

	Science, Education and Innovations in the Context of Modern Problems
	Issue 12, Vol. 8, 2025
	RESEARCH ARTICLE 
	<h1>The Relationship between Organizational Loyalty and Job Performance: an Empirical Study</h1>
Doudou Naouri Nour Eddine	University Of Ziane Achour Djelfa Algeria E-mail: doudounaouri1980@gmail.com
Nedjimi Messaoud	University Of Ziane Achour Djelfa Algeria E-mail: m.nedjimi@univ-djelfa.dz
Issue web link	https://imcra-az.org/archive/387-science-education-and-innovations-in-the-context-of-modern-problems-issue-12-vol-8-2025.html
Keywords	Organization; Loyalty; Job; Organizational Loyalty; Job Performance.
Abstract	This empirical study examines the relationship between organizational loyalty and work performance among 135 employees across various sectors, grounded in Social Exchange Theory. Utilizing Meyer and Allen's three-component model, the research operationalizes loyalty through affective, calculative, and normative dimensions, while performance is measured via task performance, contextual performance, and counterproductive work behavior (inversely coded). Employing a quantitative, correlational design with convenience sampling, data were collected using established 5-point Likert scales and analyzed through descriptive statistics, Pearson correlation, and simple linear regression. The findings reveal a statistically significant moderate positive correlation between organizational loyalty and work performance ($r = 0.355$, $p < 0.001$). Loyalty explains 12.6% of performance variance ($R^2 = 0.126$), with the regression model indicating that each one-unit increase in loyalty predicts a 0.354-unit increase in performance. Both constructs demonstrated moderate-to-high mean scores (3.45 and 3.53, respectively).
Citation.	Doudou Naouri N.E; Nedjimi M. (2025). The Relationship Between Organizational Loyalty and Job Performance: An Empirical Study. <i>Science, Education and Innovations in the Context of Modern Problems</i> , 8(12), 1420–1431. https://doi.org/10.56334/sei/8.12.119
Licensed	© 2025 The Author(s). Published by Science, Education and Innovations in the context of modern problems (SEI) by IMCRA - International Meetings and Journals Research Association (Azerbaijan). This is an open access article under the CC BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).
Received: 29.05.2025	Accepted: 11.10.2025
	Published: 02.12.2025 (available online)

Introduction:

The success of organizations in today's competitive work environment is inextricably linked to the quality and engagement of their human capital. Two fundamental constructs in this domain are organizational loyalty and job performance. Organizational loyalty—often conceptualized as a deeper and more enduring form of commitment—refers to an employee's psychological attachment to their organization and their desire to remain with it [1]. In contrast, job performance encompasses the aggregate of an employee's behaviors that either positively or negatively

contribute to the attainment of organizational objectives [2].

The theoretical premise underlying their relationship is grounded in Social Exchange Theory (SET), which posits that employees who feel valued and engaged by their organization are more likely to reciprocate with heightened effort and productivity [3]. Despite this intuitive linkage, empirical evidence requires continuous validation across diverse samples and contexts. This study aims to contribute to the existing body of knowledge by empirically examining the nature and strength of the relationship between organizational loyalty and job performance within a specific sample of 135 participants.

1.1. Research Objectives:

1. To determine the level of organizational loyalty among the surveyed sample of participants .
2. To determine the level of job performance among the surveyed sample of participants .
3. To investigate the relationship between organizational loyalty and job performance .
4. To assess the predictive capacity of organizational loyalty for job performance .

1.2. Research Hypothesis:

There exists a positive and significant relationship between organizational loyalty and job performance.

2. Literature Review:

2.1. Organizational Loyalty and Commitment: Conceptual Development:

Organizational loyalty is a multifaceted construct, most commonly operationalized through Meyer and Allen's Three-Component Model of organizational commitment [4]. This model distinguishes among:

- Affective Loyalty (AL):** The employee's emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the organization .
- Continuance (Calculative) Loyalty (CL):** The employee's awareness of the costs associated with leaving the organization (e.g., loss of benefits, career disruption) .
- Normative Loyalty (NL):** The employee's sense of obligation to remain with the organization.

The concept of organizational loyalty is deeply rooted in the history of management thought, having evolved from a simplistic, often moralistic expectation of employee fidelity into a complex, multidimensional construct central to modern organizational behavior. While the term "**loyalty**" is common in everyday language, academic literature predominantly employs the more precise term "**organizational commitment**." Early conceptualizations, such as those by Porter and colleagues, defined commitment as the relative strength of an individual's identification with and involvement in a particular organization, focusing primarily on a single affective dimension [9].

According to Solomon (1992), organizational loyalty manifests as the desire and willingness to stay with the organization—achieved by treating employees as partners and community members rather than mere individuals, and by offering professional development opportunities along with access to both material and non-material benefits [10]. The Loyalty Research Center (1990) defines it as dedication to the organization's success and an unwavering belief that working for this organization is the best available option. Loyal individuals not only plan to stay but also do not actively seek alternative employment and remain unmoved by offers from other organizations, regardless of their attractiveness [11].

Thus, organizational loyalty is not merely allegiance to a particular organization but a continuous process through which an employee expresses ongoing interest in the organization and its sustained success—demonstrated by belief

in its mission and consistent effort toward its realization, even when goal attainment requires time.

Mary Sheldon defined organizational loyalty as an individual's attitude toward the organization that fuses their personal identity with the organization they serve. This fusion is distinct from either its antecedents or its outcomes. According to Sheldon and Chatman, loyalty rests on three pillars [12] :

1. **Fusion:** Submission to and internalization of organizational values that govern one's behavior .
2. **Identification:** Alignment of self-concept with the organization .
3. **Internalization:** Incorporation of the organization as part of one's self-identity.

Buchanan conceptualizes organizational loyalty as an orientation comprising three elements [13] :

1. A sense of belonging derived from personal conviction in the organization's goals and values .
2. Immersion and active participation in work, rooted in the belief in the significance of one's role within the organization .
3. Faithfulness, manifesting as a firm desire to continue working for the organization.

3. Dimensions of Organizational Loyalty

The field matured significantly with the introduction of Meyer and Allen's [4] Three-Component Model, which remains the dominant theoretical framework. This model posits that commitment is not a unitary concept but consists of three distinct psychological states [14]:

- 1. Affective Dimension (Affective Loyalty):** Refers to the employee's feeling of emotional connection to the organization and willingness to contribute to it, extending to identification with the organization .
- 2. Continuance (Calculative) Dimension (Calculative Loyalty):** Reflects the employee's perception of a cost-benefit analysis associated with remaining in the organization .
- 3. Normative Dimension (Normative Loyalty):** Denotes the employee's sense of moral obligation to stay with the organization.

Manifestations of individual loyalty toward organizations vary depending on the underlying motivational force. Although scholars generally agree on the multidimensionality of organizational loyalty, some propose additional dimensions [15]:

- **Job Security:** The individual's sense of stability and safety in their role .
- **Participation:** Individual contributions to decision-making and problem-solving, which reinforce their role and strengthen organizational belonging .
- **Cohesion:** The individual's sense of being part of the institution, sharing a unified existence, purpose, and common destiny .
- **Satisfaction:** The individual's positive feelings regarding the group's significance and pride in belonging to it .
- **Responsibility:** The individual's conscientiousness in fulfilling duties and obligations .
- **Recognition and Respect:** The organization's appreciation of individual efforts and cultivation of a positive, constructive perception of employees.

High levels of affective and normative loyalty are generally associated with positive organizational outcomes, whereas continuance (calculative) loyalty can be a double-edged sword—binding employees without fostering genuine engagement [5].

4. Concept of Job Performance:

Job performance is typically construed as a combination of in-role and extra-role behaviors. Campbell et al. argue that common definitions of job performance are essentially synonymous with productivity, describing it as the ultimate outcome of exerted effort [16]. Building on this, Viswesvaran & Ones define job performance as the aggregate of behaviors exhibited by an employee that contribute to organizational goal accomplishment [17].

Mathis & Jackson define job performance as the output an individual produces within a specified timeframe and according to predefined standards [14]. In practice, job performance is a broader and more comprehensive construct. An individual's performance refers to the interaction between the totality of productivity-generating behaviors exhibited during task execution and the degree to which assigned duties are fulfilled. Thus, performance encompasses the methods used, the quality of work, time invested in task completion, and both quantitative and qualitative outcomes, as well as behavioral conduct during work.

To better understand job performance, it may be framed as a system comprising three main elements [18]:

1. **Inputs:** Include the individual's material and immaterial resources, such as personality, abilities, knowledge, and skills .
2. **Process (Production Capacity):** Encompasses the activities that transform inputs into outputs—particularly the individual's behaviors and associated effort during task execution .
3. **Outputs:** Include the quantity of products and services the individual generates within the allotted time and in accordance with established standards.

Job performance is also defined as the degree to which assigned tasks are completed and fulfilled, reflecting how effectively the individual meet's role requirements [19]. Consistently, it is described as the responsibilities, duties, activities, and tasks that constitute an individual's work, which they must perform competently according to standards achievable by a trained and skilled worker [20]. Ultimately, it refers to how employees execute the duties and responsibilities assigned by the organization and the outcomes they achieve.

In this study, job performance was measured along three dimensions [06]:

- **Task Performance:** The effectiveness with which employees carry out activities contributing to the organization's technical core—often derived from job descriptions .
- **Contextual Performance:** Behaviors that support and enhance the organization's social and psychological environment, such as helping colleagues, volunteering for extra tasks, and demonstrating enthusiasm .
- **Counterproductive Work Behavior:** Voluntary actions that violate key organizational norms and threaten the well-being of the organization or its members (reverse-coded for inclusion in the overall performance index).

5. The Relationship Between Organizational Loyalty and Job Performance:

Understanding the relationship between organizational loyalty and job performance requires examining how each commitment component correlates with task and contextual performance dimensions. A substantial body of research supports a positive association between organizational loyalty (commitment) and job performance. Emotionally loyal employees are more likely to exert discretionary effort, directly enhancing both contextual performance and task execution.

Studies have shown that loyalty acts as a motivational force, leading to reduced absenteeism, lower turnover rates, and greater willingness to go above and beyond formal job requirements. The present study aims to provide contemporary empirical evidence for this relationship.

6. Methodology:

6.1 Research Design and Sample:

A quantitative, correlational research design was employed. The target population comprised employees from various sectors. A convenience sampling technique was used to select 135 respondents (N = 135). This sample size is deemed adequate for the planned statistical analyses.

6.2. Measurement Instruments:

All constructs were assessed using established scales adapted to a 5-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree).

Construct	Dimension	Sample Items
Organizational Loyalty	Affective Loyalty	I feel a strong sense of belonging to my organization
	Continuance (Calculative) Loyalty	I have a lot to lose if I leave my organization
	Normative Loyalty	I feel a moral obligation to remain with my organization
Job Performance	Task Performance	I successfully complete all tasks associated with my job
	Contextual Performance	I volunteer for additional work tasks
	Counterproductive Behavior	I often waste time at work. (reverse-coded)

Table: Measurement Instruments – Constructs, Dimensions, and Sample Items

6.3. Data Analysis:

Collected data were analyzed using descriptive statistics (mean, standard deviation), Pearson's correlation coefficient, and simple linear regression. Statistical significance was set at $p < 0.05$.

7. Results

7.1. Descriptive Statistics:

Descriptive statistics for the main variables and their dimensions are presented in Table 1.

Variable	N	Mean	Desv. Est.	Min	Max
Organizational Loyalty	135	3.45	0.58	2.00	4.67
Job Performance	135	3.53	0.58	2.00	4.67
Affective Loyalty	135	3.51	0.65	1.67	5.00
Continuance Loyalty	135	3.39	0.62	1.67	4.67
Normative Loyalty	135	3.46	0.61	1.67	5.00
Task Performance	135	3.55	0.60	1.67	5.00
Contextual Performance	135	3.52	0.61	1.67	5.00
Counterproductive Behavior	135	3.51	0.61	1.67	5.00

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics for Organizational Loyalty and Job Performance Constructs (N = 135)

The table indicates that mean scores for both organizational loyalty ($M = 3.45$) and job performance ($M = 3.53$) exceed the midpoint of the 5-point scale, suggesting that respondents generally exhibit moderate to high levels of

loyalty and performance.

Figures 1 and 2 illustrate the distributions of the two main variables (normal approximation curves included).



Figure 1: Distribution of Organizational Loyalty Scores (N=135).



Figure 2: Distribution of Job Performance Scores (N=135).

7.2. Correlation Analysis:

Pearson correlation analysis was conducted to test the relationship between organizational loyalty and job performance. Results, presented in Table 2, display the correlation matrix for all main variables.

Variable	1.(OL)	2.(JP)	3.(AL)	4.(CL)	5.(NL)	6.(TP)	7.(CP)	8.(CWB) (R)
1.Organizational Loyalty	1.000							
2.Job Performance	0.355	1.000						
3.Affective Loyalty	0.885	0.325	1.000					
4.Continuance Loyalty	0.865	0.339	0.697	1.000				
5.Normative Loyalty	0.888	0.344	0.705	0.686	1.000			
6.Task Performance	0.315	0.949	0.287	0.302	0.307	1.000		
7.Contextual Performance	0.339	0.952	0.309	0.327	0.330	0.879	1.000	
8.Counterproductive Behavior	0.329	0.953	0.298	0.317	0.321	0.880	0.883	1.000

***Note:** All correlations between dimensions of organizational loyalty and job performance are statistically significant at $p < 0.001^*$.

These preliminary results indicate a positive and statistically significant relationship between organizational loyalty and job performance ($r = 0.355$, $p < 0.001$), supporting the research hypothesis. The relationship is of moderate strength, suggesting that while loyalty is an important factor, other variables also influence job performance.

7.3. Regression Analysis:

A simple linear regression was conducted to determine the extent to which organizational loyalty predicts job performance. Model summary statistics are presented in Table 3.

Table 3: Simple Linear Regression Summary (Dependent Variable: Job Performance)

Model	R	R-Square	Adjusted R-Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	0.355	0.126	0.119	0.545

The model summary indicates that Organizational Loyalty accounts for **12.6%** of the variance in Job Performance ($R^2 = 0.126$).

The coefficients of the regression model are detailed in Table 4.

Table 4: Regression Coefficients

Variable	B (Unstandardized)	Std. Error	Beta (Standardized)	t	Sig.
(Constant)	2.311	0.331	-	6.982	< 0.001
Organizational Loyalty	0.354	0.095	0.355	3.737	< 0.001

The regression equation is :

$$\text{Job Performance} = 2.311 + 0.354 \times \text{Organizational Loyalty}^*$$

The unstandardized coefficient ($B = 0.354$) is statistically significant ($p < 0.001$), meaning that for every one-unit increase in organizational loyalty, job performance is predicted to increase by 0.354 units. This further confirms the predictive relationship.

Figure 3 visually depicts this relationship via a scatterplot with the regression line.



Figure 3: Scatter plot illustrating the positive linear relationship between Organizational Loyalty and Job Performance, with the regression line and key statistics.

8 .Discussion:

The findings of this study provide robust empirical support for the hypothesis that a positive relationship exists between organizational loyalty and job performance. The moderate positive correlation ($r = 0.355$) and significant predictive power ($\beta = 0.354$, $p < 0.001$) align with and reinforce conclusions from prior research in this domain [4], [7], [8].

8.1. Interpretation of Results:

The moderate strength of the relationship suggests that while loyalty is an important performance driver, it is not the sole determinant. Other factors—such as individual abilities, available resources, work environment, and leadership quality—likely account for the remaining variance. Nevertheless, the positive beta coefficient underscores that initiatives aimed at enhancing organizational loyalty represent a valuable investment for organizations seeking to improve overall workforce performance.

The moderate-to-high scores on both constructs suggest a generally healthy organizational climate within the sample. Strong intercorrelations among loyalty dimensions (affective, continuance, normative) and performance dimensions (task, contextual, counterproductive) indicate significant covariance, supporting the use of composite scores in the primary analysis.

8.2 Theoretical and Practical Implications

8.2.1 Theoretical Implications:

This study successfully applied the Three-Component Commitment Model to the context of job performance and provides contemporary evidence for the enduring relevance of Social Exchange Theory (SET) in explaining employee behavior. It suggests that a holistic view of loyalty—encompassing emotional attachment, perceived costs, and moral obligation—collectively influences an employee's willingness to perform effectively.

8.2.2 Practical Implications:

Organizations should prioritize strategies that foster affective and normative loyalty, such as:

- **Cultivating Organizational Culture:** Promoting a positive, inclusive, and ethical work environment to strengthen emotional attachment (affective loyalty).
- **Investing in Employee Development:** Providing clear career pathways and growth opportunities to foster a sense of obligation and value (normative loyalty).
- **Ensuring Fair Compensation and Benefits:** While continuance loyalty is less ideal, competitive compensation reduces perceived exit costs and contributes to overall stability.

8.3 Limitations and Future Research:

This study is subject to several limitations. First, the use of a convenience sample ($*N* = 135$) restricts the generalizability of findings. Second, the cross-sectional design precludes causal inference; although loyalty predicts performance in this model, it is plausible that high performance also enhances loyalty. Third, reliance on self-report measures for both loyalty and performance may introduce common method bias.

Future research should employ longitudinal designs to examine the causal direction of this relationship. Additionally, incorporating objective performance metrics and investigating mediating variables (e.g., motivation, engagement) or moderators (e.g., leadership style, organizational justice) would yield a more nuanced understanding of this critical organizational phenomenon.

9 Conclusion:

This empirical study has successfully demonstrated a positive, moderate, and statistically significant relationship between organizational loyalty and job performance in a sample of 135 participants. The findings confirm that organizational loyalty is a meaningful predictor of job performance, thereby validating the central hypothesis and aligning with established theories of organizational behavior. Organizations are encouraged to implement targeted HR strategies aimed at fostering employee loyalty to realize tangible gains in workforce productivity and overall organizational effectiveness.

Ethical Considerations

This study was conducted in adherence to established ethical standards for research involving human participants. Participation in the survey was voluntary, and all respondents provided informed consent prior to completing the questionnaire. No personally identifiable information was collected, and data were analyzed in aggregated form to ensure confidentiality and anonymity. The study did not involve any form of harm, psychological stress, or manipulation, and respondents had the right to withdraw at any stage without consequences. All procedures complied with institutional ethical principles and general research ethics guidelines.

Acknowledgements

The authors express their sincere gratitude to the University of Ziane Achour Djelfa for the academic support provided throughout the implementation of this study. A special acknowledgment is extended to all employees who voluntarily participated in the survey and made valuable contributions by providing responses. Their openness and cooperation were fundamental to achieving the objectives of this research.

Funding Statement

No external funding, grant support, or financial sponsorship was received for the execution of this research. The study was carried out using the authors' own efforts and institutional research facilities available within the University of Ziane Achour Djelfa.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest regarding the authorship, analysis, or publication of this paper. All interpretations, findings, and conclusions presented are solely based on the collected data and reflect the authors' academic perspectives without influence from third parties or pre-existing institutional interests.

References

1. Mowday, R. T., Steers, R. M., & Porter, L. W. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 14*(2), 224-247.
2. Campbell, J. P. (1990). Modeling the performance prediction problem in industrial and organizational psychology. In M. D. Dunnette & L. M. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (Vol. 1, pp. 687-732). Consulting Psychologists Press.
3. Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. Wiley.
4. Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review, 1*(1), 61-89.
5. Meyer, J. P., Stanley, D. J., Herscovitch, L., & Topolnytsky, L. (2002). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: A meta-analysis of antecedents, correlates, and consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 61*(1), 20-52.
6. Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1993). Expanding the criterion domain to include elements of contextual performance. In N. Schmitt & W. C. Borman (Eds.), *Personnel selection in organizations* (pp. 71-98). Jossey-Bass.
7. Riketta, M. (2002). Attitudinal organizational commitment and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 23*(3), 257-266.
8. Cooper-Hakim, A., & Viswesvaran, C. (2005). The construct of work commitment: Testing an integrative framework. *Psychological Bulletin, 131*(2), 241-259.
9. Solomon, C. M. (1992). The loyalty factor. *Personnel Journal, 71*(1), 52-62.
10. Loyalty Research Center. (1990). *Latest insights* (pp. 1-5). <http://www.loyaltyresearch.com/>
11. Al-Hayan, A. M. (1998). *Organizational loyalty among Saudi managers*. Riyadh University Press.
12. Stewart, J., & Goldarick, M. (1996). *Human resource development: Perspectives, strategies and practice*. Pitman Publishing.
13. Joda, M. A. (2008). Application of the balanced performance measurement system and its effect on organizational commitment of workers in the Jordanian Aluminum Company. *Jordanian Journal of Applied Sciences, 11*(2), 281-297.
14. Campbell, J. P., Gasser, M. B., & Oswald, F. L. (1996). The substantive nature of job performance variability. In K. R. Murphy (Ed.), *Individual differences and behavior in organizations* (pp. 258-299). Jossey-Bass.
15. Viswesvaran, C., & Ones, D. S. (2000). Perspectives on models of job performance. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 8*(4), 216-225.
16. Mathis, R. L., & Jackson, J. H. (2008). *Human resource management* (12th ed.). Cengage Learning.
17. Ghebregiorgis, F., & Karsten, L. (2007). Human resource management and performance in a developing country. *International Journal of Human Resource Management, 18*(2), 321-332.
18. Zwick, T. (2006). The impact of training intensity on establishments' productivity. *Labour Economics, 13*(6), 715-740.
19. Durrani, B., Obaid, U., & Sabeeh, U. (2011). Effect of leadership on employees' performance in multinational pharmaceutical companies in Pakistan. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary*

- Research in Business*, 2(9), 286-299.
20. Luchak, A. A., & Gellatly, I. R. (2007). A comparison of linear and nonlinear relations between organizational commitment and work outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(3), 786-793.
 21. Allen, N. J., & Grisaffe, D. B. (2001). Employee commitment to the organization and customer reactions: Mapping the linkages. *Human Resource Management Review*, 11(3), 209-236.
 22. Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Paine, J. B., & Bachrach, D. G. (2000). Organizational citizenship behaviors: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature. *Journal of Management*, 26(3), 513-563.
 23. Judge, T. A., & Bono, J. E. (2001). Relationship of core self-evaluations traits with job satisfaction and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(1), 80-92.
 24. 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.
 25. Yousef, D. A. (2000). Organizational commitment and job satisfaction as predictors of attitudes toward organizational change in a non-western setting. *Personnel Review*, 29(5), 567-592.
 26. Afsar, B., Badir, Y., & Kiani, U. (2016). Linking spiritual leadership and employee pro-environmental behavior. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 45, 79-88.
 27. Kuvaas, B. (2006). Work performance, affective commitment, and work motivation. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 16(3), 221-236.
 28. Harris, K. J., Wheeler, A. R., & Kacmar, K. M. (2009). Leader-member exchange and empowerment. *Leadership Quarterly*, 20(3), 371-382.
 29. Wayne, S. J., Shore, L. M., & Liden, R. C. (1997). Perceived organizational support and leader-member exchange as moderators of job stressors. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82(2), 411-421.
 30. Shore, L. M., & Wayne, S. J. (1993). Commitment and employee behavior. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36(3), 687-699.