenda. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour, 77*(2), 323–337. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2010.04.007

Meyer, J. P., Stanley, D. J., Herscovitch, L., & Topolnytsky, L. (2002). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organisation: A meta-analysis of antecedents, correlates, and

©Copyright 2026 by the author(s) This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour, 61*(1), 20–52. https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.2001.1842

Miller, K. I., Ellis, B. H., Zook, E. G., & Lyles, J. S. (1990). An integrated model of communication, stress, and burnout in the workplace. *Communication Research, 17*(3), 300–326. https://doi.org/10.1177/009365090017003002

Panaccio, A., & Vandenberghe, C. (2010). The relationships of role clarity and organisation-based self-esteem to commitment to supervisors and organisations and turnover intentions. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 40*(6), 1455–1485. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2010.00627.x

Riketta, M. (2002). Attitudinal organisational commitment and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Organisational Behaviour, 23*(3), 257–266. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.141

Rosenstiel, L. von. (2015). *Grundlagen der Organisationspsychologie: Basiswissen und Anwendungshinweise* (7. Aufl.). Schäffer-Poeschel.

Rustamov, E., Rustamova, N., Nahmatova, U., Aliyeva, M., & Zalova Nuriyeva, U. (2024). Azerbaijani adaptation of the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale: Investigating its relationship with psychological distress and work-life satisfaction. *Technium Social Sciences Journal, 68*, 68–80. https://doi.org/10.47577/tssj.v68i1.11801

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist, 55*(1), 68–78. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.68

Somers, M. J. (2009). The combined influence of affective, continuance and normative commitment on employee withdrawal. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour, 74*(1), 75–81. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2008.10.006

Tett, R. P., & Meyer, J. P. (1993). Job satisfaction, organisational commitment, turnover intention, and turnover: Path analyses based on meta-analytic findings. *Personnel Psychology, 46*(2), 259–293. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1993.tb00874.x

Wegge, J., Schmidt, K.-H., Parkes, C., & van Dick, R. (2006). Taking a sickie: Job satisfaction and organisational commitment as interactive predictors of absenteeism in a public organisation. *Journal of Occupational and Organisational Psychology, 79*(1), 77–89. https://doi.org/10.1348/096317905X52641

White, R. W. (1959). Motivation reconsidered: The concept of competence. *Psychological Review, 66*(5), 297–333. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0040934

Yücel, İ. (2012). Examining the relationships among job satisfaction, organisational commitment, and turnover intention: An empirical study. *International Journal of Business and Management, 7*(20), 44–58. https://doi.org/10.5539/ijbm.v7n20p44

©Copyright 2026 by the author(s) This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

Zalova-Nuriyeva, U., Mammadova, R., Nasibova, E., Babazade, Z., Rustamov, E., & Maharova, V. (2026). Revisiting the multidimensional structure of empathy: Psychometric evaluation of the Interpersonal Reactivity Index in a non-Western context. *Futurity of Social Sciences, 4*(2), 152–173. https://doi.org/10.57125/FS.2026.06.20.08

Zalova Nuriyeva, U., Aliyev, B., Rustamov, E., Mammadova, R., Naghiyeva, A., & Dadashzada, F. (2025). Adaptation of the Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale to Azerbaijani: Investigating its relationship with work engagement, anxiety, and job satisfaction. *Educational Psychology Journal, 14*(2), 57–68. https://doi.org/10.15294/epj.v14i2.36889

©Copyright 2026 by the author(s) This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.