Organizational commitment in this study is defined not as a state of mind, nor even as a product of congruency between organizational goals and individual sentiments or moral values. It is an unequivocal behavior of delivery, and carried out under the worst conditions, when organizations are unable to reward it. Therefore, its definition here departs from any attribution of motives to OC, such as instrumental-calculative or moral-identification ones. Such attributions are central to traditional definitions of OC, and they should be regarded as autonomous variables. Conceptualizing organizational commitment (OC) as behavior, and measuring OC by several binary behaviors, namely, performing or not performing certain activities that signify commitment, the impact of perceived organizational power (POP) and perceived employment alternatives (PEA) on OC – all these are investigated in this paper. In a study of 361 respondents from four organized systems, it was found that OC was dependent partially and in a non-linear manner on POP and PEA. However, the part that was not explained by these independent variables leaves ample room for different possible explanations of OC. For example, many people in this study chose active modes of positive commitment in spite of having employment alternatives and sometimes were possessed with merely a small amount of organizational power. This suggests an exciting alternative, namely that even in bad times for their employing organization; employees may not automatically rush to take advantage of their employment alternatives, but, on the contrary, may continue to contribute their knowledge, skills and abilities voluntarily, and not as tactics designed to protect their organizational assets. After all, pure commitment is an inner sense of obligation to do something which is not necessarily agreeable or gainful.