ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT: An Analysis from the Psychosociological Perspective

Anizaura Lídia Rodrigues de Souza
Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais - UFMG
Centro Universitário do Leste de Minas Gerais – Unileste
Departamento de Psicologia do Centro Universitário do Leste de Minas Gerais - Campus Coronel Fabriciano:
Av. Tâncrodo Neves, 3500, B. Universitário, 35170-056
E-mail: anizaura@gmail.com

Livia de Oliveira Borges
Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais – UFMG
Departamento de Psicologia, da Faculdade de Filosofia e Ciências Humanas (FAFICH) da Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais (UFMG), Sala 4066. Campos Pampulha. Av. Antônio Carlos, 6627. CEP 31270-901.

Institutional support provided to the paper:
Centro Universitário do Leste de Minas Gerais – Unileste; CAPES (Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior); and CNPq (Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico)

ABSTRACT
This paper aimed to analyze articles on organizational commitment (OC) in order to reflect on the application and the importance of a psychosociological perspective in investigation on the phenomenon and in what ways the research advanced toward this direction. We considered publications in 2013, using the PsycInfo and SciELO databases, with the term (Portuguese and English): organizational commitment. Initially, we identified 21 articles, but we included 11 of them in the analysis. We categorized them according to the goal, the focused phenomena, technical procedures and levels of measurement. The results indicated a variety of focused phenomena articulated to OC, and most referred to the attitudes of individuals in front of their organizations and their work. Most of articles applied measures of individual level and only four combined this level to others. Despite advances in psychosociological aspects in the articles, this perspective has not completely proven itself as trend.
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1. INTRODUCTION
Theories of organizational commitment (OC) have become more complex, given its propositions of multifaceted structure – affective, normative, calculative – and multiple foci – the organization, the team and the career (Meyer, Stanley, & Vandenberg, 2013). There are studies recently replacing the calculative facet, for dimensions: lack of employment alternatives and sacrifices associated with exit (Stanley, Vandenberghe, Vandenberg, & Bentein, 2013).

In parallel to the advances of such studies, there are complex transformations or reordering in society as the construction of different social relations – more transient and volatile –, the exacerbation of individualism, the search for economic success, the liberalization of markets and precarization of employment (Bauman, 2001; Lévy, Nicolai, Enriquez, & Dubost, 1994). Society signaled for a waiver of the lasting social contracts and social and labor systems became weakened, affecting long-term projects established between employees and organizations, including the maintenance of OC.

Since the 80s, in literature (e.g., Álvaro, 1995; Álvaro, Garrido, Schweiger, & Torregrossa, 2007; Ferreira, Neves, Abreu, & Caetano, 1998; Katzell, 1994; Lapassade, 1983; Leitão, 1987), there are trends to adopting a more psychosociological perspective, able to integrate multiple levels of analysis (like individual, organizational interpersonal and societal), place the phenomena in the socio-historical context and adopt different methodological strategies. Such trends assume that these levels of analysis are interdependent, complementary and inseparable, reflecting the insertion of people in all of them. However, according to Tavares (2011), in the literature on the tie of people to organizations, the psycho level of group analysis prevails, whilst calling for a level of organizational-societal analysis, revealing that the trends mentioned yet challenge the scientific field.
Aware of this direction, this paper aims to analyze articles on OC, published in 2013, in order to reflect on the application, influence and the importance of a psychosociological perspective. Which have the trends identified since the 80s materialized? We will analyze, then, on what aspects the research improved and if this perspective has established itself as a trend for future researches or if the researches have incorporate its characteristics.

1.1 – The work and organizational psychosociology: a perspective of analysis
Understood as a discipline or intermediate analytic perspective between the social psychology and sociology, the psychosociology deals with the interaction, intends to rupture the dichotomy between individual and society and considers itself as integrative. It engages in understanding how individuals and groups perceive the society and act in it, and how they affect and are affected by social structures (Alvaro, Torregrosa, & Garrido, 1992; Leitão, 1987; Machado & Roedel, 1994). In other words, it is concerned with comprehension of people in everyday situations in their social groups and work.

Therefore, its field of research and reflection faces the understanding of groups, communities, organizations, institutions, which are considered concrete aspects that influence people's lives and are created, managed and processed by them. It examines the phenomena simultaneously in their psychological and social dimensions. In addition, such perspective should consider them in the concrete socio-historical conditions wherein they procedurally develop (Álvaro et al., 2007; Machado & Roedel, 1994; Goulart, s/d; Martin-Baró, 1983; Wortmeyer, 2008).

According to Lapassade (1983), organizations as research object recently emerged in line with the evolution of their complexity and the phenomena that occur in them. Social psychology and sociology did not account for analyzing them, despite the contributions and influence of social psychologists like Katz and Kahn (Ferreira et al., 1998; Katz & Kahn, 1996). In the context of Psychology, a prevailing trend despised the analysis of organizational structures as social phenomena, while it developed micro-approaches centered on the individual level. In contrast, sociology focused their explanations in societal level processes.

The work and organizational psychosociology prioritizes the relationship between people and their work and organizations. Thus comprises that the working conditions, their content, worker's capabilities, its needs, culture, perceptions and experiences are key to explaining the various aspects of people's behavior and its links with the operation of the organization. Such aspects may also to influence health, income, satisfaction and organizational ties, including the workers' commitment (Ferreira et al., 1998). In other words, the application of the psychosociological perspective to explain the phenomena tends to build models that incorporate aspects of the individual (e.g., worker's ability and needs) to macro-social aspects (e.g., culture) passing through organizational aspects (e.g., working conditions and job content) among other intermediate levels. For consequence, it considers that a level of analysis intersects with another. For example, the individual needs may be represented in it cultural and socio-economic environment influences. Therefore, we mentioned that it considers itself as integrative.

This perspective does not consider individuals, groups and companies as having a demand in itself, regardless of the others with which they are articulated. These demands only make sense in relation to each other and should be interpreted in whole of its complexity (Katzell, 1994; Kozlowski & Klein, 2000; Lévy et al., 1994). As already argued by Alderfer and Smith (1982), the dynamics between individuals and different organizational groups should be reviewed in light of a broader context – organizational and societal – paying attention to factors that affect and shape substantially the ties developed in the organizational context, including OC.

Besides the trend to highlight the complexity of the phenomena and from a methodological point of view, the adoption of psychosociological perspective gives rise to a trend to embrace the application of different methodological strategies, as well as reject the dichotomy between techniques of qualitative and quantitative data analysis (Álvaro, 1995; Carvalho, Pedrosa & Amorim, 2006; Katzell, 1994).

The existence of various analytic perspectives in the same scientific field tends to incentive the elaborations of critics from one to one as well as the increasing the visibility of limits and challenges. Because of this, we consider that the researches in generally of the field can improve their quality by incorporating suggestions and orientations from one perspective without meaning to adhere to the whole of that point of view. Then, in the next section, we are going to review the dominant theoretical conceptions of OC.

1.2 – Dominant theoretical conceptions of OC
It is difficult to identify when and what was the pioneering concept to get highlight on OC, but it is generally agreed that there is a multiplicity of understandings (Carvalho, Alves, Peixoto, & Bastos, 2011; Cohen, 2007;
Rodrigues & Bastos, 2012). One of the first conceptions of OC to gain visibility was developed by Becker (1960), and was associated with sociological perspective. He embraced only one dimension and called it instrumental or calculative commitment. He defined OC as the product of exchanges between the individuals and the organizations that are based on the expectations of immediate or future rewards, contingent costs and loss of side-bets (investment in something of value, such as time, money and individuals’ effort, which are considered at the time of evaluating employment alternatives). OC thus would be a tendency to remain engaged due to costs associated with its exit. Also according to the author, the way and the intensity of investing in the organization may vary from person to person.

A second conception emerged from the work made by Mowday, Porter and Steers (1979), called affective commitment. For these authors, such construct would consist to a state in which an individual identifies itself with an organization and its goals, wishing to remain affiliated with it in order to accomplish his goals. Three dimensions would be associated with the concept: 1) a willingness to perform a significant effort for the organization; 2) a strong belief and acceptance of the goals; 3) and the desire to remain affiliated to the organization.

Later, part of the researches also happened to reference OC as a feeling, a desire or an intent of the employee to remain in its organization, prevailing an affective and attitudinal response (Mottaz, 1987). Currently, affective OC is among the most studied components of OC. Meyer, Allen and Gellatly (1990) emphasized that the difference between the two understandings lies in the fact that employees with high affective OC remain in organizations because they want to, while those with high calculative OC remain there by necessity or to avoid harm themselves.

The third conception in the OC study is the normative, relating to the recognition of moral obligations and duties to the organization, which also accompany or cover with feelings of guilt, discomfort, apprehension and worry, when the employee thinks or plans to exit from the organization. This OC vision has as foundations the regulatory controls used by organizations, i.e. the rules, regulations, its mission and organizational values which affects individual behavior in the desired direction (Wiener, 1982). Thus, such vision prescribes that the organization needs to establish a set of values that help its acceptance among its employees. In researches, the normative conception has received less attention (McInnis, Meyer, & Feldman, 2009; Meyer & Parfyonova, 2010).

Basically the first studies of commitment adopted a unidimensional character and has describe it as a force that directs the individual to maintain a conduct standard relevant to one or more foci, for example: organization, career and union (Meyer & Herscovitch, 2001). In an attempt to integrate the different ways presented on OC and analyze it more broadly, Meyer and Allen (1991) developed the three-dimensional model including affective, calculative and normative concepts, previously mentioned. The reasons for the employee to remain working in the organization are therefore underlying the psychological nature of the model's three components, that is, of desire, of necessity and of moral obligation to continue in the organization. Employees can submit diversified OC bonds, composed by combining different levels of these components, such as a strong need and obligation, combined with a low desire to remain in the organization. It is not clear that these components are the only ones or that each one represents a unitary construct. OC can assume different standards, according to the entities related to it, for example, the organization or career (Meyer & Allen, 1991). This model leveraged international studies over the past 20 years. Despite representing significant progress toward the concept of the phenomenon, there is no consensus for its adoption in the study area (Bastos, Rodrigues, Moscon, Silva, & Pine, 2013). There are publications, for example, in which the authors have adopted a four-dimensional model – affective, normative, lack of employment alternatives and sacrifices associated with exit – for the measurement of OC (Stanley et al., 2013).

The prevalence of adoption of multidimensional concepts that literature indicates by itself does not reveal psychosociological trends, but we consider important to mention that this prevalence may mean a preparation or construction of requirement to advance towards such trends. The conceptual severity expressed in the treatment of phenomenon dimensionality leads to a better approximation of the real complexity. The dimensionality in these terms is an openness to psychosociological approach because, in the case of a phenomenon conceived as a way to bond (individual-work and individual-organization), its dimensions are sides of worker's relationship with the work and the organization. Thus, the dimensionality presuppose the organizational commitment phenomenon thought on the socio-historical context (organizational and societal). In the end, reflecting from the concepts mentioned above for each dimension, we conclude that there is, for example, normative commitment without the standards and organization values, there is no affective commitment without appreciation of the organization by society, etc. We also understand that the summarized literature just corroborate the relevance of our goal.
We analyzed articles published in 2013, containing in its scope or purpose of researching on OC. The searches for articles were performed in PsycInfo and Scielo databases, using the term (Portuguese and English): organizational commitment. Then, we performed a reading of the found articles to verify their suitability for the objective of this paper. As inclusion criterion, we opted for articles that adopted OC as the main phenomenon (such as criterion or antecedent variables) and that could be included within the field of Work and Organizational Psychology. We excluded those who treated them as equivalent or as consequent variable. Adopted such criteria, from 21 found articles in the initial search, 11 of them were included in the analysis.

We have examined the articles based on the above theoretical framework. The plan of analysis consisted in categorizing them regarding objectives, focused phenomena, procedures (data collection and analysis) and measurement levels (e.g. individual, group, organizational, societal) covered by them. When the articles did not spelled out the analytic levels, their ratings were based on reading comprehension.

3 – RESULTS
Most articles (f = 6) measured OC three-dimensionally, supporting in the model of Meyer and Allen (1991). Three of them chose to measure only the affective dimension and two assessed the affective and continuation (calculative) dimensions of OC. We note that an article (Gallus, Walsh, van Driel, Gouge, & Antolíć, 2013) did not mention the OC dimensionality, however, by the examples used in the text, we understand that it considered only with the affective OC.

From the analyzed set of articles, four focused the OC dimensions as antecedent variables and seven as criterion (Table 1). They were taken as antecedent variables: perception of organizational support (f = 3); intention to remain in the organization/turnover (f = 2); organizational justice (f = 2); leadership (toxic and transformational) (f = 2); organizational learning (f = 1); partner's attitudes to the work schedule (f = 1); affective commitment of the spouse with the worker's organization (f = 1); work/family conflict (f = 1); work/job counterpart for family (f = 1); mobility between different status groups (f = 1); perception of organizational prestige (f = 1); perception of family support (f = 1); consolidation processes of psychosocial care centers (f = 1); organizational reciprocity (f = 1); satisfaction with job and leadership (f = 1); having or not deficiency (f = 1); organizational transformations (e.g. change of positions and sectors, salary increase, physical structure) (f = 1); and sociodemographic variables (f = 1).

As consequent variables, an article included depression and anxiety. As correlate, the articles considered: job satisfaction (f = 2); organizational support (f = 1); intention to leave the organization (f = 1); life quality (f = 1); and engagement (f = 1). As moderators they adopted: civility (f = 1); gender and family characteristics (e.g. number of children, wedding time) (f = 1); and organizational identification (f = 1). Finally, as control, there were demographic variables (f = 3).

This diversity of focused phenomena and forms of relationship between them and OC, as well as consideration of a constellation of aspects, as we identified in the column called focused phenomena in Table 1, highlighted the complexity that explicative models are adopting. We consider this observation is corroborated by identified objectives and the application of sophisticated statistics as structural equation.

The expected procedural character of the phenomena by theoretical framework appears clearly in two articles. One (Costa & Bastos, 2013) operationalized the research by the adoption of a longitudinal design in which presented the hypothesis of OC dynamism and organizational changes as antecedent variables. The other (Alves, Gold, & Cortes, 2013) understood that organizational bonds (e.g., OC, engagement and job satisfaction) were implied in the consolidation process of Psychosocial Care Centers. It is an institutional process, then it involves organizational and societal levels of analysis.

Regarding the method, all analyzed items are field researches, predominating structured questionnaires application (f = 10), and of these, one adds documental analysis (Genari, Faccin, & Macke, 2013) and another, interviews (Costa & Bastos, 2013). An article (Alves, Gold, & Cortes, 2013) applied exclusively interviews. With respect to techniques of data analysis, we also observed a predominance of statistical techniques (f = 10). And among these, there was a variety of descriptive and inferential techniques. When we paid attention to type of research design, Bastos and Costa (2013), as we already noted, differentiated by the application of a longitudinal design, while all other researches adopted transversal designs, with the characteristic of electing the moment of carrying out the field works, and controlling the temporal evolution of phenomena.
In reference to the level of the measurement, in six articles prevailed adoption the individual level. One article (Gallus, Walsh, van Driel, Gouge, & Antolic, 2013) adopted the administrative unit as the analytic level, aggregating the individual responses, analyzing variance of values of focused phenomena between the investigated units. A second one (Wayne, Casper, Matthews, & Allen, 2013) included extra-organizational variables, such as: work-family conflict and affective commitment of the spouse with the worker's organization. A third (Costa & Bastos, 2013) used measures at individual and organizational level. For the latter measure, the authors conducted interviews with managers and employees, identifying the organizational changes over two years. The fourth (Boros & Curseu, 2013) moved between the individual and societal level. The measure considered societal referred to the organizational prestige, which the authors measured from a structured questionnaire administered to employees, and in ten journalists, in addition to the assessment published in specialized lists about the organizations. A fifth (Alves, Gold, & Cortes, 2013) applied interviews with employees, carries out inferences from its contents and contextualized the OC and other related bonds involved in the consolidation process of psychosocial care centers, moving between the individual and institutional level of analysis.

The analytic level adopted by the articles, however, did not reflect only in the measurements. Most of the phenomena studied referred to attitudes of individuals in front of their organizations (e.g., OC, identification, perception support) and his work (e.g., satisfaction and engagement) being also included the commitment to beneficiaries. This last focus referred to a look beyond organizations. Therefore, the analyzed objects have its starting point on individual responses, but these responses refer to people looking for larger objects. In addition, we observed that almost all articles made an effort to contextualize the circumstances of data collecting, as well as the organizational participation of respondents.

4 - DISCUSSION

The analysis of the articles on OC aimed to reflect over which aspects the researches about the phenomenon have been moving towards the applicability of a psychosociological perspective or towards the incorporation characteristics of psychosociological perspective in another. The prevalence of adopting a OC conception as multidimensional, confirms what we found in the reviewed literature as a starting point. But as we have considered before, this alone does not reveal whether there is a walk toward a psychosociological perspective, but only the opening for this.

The constellation of phenomena considered in each research published in 2013, however, is a more direct indicator of the trend toward a psychosociological approach, because it tends to cover different levels of analysis without discriminating each phenomenon according to these levels. Therefore, we consider this trait of studies as an attempt to adopt an integrative character as expected by the approach.

However, most researches have adopted a unique measurement level – individual or group –, confirming Tavares' notes (2011), on the prevalence of these analytic levels in researches on organizational bonds. A few articles involving different measurement levels (organizational, extraorganizational, institutional and societal) associated to individual level presented contributions that indicate a trend to converge with psychosociological purposes. They reflected a possibility of overcoming the individual-organization-society fragmentation, as they integrated these different levels of analysis.

The applicability of a longitudinal design and the articulation of more than one methodological strategy facilitated to highlight the procedural and socio-historical character of focused phenomena. Consider organizational prestige from the perspective of people outside the organization was an example of option that corroborated the complexity in which these different levels are crossed. The adoption of extraorganizational variables, although not always handled by a macrossocietal character, indicated a possibility of analyzing a psychosocial phenomenon considering multiple aspects and relations with it involved (Álvaro et al., 2007).

Although aware of the individual's perceptions for its organization or for its work, a study also turned its attention to an aspect not restricted in this environment, extrapolating boundaries, to incorporate a look at the organization's beneficiaries. Such coverage can also signal an interface with the studies of Consumer Psychology. Similarly, the article categorized on the unit level (group) also showed prudence at the moment that it considered the results of the entire unit, collectively, which are impacted by the individual, group and interpersonal relationships that are developed there.

In addition to the prevalence of adopting a OC conception as a multifaceted phenomenon (e.g. Costa & Bastos, 2013; Meyer et al, 2013), we also observed OC analysis in the context of complex models involving multiple antecedent and / or consequent variables, as well as considering multiple associations between them. These
observations support trends to integrative and complex considerations of phenomena, as already flagged (e.g., Álvaro, 1995; Katzell, 1994).

Given the amount of knowledge that has been generated in the area, contributing to science, for professional practice and for reflections on the work, the development of the studies examined presented guided by one or the other aspects suggested by psychosociological perspective. This does not eliminate, however, the possibilities of moving more in that way. The inclusion of societal order of elements (e.g., values, culture and regional history) and organizational (structure, history) must build more space in the research into the psychosocial phenomena, in the case of OC. It can improve the comprehensive quality of the explanations drawn up in terms mentioned by Leitão (1987) and Machado and Roedel (1994). We believe that change the quality of the explanation tends to change the ways of intervening.

Among the different OC foci, only one of them (commitment to beneficiaries) included variables in the articles connecting them to organizational focus. It suggest the need to incorporate the strategy in this direction, in order to appropriate itself more adequately of the real complexity of life that is not compartmentalized, as well as grasp meaning to networks (Figueroa, González, & Solís, 1981 cited by Pessoa & Pinheiro, 2010).

The difficulties are known, but we need strategies capable of overcoming them. It is not easy to identify and precisely define the levels of analysis, because they move between a tenuous lines, what can become probable a confuse identification of them. The operationalization of the concepts and levels demands mastering of diversified methodologies, and mechanisms to establish the relationships between them (Katzell, 1994). Lack of knowledge about social indicators and deadlines for the completion of the researches are aspects that may also have contributed to hinder the adoption of more complex approaches (multilevel, contextualized, with wide models, etc.).

The analyzed studies that have advanced this approach revealed contributions in the explanation of psychosocial phenomena. Among of them we highlight the concern with the procedural character of focused phenomena, the complexity of explanatory models with the adoption of more comprehensive and integrated analysis, and the interaction between phenomena of different levels, considering the complex interactions that constitute each analysis level and as well as the inter-influences that operated between these different levels. The perspective adopted in these investigations appears as incentive to be positioned for further research to adopt the same path, in order to achieve respect for psychosociological aspects as a trend.

5 – FINAL CONSIDERATIONS
On the adoption of a psychosociological perspective in research on OC, in summary, we believe that, even reflected in the examined articles, it needs to move forward, especially if we consider that the relationships developed in the organizational context are result of multiple constituents and, in this context, the bonds are born, they develop or become extinct. They need, however, to be analyzed from various levels, covering the full dynamics of relationships by which they are impacted.

Our analysis stuck to examine publications on OC only in 2013, from two databases. This was enough for the scope and / or purpose of the present article. However, this point can be considered as limitation, because is not make up viable a longer analysis, with a wider sampling that would allow further check of how these studies are gradually advancing, over the decade. We suggest therefore that future researches pay attention to overcome these limits.

Exploring the OC articulated to its different foci (career, union, teams) should also be a way to contemplate itself, as the OC investigations are already consolidated. Researches involving different foci are still too few. Trend measurements for different occupations/professions should be objects of investigations, articulated to individual and social values assigned to them. Longitudinal and cross-cultural studies should also be prioritized to better understand the procedural character and verify how cultural variations may interfere with the way the phenomena studied manifest.

We hope that the raised issues may be useful to support the planning of empirical research on OC, as regards the definition of the design and characteristics of a psychosociological perspective, like the adoption of multiple analysis levels, multiple methods, considering the processuality of phenomena and overcoming the individual-organization-society fragmentation. This signals to consider the different implications of the phenomena together with the social values, family context, cultural aspects, the organizational context, working conditions experienced there and influence of reference groups of employees within the organizations. We reiterate, finally, that the adoption of a psychosociological perspective tends to promote broader reflections on the dynamics of bonds with the organization.
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Table 1. Articles (2013) on organizational commitment according to their purposes, phenomena, techniques and analysis levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Focused phenomena</th>
<th>Procedures</th>
<th>Measurement Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gallus, Walsh, van Driel, Gouge, &amp; Antolic</td>
<td>To verify the effects of toxic leadership (negative) in the results of the unit and staff, predicting that the toxic leadership directly affects in civility and civility would mediate the relationship between toxic leadership, job satisfaction and OC</td>
<td>Toxic or negative leadership - Job satisfaction - Organizational civility - OC (affective)</td>
<td>- collection: questionnaires - analysis: statistics</td>
<td>unit (group)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meyer, Kam, Goldenberg, &amp; Bremner</td>
<td>To identify the OC profile, its impact on intention to stay, in the depression and the anxiety, as well as conditions that can contribute to the development of compromised profiles</td>
<td>Conditions (perceived organizational support, organizational justice, job satisfaction and leadership) - Depression and anxiety - Intent to stay - OC (three dimensions) - Demographic variables (control)</td>
<td>- collection: questionnaires - analysis: statistics</td>
<td>individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne, Casper, Matthews, &amp; Allen</td>
<td>To analyze if employee's perception of family support affects the employee's work-family conflict and the work counterparts for family. The latter two directly affect the affective OC of the employee, being that the first also indirectly affects through the spouse's attitudes to the work schedule and the affective OC</td>
<td>Organization's perception of family support - work-family conflict - Work counterparts for family - Partner attitudes with work schedule - Affective OC - Affective OC of spouse - Gender and family characteristics</td>
<td>- collection: questionnaires with employees and their spouses - analysis: statistics (SEM)</td>
<td>individual and extra-organizational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valéau, Mignonac, Vandenberghe, &amp; Gatignon Turnau</td>
<td>To study OC of volunteers with the organization and with the beneficiaries and relationship of them with the intention of turnover</td>
<td>Intention of turnover - commitment (three dimensions) with the organization - Commitment to organization's beneficiaries - Age, gender, work period (control)</td>
<td>- collection: questionnaires - analysis: statistics</td>
<td>individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa &amp; Bastos</td>
<td>To evaluate the affective commitment process (AC), continuing commitment (CC), perception of organizational support (POS) and intention to leave the organization (ILO), associating them to the organizational changes perceived by the manager and workers</td>
<td>Affective and continuation OC - Intentions and behaviors of leaving the organization - Perception of organizational support - Organizational changes</td>
<td>- design: longitudinal (during 2 years) - collection: questionnaire and interviews - analysis: statistics and content</td>
<td>individual and organizational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authors</td>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Focused phenomena</td>
<td>Procedures</td>
<td>Measurement Levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boros &amp; Curseu</td>
<td>- To test an integrated model of organizational identification, OC (affective and continuation) and intention of turnover in four organizations</td>
<td>- Intention of turnover&lt;br&gt;- Organizational identification&lt;br&gt;- Affective OC and continuation&lt;br&gt;- Perception of organizational prestige&lt;br&gt;- Mobility between groups of different status</td>
<td>- preliminary analysis of organizational prestige involving outsiders&lt;br&gt;-collection: questionnaires&lt;br&gt;-analysis: statistics (SEM)</td>
<td>Individual and societal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cho, Eum, &amp; Lee</td>
<td>- To examine the impact of organizational learning (shared vision and collaborative activity, leadership, knowledge and skills and participation in decision-making) in affective OC</td>
<td>- Affective OC&lt;br&gt;- Organizational learning</td>
<td>-collection: questionnaires&lt;br&gt;- analysis: statistics</td>
<td>individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genari, Faccin, Macke</td>
<td>- To assess how the OC is manifested in the internal organization environment in networks</td>
<td>- OC (three dimensions)&lt;br&gt;- Demographic variables</td>
<td>- collection: questionnaire and documents&lt;br&gt;- analysis: statistics and documental</td>
<td>individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carvalho-Freitas, Silva, Farias, Oliveira, &amp; Tette</td>
<td>- To verify if OC and satisfaction with aspects related to life quality at work present significantly different results between people with and without disabilities</td>
<td>- OC (three dimensions)&lt;br&gt;- Life quality at work&lt;br&gt;- Demographic variables&lt;br&gt;- Having or not disability</td>
<td>-collection: questionnaires&lt;br&gt;- analysis: statistics</td>
<td>- individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maciel &amp; Nascimento</td>
<td>- To analyze the relationship of different gestalts of transformational leadership with OC</td>
<td>- Transformational leadership&lt;br&gt;- OC (three dimensions)&lt;br&gt;- Demographic variables</td>
<td>-collection: questionnaires&lt;br&gt;- analysis: statistics</td>
<td>individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alves, Dourado, Côrtes</td>
<td>- To investigate the influence of organizational bonds in the consolidation of Psychosocial Care Centers</td>
<td>- Satisfaction at work&lt;br&gt;- Engagement&lt;br&gt;- OC (three dimensions)&lt;br&gt;- Perceptions of justice, support and organizational reciprocity</td>
<td>- collection: interviews&lt;br&gt;- analysis: content</td>
<td>individual and institutional</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>