EMPLOYEE COMMITMENT AND THE IMPERATIVE ROLE OF GOVERNANCE TOWARDS ATTAINING PERFORMANCE

ALAO, ESTHER MONISOLA PhD
BABCOCK UNIVERSITY, ILISAN-REMO
OGUN STATE

ABSTRACT

Employee productivity is the outcome of employee commitment; it is significantly linked to the attainment of the overall objective of an organization. Often times when employees do not respond appropriately to work expectation, performance dwindles and often demands urgent attention of management. The study thus examines employee commitment and productivity sustenance as an imperative role of governance towards attaining performance'. Population of the study is 356 while computed sample size is 188. Analysis of the data is through simple linear regression. Findings revealed that employee commitment significantly has influence on job satisfaction ($F_{(4, 179)} = 63.528$, $p<0.05$, Adj. $R^2 = 0.577$).indicated a strong link between employee commitment, productivity and organization performance attributable to good working conditions, job content, proactive response of managers and innovativeness. The study concludes that the understanding of managers' roles in governance is apt for continuous organizational performance.

KEY WORDS: Employee Commitment, Productivity, Performance, Innovativeness, Proactiveness

Introduction

Every profit or non-profit making organization value high employee productivity, since this is expected to contribute immensely to the attainment of organization's overall goal. Ironically, employees for one reason or the other sometimes record less continuous hours of work before taking time out for break, phone calls, attending to personal problems, guests or programmes. This agrees with Evans (2014) who suggested that employees do not work full hours daily since for every 52minutes, a break of 17minutes is taken. Sexton (2015), in Draugiem Study alluded that when employees take frequent breaks, they are refreshed and therefore contribute productively and more effectively. While this may be the case in some organizations' culture, it is hardly found in business-oriented organizations, this paper therefore, focuses on employee commitment, productivity sustenance and the imperative role of governance towards attaining performance.

Employees are said to be committed to the organization, the managers or leaders or the work schedule allotted to them. Often the efficient attainment of assigned jobs is an indication of

the commitment of the employee, especially an emotional commitment of the employee to the organization will result in increased productivity for the organization. Samatvam (2018), in Human and Organization development suggested that 'releasing the potential of a highly engaged workforce holds the prospect of significantly improving productivity, customer satisfaction, retention and innovation,' Nonetheless, this cannot be attained without employee commitment, (Brad and Peter, 2009; Carver and Candella (2008) and Anyanwu 2000). An emotionally committed employee will contribute outstandingly, work hard and record a long work tenure' (Maheshwari, 2005). The imperativeness of the organization's success and sustenance was linked to the wholesome commitment of the employee towards high productivity which has an increasing effect on economic growth and standard of living (Anyanwu, 2000; Adegoke, 2018) and a response to organization's influence. The framework in which commitment is captured identifies the term as ''a process by which the goals of an organization and that of the employee become increasingly integrated'' (Hall, Schneider and Nygren, 1970; Adnan, 2018), a ''state of being by which individuals become bound by his action and through these actions to beliefs that sustain his own activities'' (Salancik, 1977), ''a stabilizing force that acts to maintain a behavioural direction….'' (Scholl 1991), and according to Allen and Meyer (1990), it is a psychological state that characterizes employee relationship with the organization.

Employee commitment is thus very important to attainment of the organization goals as the success or failure of the organization is tied to the extent of the committed effort of the employee. This is manifested in the rate of employee turnover, productivity in relation to sales turnover and profitability among others, however, the organization commitment is essential to securing the commitment of the employee as indicated in the discharge of the employer's responsibility to the employees through motivation and good working conditions. Extant literature affirmed the positive relationship between employee commitment and organization competitiveness using a cross-sectional study of a sugar industry. Findings indicated a need for sustaining employee commitment through motivation (Dinku, 2018).

Based on the findings that model parameters such as physical environment, service offered and employee job satisfaction have significant impact on the level of profitability, Ibima (2013: 1) suggested that ''the level of satisfaction among employees tends to affect the service offered, which

has a direct link with customer satisfaction''. This emphasizes the relevance of the commitment of employees to profit generation and economic growth of an organization. This agrees with Princy and Rebeca (2019) in the outcome of their study that emphasises employee as impacting organizational performance.

Productivity, has no generally acceptable definition (Udo-Aka, 1983, Adegoke, 2018) but could be described as the balance between all factors of production that will yield high output (Drucker, 1999). Productivity, a relationship between input and output generated from a system is a ratio of the volume measure of output to a volume measure of input. From the business angle, it is captured as a measure of overall production efficiency, effectiveness and performance of the organization; economists view it as any ratio of 'output generated by an input'. Productivity is linked with the management of resources through value creation. (Tangen,2005). The major resource in the discus is the human element and its contribution to attainment of high-level output that will enhance organizational performance. The challenge in the current dispensation is the rate of employee mobility and the need to sustain productivity and employee commitment. Employee mobility has a great impact on the level of productivity as well as overall organizational performance, management thus have an imperative role to handle employees' commitment effectively, pre-empt employee mobility in order to enhance and sustain productivity.

The main objective of the study therefore is to examine 'employee commitment and the imperative role of governance towards attaining performance'.

Sub Objectives

- Examine the influence of organizational commitment on job satisfaction.
- Investigate the relationship between employee service commitment and job satisfaction.
- Assess the relationship between employee work commitment and job satisfaction.
- Appraise the influence of career commitment on job satisfaction.
- Investigate if employee commitment is significantly related to job satisfaction

The Research Questions for the study

- What is the influence of organizational commitment on employee service commitment?

- What is the relationship between employee service commitment and job satisfaction?

- What is the relationship between employee work commitment and job satisfaction?

- How will employee career commitment relate to job satisfaction?

- What is the relationship between employee commitment and employee job satisfaction?

Methodology

The study adopts descriptive and explanatory research design, population of the study comprises 365 administration and faculty staff of the University. Sample size determined using Taro Yamane formula (Ozogulu, 1998) was 188 while returned copies of the questionnaire (97.87%) were from 76 Faculty and 108 administrative staff.

$n = N / 1 + N (e)^2$

Where n is sample size; N is population; e is error margin; 1 is constant

In this study $N = 356; e = 0.05$

Hence $N/ 1 + N (e)^2 = 356 / 1 + 356 (0.05)^2$

$356 / 1 + 356 (0.0025)$

$188.34 \approx 188$

Sample size determined = 188

The instrument of study is the questionnaire administered to academic and administration employees. Analysis of data was carried out using the Cronbach Alpha for reliability testing (Organizational commitment had a reliability coefficient of 0.836; service commitment had 0.898, work commitment had 0.857, career commitment had 0.819 and job satisfaction had

0.919 (See Table 1). Mean, Standard Deviation, Simple Linear Regression and Multiple Linear Regression were applied in analysing the study. (Tables 3 to 7)

The significance of the study

The work environment in the public and private sector is entirely different from one another, whereas employees in the private sector work under nearly exploitative and uncertain conditions in which they are more subservient especially in a period when there is gross underemployment, the contrary is what obtains in the public sector. This study seeks to establish a need for balancing prerequisites to being employed in both sectors in order to improve the level of employee commitment to productivity through a well strategized governance system. Both the private and public university administrations will benefit from establishing a more conducive work environment. Employees will benefit immensely from a well strategized governance system as their job and service conditions are improved.

Review of Literature

Conceptual Framework

Literature is rich with different approaches to employee productivity and governance influence on productivity in the workplace.

Organizational (Performance) Effectiveness and Employee Commitment

Sharma and Barjpai (2010) observed that organizational performance is high when continuously committed employees are engaged. The commitment of an employee is earned by different factors which include the organizational structure, work process, operational modes, working conditions (salary, promotion, and training) and communication as they affect the employee. In addition, employee commitment is influenced by a recognition of employee needs and carrier growth opportunities that must be clearly operational. This is unlike organizations that fiddle with employee interest, welfare and growth needs. The role of the management in significantly improving productivity through the commitment of the

employee has a relationship with profitability and quality decisions. This agrees with Lin and Chiang (2008) that there is a significant relationship between productivity and governance. In relation to employee productivity, output quality and workmanship, adherence to standards and customer satisfaction are penned out as factors that impact profitability (Udo-Aka, 1983). The implication of the foregoing is that organization's productivity is attainable through a combination of variables which include, employee commitment, application of quality and governance among others. Notably, enforcing regularity and punctuality at work alone do not add to productivity unless the employee is committed. Predisposing factors that affect employee productivity include, attitude, relationship with supervisor, health status and organization's welfare package, poor working tools, employee morale as a result of some form of discipline or downsizing.

Equally, a low employee output indicates a serious challenge for the organization since at the point of employment a commitment to paying a fixed monthly sum has been agreed in the employee engagement letter; who gains and who loses when a worker's day output must be rewarded (Taylor 1964). Low employee commitment affect regularity, punctuality, job delivery, attitude and productivity at work whereas a committed employee is creative, works independently to arrive at goal as much as possible. Increased job satisfaction, customer interest, high level of morale, goal alignment and harmonious working relationship are characteristics of a committed worker. Advocating the state of man in organizations, Mayo and MacGregor (1960), emphasized that man being a "social creature has responsibility for discharging a good leadership style that will harness employee efforts towards productivity; 'man', therefore needs to be motivated and involved in decision making (McElroy 2001; Ogilvie 1986).

Employee commitment is therefore viewed as a psychological state in which the employee becomes bound to the organization (Allen & Meyer, 1990), a disposition in which employee derive satisfaction in the workplace thereby making him committed to discharging his or her duty as expected (O'Malley, 2000). Employee commitment is considered as "the strength of an individual's identification and involvement in a particular organization". This definition is premised on an employee's strong belief in the organization's goals which makes him or her to exert effort in driving organization's goal attainment as well as exercising a strong

determination to remain attached to the organization. More explicitly, employee commitment is identified by his being connected to a goal, organization or a specific job as defined by the employee's attitude to work. It is therefore apt that organizations consider enabling and motivating employees to enhance productivity output as low commitment implies low output and low overall organization performance.

Attempts to enhance employee commitment, demand that employees are given a sense of belonging in which the success of work is owned by the employee, regular induction and training in the specific area of training need are organized (Arnoff 1971, Adhikari 2010); harmonious relationship between colleagues and supervisors on the other hand, truth, justice and fairness become a regular practice, in which work life balance for employees, integrity drive and meeting the welfare needs of the workers are practised (Aborishade & Obioha 2009; Ajibade 2014).

The perception of productivity and performance brings to fore the benchmarking that would influence productivity; effectiveness and efficiency are key terms that consider doing things right and applying resources to maximise productivity. Performance, profitability and productivity (The Triple-P Model) are identified as a 'perfect' link that establish process of determining performance (Tangen 2005). The implication points to employee productivity that epitomise a combination of quality, prompt service or product delivery and attainment of set standards. These constitute a basis for evaluating employee commitment, measuring and rewarding the employee (Tangen, 2005, Miller, 1984). Pertinent issues considered in this paper include examining the extent to which employee commitment in terms of work, career and service have been harnessed through governance process as characterized by the commitment of the organization.

The attainment of targets or set goals serve as a basis of determining employee contribution to the goals of the organization.. Different Key performance Indicators (KPI) are applied in organizations; effective achievement of set objectives as well as reaching targets successfully are applicable measures. Various tools have been designed for measuring and evaluating employee performance, these are Management by Objective (MBO), Self-Evaluation and Graphic Rating Scale among others. Standardized governance frameworks such as Balanced

Scorecard, Personnel records, use of Performance Appraisal forms and Appraisal interviews among others, are projected as means of measuring employee productivity. A major challenge is choosing a wrong performance measure which may negatively affect employee productivity.

Employee downtime and effect on productivity

Downtime and productivity are quite significantly related; downtime in a manufacturing process appear in machine breakdown as a result of motor or equipment failure, raw material inadequacies, shortage of operators and planned stoppage, whereas for employee downtime or break, it is suggested to increase the workers stance of contributing effectively to productivity Epstein, 2018; Derek, 2013). The effect is seen on a relaxed worker, increased productivity rate and possible contribution to income and improvement in performance (Brodsky, 2017. Jones, 2005).

Governance (Training) and Employee Commitment

Performance measurement, a pre-determined tool for integrating the success of an organization (Kaplan, and Norton, 2001) is important to organizations that are functioning in a highly competitive global environment. Authors affirmed the essence of measuring employee performance in terms of their productivity at work (Sauerman, 2016; Kazan, 2013). A prelude to this is meeting the need for training the employee in order to harness the wealth of employee commitment through increased productivity. Training is a means to enhancing the skills, knowledge and talent of an employee (Obisi, 2001, Ajibade, 2014); it enables fostering the initiative and creativity of employees thereby preventing manpower obsolescence (Arnoff, 1971). Linking training to a behavioural need for employee performance, it is described as a cornerstone of sound management' (Clothier & Spriegel, 1977) a necessity that is practical and vitally essential to moulding employees' attitudes' (Mamoria, 1975). Performance, as defined by Newstrom (2011), is the outcome or end result of actions undertaken in executing a goal or an objective. A significant relationship was affirmed from the investigation on 457 companies on the effect of training on performance using effectiveness and profitability as measure of performance.

Determination of Employee Commitment

Commitment implies a feeling of loyalty and a state of mind that ties employee commitment to the organization, the work itself and the desire to fulfil a set goal. Commitment is further viewed as a 'binding force on an individual with a target and a course of action relevant to the same target' (Meyer & Hercovitch, 2001: 310 & Meyer, 2010). Allen and Meyer, (1990), described commitment with terms such as feeling, continuance and normative commitment. Employees feel committed to remain and work in the organization, assess the cost of leaving but decides to stay and be loyal (Meyer & Allen, 1977). The following studies on productivity, observed the declining level of employee engagement and productivity and suggested that engaging every worker requires the three- 'H' act in which the head, the heart and the hand of an employee must effectively harmonise in discharging their duties. Ogala (2014), however posited that making an impact on employee productivity demands a strong governance framework that enhances compliance, a scenario that equally apply to all work sectors. Governance roles are typified by training, motivating, favourable working conditions, participation in decision making among others. A remarkable difference however exists between the private sector and the public-sector approaches to employee performance.

According to O'Malley (2000), employee commitment can be identified in terms of 'aligned interest and values' wherein employees depict a sense of belonging. Salancik (1977) however, opined that employee through his beliefs become tied to the organization, whereas another view indicates commitment as 'a psychological state' in which the employee becomes bound to the organization (Meyer, 1990). Hoek (2016) identified employee commitment with employee's attitude to work, connection to goal attainment or to organization or the job itself. Penley and Gould (1988) capture employee commitment as Moral, Calculative and Alienative. This implies that goals are identified and accepted, employee receive inducements to match contributions, when rewards are no more offered, the employee withdraws commitment, but still remains in the organization as a result of pressure. Porter (1974) viewed it as value, effort and retention commitment. This perspective reveals employee relationship with the organization. Meyer and Schoorman (1992), considered employee commitment in terms of value and continuity of employee in the organization. Motivating employees through regular payment of salaries and staff training were found to

influence employee job satisfaction, Sokefun (2011). This fact was emphasized by the recommendation of Aborisade and Obioha (2009) that employers need to understand what motivates their employees as individual worker has what motivates him or her. Motivation is basically, identified by different theorists as the responsibility of management in the application of extrinsic motivating factors (McGregor 1960). Extenuating the reason for applying this, Mcgregor in identifying people's response to work as inherently lazy, suggested that the people have to be persuaded, rewarded, coerced, controlled directed or threatened with punishment in order to achieve organizational productivity. On the other hand, workers appreciate enriched job, recognition for performance; these have been found to secure employee commitment (Sokefun, 2011).

The end-result of commitment is the expectation of employee loyalty to the organization and productivity. Taking a look at what informs employee commitment, Grusky (1966) cited benefits such as promotion expectation (Goertner & Nollen, 1989), training (Scandura,1977), job security (Youssef, 1988). Where unemployment is high such as we have in developing countries the tendency for an employee is to hold tight to what is available and put in more effort to pave way for benefits that may arise. A review of factors that influence employee commitment suggested that lay-off plans, denied and poor promotion procedures, poor working conditions affect employee commitment (Ahmad and Schroeder (2003). Effective communication, employee engagement and participation in decision making were found to have positive influences on employee commitment and productivity (Ozuomba et al, 2016, Maugo, 2013)

Employee Commitment and Job Satisfaction

From a study administered on 247 middle level employee managers of a private sector organizations, job satisfaction was found to be positively related to organization commitment. The findings of the study suggested that administrators and policy makers need to understand managerial effectiveness from the personality traits perspective. Notably, job satisfaction is influenced by the subsisting relationship between employees and management (Meyer and Maltin 2010). A similar study found that there is a relationship between job satisfaction, organization commitment and turnover (Ali, Mosadeghrad, Ewan and Rosenberg (2008). The

wellness of employees was also found to have influenced employee regularity at work (Meyer, Stanley and Hercovitch 2002), discouraged employee from sudden resignation (Matthew and Zajac 1990), effective performance by employees (Riketta 2002), employee engagement in team work and (Becker and Kerman 2003). These studies summarily reveal the various benefits that the organization derive from employees who are committed to work.

Career commitment according to Blau (1985) is viewed as the attitudinal response of an employee towards his vocation or profession. The commitment to service by an employee is however conceived as being dedicated to organization's cause; work commitment on the other hand is the feeling of responsibility that a person has towards the goals, mission, and vision of the organization he/she is associated. Employee career commitment from another perspective is viewed in terms of age and tenure in which employees in early stage of their career may seek greener pasture whereas those that are long tenured would rather remain to harvest rewards of a stable employment (Orstien and Isabella, 1990. This is corroborated in the 'Career development theory' of Levinson (1978), Super (1957) and Alniacik (2012). For employees in the middle and later stage of their career, a weak relation between age and organization commitment is however suggested in Meyer and (1993), Kumar and Giri, (2009). Kaur (2010) however found that employee level of commitment increases as the career stage progresses from mid-stage to higher level.

Employee high work commitment is suggested to enhance organizational performance (Redmond and Alderton, 2016) especially influenced by the motivational factors. The attitudes of employee to work however vary from one to another either due to age, tenure in office and career among others (Kaur, 2010). As suggested by Kumar and Gini (2009), job satisfaction and organizational commitment are influenced by employee age, experience and employee personal goal drive.

In summary, the performance of the organization is greatly dependent on the commitment of the employee in terms of goal-driving as may be identified in the employee's work attachment, services discharged and the tenure or career of the employee within the short or long run.

Theoretical Review

Argyris and Schon (1974, 1978) through the 'Theory of Action' posited that the deliberate behaviour of human beings is determined by the individual's theory of action. The Theory of Action is based on a delivery model referred to as Theory of Change; it explains the processes through which change arises for individuals, groups or communities (Coffey, 2018). A good theory of Action according to Wallace (2018) stems from what motivates an individual or group to act in a particular way. It is suggested that the theory be articulated from an evaluation perspective. The implication is that the behaviour of each person is informed by the mind-set of that individual. It further suggested that theory-of-action stands for "cognitive enterprise undertaken by individual actions" which depicts how members of senior management manage the organization to which they belong. This explains the influence of individual mind-set on the extent to which an employee becomes committed to productivity or the organization.

Self-Determination Theory – Edward L. Deci and Richard M. (1971)

This is a theory based on how employees are motivated which also inform' inherent growth tendencies and their innate psychological needs' such as competence, autonomy and psychological relatedness. The experience is basically devoid of external influence since it is innate (intrinsic). The implication of the theory is that the employee is able to make personal decisions to do things in specific ways. The theory considers three universally necessary psychological needs and three motivational approaches. However, Deci (1971) averred that self -determination theory is thwarted if basic needs are not met. Accordingly, a basic understanding of one's abilities, strength and needs are important as well as ability to apply personal insights to real life settings (Bender, 2008).

Social Exchange Theory (SET)

The theory, SET as reviewed by Copranzano & Mitchell, is acclaimed to be one of the most influential conceptual paradigms for understanding workplace behaviour. The theory dates back to the 1920s and links disciplines such as anthropology (Sahlins 1972, Malinowski 1922), Psychology (Gouldner (1960) and Sociology (Blau 1964). Authors agree that Social exchange is a series of interactions which are interdependent and contingent on the actions of another person (Cropanzano & Mitchell 2005, Blau 1964). Other assertions indicate that 'exchange beliefs moderate the relationship between participative decision-making (Witt, 1992); a strong exchange ideology which significantly increased employee job satisfaction with training (Witt & Broach, 1993); manager-rated commitment which strengthens the effects of job satisfaction and procedural justice (Witt, Kacmar & Andrews, (2001).

To effectively position employee commitment in line with performance thus, requires recognition of what will motivate the employees to commitment, job contentment and be committed to enhancing productivity and attainment of organization goal.

Theoretical Framework

The underpinning theory for this study is the Social Exchange Theory (SET). It actually touches the challenge and expectations of employees in the work place. Motivation to work is necessary as employees individually have a mind-set of what they desire to achieve and where they wish to be in the future. Thus, employers and managers need to understand how to drive the organizational goals while sourcing optimum employee commitment.

Empirical Framework

Employee commitment and job satisfaction do not just happen but manifest under the influence of various roles played by the management in the organization. Variables such as motivation, training, working conditions of employee, recognition of performance and much more are management roles that enable employee commitment to influence organizational productivity. Extant literatures affirm that there is a relationship between employee

commitment and organization performance (Andre 2017), Taylor et al (2018), Yousef (2016); and that 'firms integrate Human Resource (HR) practices with business strategies to enhance organizational performance and they are performing better' (Gautam, 2008, Adhikari, 2010). Testing a model that examined the effect of top management team with a sample of 1664 employees from 39 affiliates of 10 Multinational Corporations (MNC), Taylor (2008), found that organizational culture and HR practices impact employee commitment. Yousef (2016) in a study of relationships subsisting in job satisfaction, organizational commitment and attitude towards organizational change in local governments, found that 'employees remain in their jobs because they want to do so, it is not based on feeling'. Srivastava (2013) in the study of 247 middle level managers in private sector organizations equally found that job satisfaction is positively related to organizational productivity with an implication for a need for managers to understand the managerial effectiveness from the personality traits of employees. Ali, Mosadeghrad, Ewan and Rosenburg (2008), in a study based on 629 nurses submitted that employees are moderately committed and therefore impact turnover. It was however averred that other factors may also bear influence on the turnover. Moreover, Masooma, Rifat and Hassan (2014) added that employee's job satisfaction is influenced by the subsisting relationship between employee and management. This position explains further the theory of Action as posited by Argyris & Schon (1974, 1978); Coffey, (2018). These imply that there are varying factors that influence employee commitment as well as job satisfaction. Management in each organization therefore should motivate employees, drive employee job satisfaction and employee commitment in order to achieve set goals and maximum productivity.

Markowitz et al (2010) in a study of 617 employees spread across both private and public sectors, on job satisfaction and organizational commitment, emphasized the differences of this scenario between the public and private sectors. The study affirmed that there are differences in working conditions, employee relationship and attitudinal responses to the organization. Satisfaction arising from innate and external contexts were found to be strongly linked to commitments that are based on emotions most especially in the public sector.

Meyer & Hercovitch (2001), in a study based on 'motivational factors found that senior management actions depict a great influence on employee commitment at the lower level of

the organization implying that the actions of senior management can hinder or enhance the growth or continuous commitment of the employee.

.

Discussion and Analysis of Result

Reliability

The questionnaire adopted for this study was tested using the Cronbach's Alpha reliability test. Organizational commitment had a reliability coefficient of 0.836; service commitment had 0.898, work commitment had 0.857, career commitment had 0.819 and job satisfaction had 0.919 (See Table 1).

Table 1 Reliability of the Instrument

Construct	Number of Items	Cronbach's Alpha
Organizational Commitment	27	0.836
Service Commitment	14	0.898
Work Commitment	7	0.857
Career Commitment	11	0.819
Job Satisfaction	23	0.919

Data Analysis

Table 2: Demographic Features of Participants

Variable		Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Age	25-35	102	55.4
	36-45	58	31.5
	46-55	18	9.8
	56 and above	6	3.3
	Total	**184**	**100**
Gender	Male	105	57.1
	Female	79	42.9
	Total	**184**	**100**
Qualification	HND032132	28	15.2
	B.A/BSc	80	43.5
	M.A./MSc	21	11.4
	PhD	55	29.9
	Total	**184**	**100**
Length of Service	1-5	97	52.7
	6-10	54	29.3
	11-15	23	12.5
	16-20	6	3.3
	21-25	2	1.1
	26 and above	2	1.1
	Total	**184**	**100**
Work Experience	1-5	81	44.0
	6-10	53	28.8
	11-15	26	14.1
	16-20	14	7.6
	21-25	6	3.3
	Above 26	4	2.2
	Total	**184**	**100**

Table 1 shows that participants were mostly between the ages of 25 to 45 (86.9%), out of these, 55.4% were between the ages of 25 to 35 which indicates that the respondents were relatively young; however few participants were aged 46 and above in this study (13.1%). Male participants dominated with study (57.1%), while their female counterparts had a representation of 42.9%. Only 41.3% of the respondents had post graduate qualifications, out of which 29.9% had PhDs; however, majority had first degree or its equivalence (58.7%). Furthermore, more than half of the participants had served the institution for 1 to 5 years (52.7%), followed by 6 to 10 years (29.3%) and 11 to 15 years (12.5%). However fewer respondents had served more than 15 years (5.5%). This implies that 41.8% of the participants had served the institution between 6 to 15 years which suggests that the rate of staff turnover in the institution was relatively high. Finally, majority of the respondents had work experience ranging from 1 to 5 years (44%), 6 to 10 years (28.8%) and 11 to 15 years

(14.1%), which suggests that newer employees were part of this study compared with older employees.

Table 3: Level of Organizational Commitment/Employee commitment

Items	$\bar{x}$	SD
Often, I find it difficult to agree with this organization's policies on important matters relating to its employees.*	3.65	1.44
It would take very little change in my present circumstances to make me to leave this organisation.*	3.58	1.49
There's not much to be gained by staying with this organisation indefinitely.*	3.42	1.35
I would be just as happy working for a different organisation if the work was similar. *	3.38	1.64
Deciding to work for this organisation was a mistake on my part.*	3.34	1.44
I feel very little loyalty to this organization	2.63	1.02
I would accept almost any type of job assignment in order to keep working for this organization	2.61	1.07
For me this is the best of all possible organizations for which to work.	2.32	1.09
I am confident that the results of the survey will be acted on.	2.16	1.10
My organization inspires the best job performance from me.	2.07	1.02
I find that my values and the organization's values are very similar.	2.01	0.88
I am extremely glad that I chose to work here rather than one of the other jobs I was considering at the time I joined.	1.97	1.02
Morale in this organization is good	1.92	1.02
My organization is known as a good employer locally	1.91	0.86
I work in a well-managed organization	1.86	0.82
This has improved as a place to work over the past two years.	1.85	0.90
I would recommend this as a good place to work	1.84	0.86
I am proud to be part of my section/department/service.	1.83	0.92
I really care about the fate of this organization.	1.82	0.84
I think this is a good place to work.	1.81	0.89
I speak highly of my organization to my friends.	1.79	0.75
I have a good understanding of where the organization is going	1.78	0.84
I tell my friends this is a good organization to work for.	1.78	0.84
I understand how my work contributes to the organization's goals and objectives.	1.68	0.76
I am willing to put in a great deal of extra effort to help this organization be successful.	1.64	0.81
I am proud to tell others that I am part of this organization	1.64	0.73
I understand how my job contributes to the organization's goals and objectives	1.59	0.68
Average Mean	**2.22**	**1.00**

***Decision Rule if mean is ≤ 1.49 =Not at all; 1.5 to 2.49 = Very Low; 2.5 to 3.49 = Low; 3.5 to 4.49= High; 4.5 to 5= Very High**
***Items were reverse coded**

Table 3 shows that generally, employees had very low level of organizational commitment ($\bar{x}$ = 2.22). However, some of the parameters of measurement showed that participants had high organizational commitment in terms of finding it easy to agree with the organization's policies on important matters relating to its employees ($\bar{x}$ = 3.65) and it would take more change in their present circumstances to make them leave the organization ($\bar{x}$ = 3.58).

Table 4: Level of Service Commitment/Organizational performance

Items	$\bar{x}$	SD
My organization gives me sufficient resources to satisfy customer needs.	2.02	0.93
My organization's customers feel that we strive to satisfy their needs.	1.97	0.91
Rules and procedures enable me to meet my customer's requirements.	1.92	0.88
My organization tries to make its products/services easy to use.	1.92	1.03
My manager is committed to high levels of customer service.	1.89	0.93
I am proud of the quality of our organization's products and services.	1.88	0.90
I am encouraged to be creative and innovative to meet my customer's needs.	1.87	0.82
Customer satisfaction is a priority in my organization.	1.84	0.88
I enjoy providing the best service to customers.	1.83	0.95
My organization responds well to customers when their needs change.	1.81	0.88
My organization offers excellent service to our customers.	1.80	0.86
This organization cares about its customers.	1.78	0.82
My organization has one of the best reputations in the industry.	1.73	0.74
I feel I have the necessary skills to provide good customer service.	1.71	0.74
Average Mean	**1.86**	**0.88**

***Decision Rule if mean is ≤ 1.49 =Not at all; 1.5 to 2.49 = Very Low; 2.5 to 3.49 = Low; 3.5 to 4.49= High; 4.5 to 5= Very High**

Table 4 indicates that employees had very low level of service commitment ($\bar{x}$ = 1.86). Some of the parameters of measurement showed that participants had very low level of service commitment in terms of perceiving that meeting customer demands to a very low level ($\bar{x}$ = 2.02), customers felt that they struggled to satisfy their needs to a very low level ($\bar{x}$ = 1.97).

Table 5: Work Commitment/Job satisfaction

Items	$\bar{x}$	SD
Life is only worth living when people get absorbed in work.	2.53	1.09
I live for my job	2.52	1.14
The major satisfaction in my life comes from my job.	2.48	1.11
The most important things that happen to me involve my work.	2.41	1.08
An individual's life goals should be work oriented.	2.22	1.05
Work should be considered central to life.	2.10	0.98
The most important things that happen in life involve work.	1.93	1.02
Average Mean	**2.31**	**1.07**

***Decision Rule if mean is ≤ 1.49 =Not at all; 1.5 to 2.49 = Very Low; 2.5 to 3.49 = Low; 3.5 to 4.49= High; 4.5 to 5= Very High**

Table 5 depicts that employees had very low level of work commitment ($\bar{x}$ = 2.31). Some of the parameters of measurement showed participants had low level of work commitment in terms of: their life being perceived as only worth living when people got absorbed in work ($\bar{x}$ = 2.53) and that participants to a low level lived for their jobs ($\bar{x}$ = 2.52). Other parameters of measurement indicated that to a very low level that: the most important things that happen to them involved their work ($\bar{x}$ = 2.41), an individual's life goals should be work oriented ($\bar{x}$ = 2.22) and that the most important things that happen in life involved work ($\bar{x}$ = 1.93). This suggests that participants work commitment was low because they perceived that life was only worth living when people are not absorbed in work, when people do not live for their jobs and that the most important things that happen in life do not necessarily involve work.

Table 6: Career Commitment/Job satisfaction

Items	$\bar{x}$	SD
I would leave my profession if I could.*	3.48	1.48
Changing my career would be difficult for me to do now.*	3.42	1.62
Changing my career now would involve a considerable sacrifice.*	3.39	1.73
I would not want to work outside my profession.	2.34	1.14
My career is likely to take me to work for other organizations beyond this one.	1.91	1.07
My career is a central interest in my life.	1.91	0.91
Pursuing my career is important to my self-image.	1.86	0.96
I think my profession is a rewarding career.	1.86	0.92
I know where my career is going	1.81	0.94
Working in my current profession is important to me.	1.78	0.81
I would recommend my profession as a career.	1.73	0.91
Average Mean	**2.32**	**1.14**

***Decision Rule if mean is ≤ 1.49 =Not at all; 1.5 to 2.49 = Very Low; 2.5 to 3.49 = Low; 3.5 to 4.49= High; 4.5 to 5= Very High**
*Items were reverse coded

Table 6 shows that employees had very low level of career commitment ($\bar{x}$ = 2.32). Some of the parameters of measurement showed participants had low level of career commitment in terms of: wanting to leave their profession if they could ($\bar{x}$ = 3.48), pursuing their career was important to their self-image to a low level ($\bar{x}$ = 1.86) and that they would to a very low level recommend their profession as a career ($\bar{x}$ = 1.73).

Table 7: Level of Job Satisfaction

Items	$\bar{x}$	SD
I often think about leaving.*	3.46	1.56
I have skills that are not used in my job*	3.22	1.77
The major satisfaction in my life comes from my job.	2.33	1.06
I get full credit for the work I do.	2.24	1.03
I am noticed when I do a good job	2.17	1.02
I am noticed when I do a good job.	2.17	1.02
I get full credit for the work I do	2.15	1.04
My immediate manager lets me know how I am doing	2.08	0.99
I feel valued by senior management	2.07	1.03
I feel my opinion counts in the organization.	2.07	0.98
There is a lot of variety in my job.	2.05	0.98
I get a feeling of accomplishment from my job	2.05	0.94
I am satisfied with my job.	2.04	0.93
I feel my views count in my section.	1.97	0.87
I feel the level of responsibility I am given is acceptable.	1.96	0.88
My job fully uses my skills	1.96	0.96
I feel I am doing a worthwhile job	1.96	0.95
I know where to get help if I have a problem at work.	1.95	0.96
I know the standards of work expected of me.	1.92	0.89
I feel my colleagues treat me with respect.	1.90	0.88
I enjoy my work most days.	1.88	0.90
I do interesting and challenging work.	1.77	0.88
I have a clear understanding of my job responsibilities and what is expected of me.	1.72	0.83
Average Mean	**2.13**	**1.01**

***Decision Rule if mean is ≤ 1.49 =Not at all; 1.5 to 2.49 = Very Low; 2.5 to 3.49 = Low; 3.5 to 4.49= High; 4.5 to 5= Very High
*Items were reverse coded

Table 7 depicts that employees had very low level of job satisfaction ($\bar{x}$ = 2.13). Some of the parameters of measurement indicate that participants had low level of job satisfaction in terms of: often thinking about leaving ($\bar{x}$ = 3.46), having skills that are not used in their jobs ($\bar{x}$ = 3.22). They also had very low level of job satisfaction in terms of feelings that they were doing a worthwhile job ($\bar{x}$ = 1.96) and in terms of having a clear understanding of their job responsibilities and what was expected of them.

Test of Hypotheses

Decision Rule

The pre-set level of significance for this study was 0.05. The null hypotheses presumed that there was no significant influence between the variables under consideration. If the P-value value exceeded the pre-set level of significance (p>0.05), the null hypothesis was accepted, however, if the p-value was less than or equal to 0.05 (P $\leq$0.05), the null hypothesis was rejected.

$H_0$1: Organizational commitment does not significantly influence job satisfaction

Table 8: Simple Linear Regression Testing the Influence of Organizational Commitment on Job Satisfaction

Variable	Coeff.	R	t-Stat.	Prob.
C	6.861		1.774	0.078
Organizational Commitment	0.693	0.618	10.596	**0.000***
R^2	0.382			
Adj. R^2	0.378			
F-Statistic	112.285			
Prob.(F-Stat)	**0.000**			

Dependent Variable: Job Satisfaction

Table 8 depicts that organizational commitment significantly influence job satisfaction (β= 0.693, t=10.596, R^2= 0.382, p< 0.05). Organizational commitment had a moderate positive significant influence on job satisfaction (r = 0.618, p<0.05). This implies that increase in employee organizational commitment would improve job satisfaction. The model shows that organizational commitment explained 38.2 percent (R^2= 0.382) variation of job satisfaction. Therefore, the null hypothesis that organizational commitment does not significantly influence job satisfaction was rejected.

H$_0$2: Service commitment is not significantly related to job satisfaction

Table 9: Simple Linear Regression Testing the Influence of Service Commitment on Job Satisfaction

Variable	Coeff.	R	t-Stat.	Prob.
C	23.279		9.470	0.000
Service Commitment	0.977	0.602	10.163	**0.000***
R^2	0.362			
Adj. R^2	0.359			
F-Statistic	103.279			
Prob.(F-Stat)	**0.000**			
Dependent Variable: Job Satisfaction				

Table 9 shows that service commitment significantly influence job satisfaction (β= 0.977, t=10.163, R^2= 0.362, p< 0.05). Service commitment had a moderate positive significant influence on job satisfaction (r = 0.602, p<0.05). This suggests that increase in employee service commitment would improve job satisfaction. The model shows that service commitment explained 36.2 percent (R^2= 0.362) variation of job satisfaction. Therefore, the null hypothesis that service commitment does not significantly influence job satisfaction was rejected.

Recommendations and Conclusion

Attaining organization goals is a crucial pillar of management function which involves effectively influencing the human capital in contributing efficiently to maximizing employee commitment. Employees derive satisfaction when they are able to perceive themselves as belonging, recognized, appreciated and effectively impacting the organization. Institutions, and every organizational entities need to put in standardised working conditions to cater for employee interest, needs and welfare, and hence provide an environment that encourages performance such as training, good working relations and participatory leadership. It is thus

imperative for management to administer and properly co-ordinate employees' welfare and job assigned in line with organization working policy by creating a balance between employees' social and welfare needs. Aligning individual goals with the corporate objectives of the organization is crucial to attaining overall mission of the organization. The work environment today has highly mobile employee who are pursuing academics while working and are likely to find other jobs if their needs are not met.

It is therefore necessary to train employees, offer them good working conditions, maintain and sustain employee interest to influence their commitment.

REFERENCES

Aborishade, R. and Obioha, E. E., (2009). The Role of Motivation in Enhancing Job Commitment in Nigerian Industries. *Journal of Social Sciences,* 19 (2) 149-154.

Adegoke, J. E., (2018). Impact of Deficiencies in Accounting Standards: Studies on Financial Reporting, Investment and Productivity. European *Journal of Business of Business Ethics and Organization.* Ejbo.iyu.fi/pdf/ejbo.

Adhikari, D. R. (2010). Human Resource Development for performance Management: The Case of Nepalese Organizations. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management* Vol. 59 (4), Pp 306-324

Adrian, S. (2018). To evaluate and study the relationship between employees' commitment and Industry performance: A quantitative approach and case study of Kansai paints. A published Theses. Kansai, Pakistan. Diva-portal.org

Agba, O., Ushie, E., M., and Nkpoven, F., (2010). Career Development and Employee Commitment in Industrial Organizations. *American Journal of Scientific and Industrial* Research. https://researchgate.net

Ajibade, O. S. (2014). Investigating the effect training on employees' commitment. scindeks-clanci.ceon.rs/data/pdf/1820-3159/2014/1820-31591403007A.pdf

Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63(1), 1-18.

Ali, M., Mosadeghrad, M., Ewan, F., and Rosenberg, D., (2008). Employee Commitment and Health Services Management Research, *Sage Journal Vol 21 (4).* journals.sagepub.com/doi

Andrew, A. (2017). Relationship between Commitment and organizational performance. Asian. *Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting* vol. 5 (2). Pp1-13 ISSN 2456-659X

Anyanwu, C. M., (2000). Productivity in the Nigerian Manufacturing Industry. http://www.cenbank.org/OUT/PUBLICATIONS/RD2000/ABE 00-7PDF

Arnoff, J. (1971) Achievement Motivations Training and Executives advancement, *Journal of Applied Science* New York Vol. 7(1) 4.

Becker and Kerman, (2003). Employee Productivity Images. *Journal of Business Retail and Management Review.* Jbrmr.com/admin/issue/pdf/content82444

Bender, W. N. (2008). Excerpt from Learning Disabilities: Characteristics, Identification, and Teaching Strategies, 2008 edition, p. 120. Elsevier Publication*s.*

Brad,Shiverick and Peter Jannette (2009). Achieving Excellence through Employee Commitment. MyInnerview. http://www.providermagazine.com/reports/Pages/Achieving-Excellence-Through-Employee-Commitment.aspx?PF=1

Carver, Lara and Candela, Lori (2008*).* Attaining organizational commitment across different generations of nurses. *Journal of Nursing Management*, **https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-***2834.2008.00911https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs*

Coffey, L. (2018). What is a Theory of Action? http://www.coffey.com/en/ingenuity-coffey/what-is-a-theory-of-action/

Dalknami, M., and Dimitradis, E., (2018). The effect of job satisfaction on employee commitment. *International Journal of Business and Economic Sciences, Applied Research. Vol 11 (3).*

Derek, B. (2013). The Effects of Taking a Short Break: Task Difficulty, Need for Recovery and Task Performance. Master's Thesis. Applied Psychology, University of Wisconsin Stout, Menomonie WI. 8.

Dinku, G.T. (2018). Effect of employees' commitment on organizational performance at Arjo Diclessa sugar factory. *.African Journal of Business Management.* 12 (9). 252-257. DOI://10.5897/AJBM

Drucker, P., F. (1999). The Practice of Management. Auckland, Butterworth

Ehjiele, E., (2019). The influence of employees' commitment on organizational performance in Nigeria.

Epstein, D., Avrahami, D., Biehl, J. T. ( ) Work-Breaks, Productivity, and Opportunities for Personal Informatics for Knowledge Workers http://www.depstein.net/pubs/depstein_chi16a.pdf.

Evans, C. (2014). The Exact Amount of time employees should work daily. https://www.fastcompany.com/3035605/the-exact-amount-of-time-you-should-work-every-day.

Frederick Taylor (1964) Frederick W. Taylor and Scientific Management: Efficiency ww.skymark.com/resources/leaders/taylor.asp.

Gaertner, K.N., & Nollen, S.D. (1989). Career experiences, perceptions of employmen practice and psychological commitment to the organization. *Human Relations*, 42, 975-91.

Grusky, O. (1966). Career mobility and organizational commitment. *Administrative Science Quarterly,* 10 pp 488-503.

Hall, D.T., Schneider, B.,& Nygren, H.T.(1970) Personal factors in organizational identification, Administrative Science Quarterly, 15, 176-189.

Henning, Robert A., Pierre Jacques, George V. Kissel, Anne B. Sullivan, and Sabina M. Alteras. Webb, (1997). Frequent short rest breaks from: 48 computer work: effects on productivity and well-being at two field sites. Ergonomics, 40(1), 78–91. http://doi.org/fhht29.

Kaplan, R., and Norton, D., (2001). The strategy focused organization. *New York Harvard Business School Pres.*

Kazan, H., (2013). Measurement of Employee Performance: State Bank Application. School of Business, Gebze Institute of Technology. *International Review Management and Business research.* 2 (2) pp 1-13.

Kaur, K., and Sandhu, H. S., (2010). Career Stage Effect on Organization Commitment: Evidence from Indian Banking Industry. International Journal of Business Management, Vol. 5 (12).

Kumar, B. P., and Giri, V. N. (2009). Effect of Age and Experience on Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment. The Icfai Journal of Organizational Behaviour, 8, 28-36.

Ibima, A. (2013). Corpotate Image: A Strategy For Enhancing Customer Loyalty And Profitability.

file:///C:/Users/Hp/Downloads/Corporate%20Image%20-%20Ibima%202013%20-%20File%202-1%20(2).pdf

Levinson, D. J., (1978). The Seasons of Man's Life, New York, Knopf.

Lin, J. & Chiang, M., (2008). Ultimate Control and Productivity. Evidence from Taiwan 's Manufacturing Firms. http://www.efmaefm.org.

Maheshwari, S., (2005) The Employee Engagement Initiative**. http://www.knowledgeworkz.com/samatvam/newsletter/The%20Employee%20Engagemen   t%20Imperative.pdf**

Mamoria, C.B (1995:48), Personnel Management, Himalaya Publishing House New Delhi.

Masooma, Javed, Rifat Balouch & Hassan, Fatimah (2014), Determinants of Job Satisfaction and its Impact on Employee Performance and Turnover Intentions. *Psychology International Journal of Learning and Development, Ol.10.5296/IJLD.V412.6094 Corpus ID28274.*

McElroy. J. C.(2001). Managing workplace commitment by putting people first. Human Resource Management Review. Vol.11, Pp 327-335.

McGregor, Douglas (1960). Theory X and Theory Y - Team Management Training from MindTools https://www.mindtools.com › Team Management › Motivating Your Team

Meyer, J.P., and Maltin, E. R., (2010). A Critical Review, Theoretical Framework and Research Agenda. Department of Psychology, University of Western Ontario. Elsevier Journal.

Meyer, R.C., & Schoorman, F.D. (1992). Predicting participation and production outcomes through a two-dimensional model of organization commitment. *Academy of Management Journal, 35, 671- 684.*

Meyer, J., P. & Hercovitch, L., (2001: 310). Commitment in the Workplace: Toward a General Model. *Human Resource Management Review* Vol. 11, pp 299-326

Miller, D. M., (1984). 'Profitability =Productivity + Price recovery. Harvard Business Review.

Newstrom, J. W. (2011). *Human Behaviour at Work*. 13th ed. McGraw Hill

Nkogbu, G., and Offia, P., A.(2015). Governance, Employee Engagement and Improved Productivity in the Public Sector: The Nigerian Experience. J*ournal of Investment and Management 4 (5)141-151. DOI:10.11648*

Obisi, C. (2011) Employee Training and Development in Nigerian Organizations: Australian J*ournal of Business and Management Research,* Vol. 1 (9) Pp82-91.

Ogala, I., (2014). Impact of good corporate governance on Employee Productivity in Nigerian Banks. A Masters Thesis, being a Research Poject submitted to the School of Post-Graduate Studies, Bayero University, Kano.

Ogilvie, J. R., (1986).The role of human resource management practices in predicting organizational commitment, *Group and Organization Studies.* Vol. 11 (4), 335-359.

Orstein, S., and Issabella, L., (1990). Age vs Stage Modelsof career Attitudes of women: A Partial Replication and Extension. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 36, 1-19.

Porter, L., Steers, R., Mowday, R., & Boulian, P. (1974). Organizational commitment job satisfaction and turnover among psychiatric technicians. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 59, 603-609

Princy, K. and Rebeca, E., (2019). Employee Commitment on Organizational Performance. International Journal of Recent Technology and Engineering. IRJTE) 8 (3). ISSN 2277-3878

Redmond, B. F., and Alderton, M. A., (2016). Work and Organizational commitment. PSYCH484 Work Attitudes and Motivation.

Salancik, G.R. (19977), Commitment and the control of organisational behaviour and belief, New direction for organisational behaviour, 1-54,Chicogo:St.Clair

Sauermann, J., (2016). Performance Measures and Worker Productivity. Stockholm University, Sweden. IZA World of Labour.

Scandura, T. A. (1997). Mentoring and organizational justice. An empirical investigation. Cited in Kumar & Yadav, Employee Commitment: A conceptual Framework. Positive Psychology. *Published by Global Vision Publishing House*.

Scholl, R.W., (1981),Differentiating commitment from expectancy as a motivating force, *Academy of Management Review,6 , 589-599.*

Scrivastava, Shalini (2013). Job satisfaction and organizational Commitment Relationship: Effect of Personality Variables. MDI, *SAGE publications. Vol. 17 (2) 159-167*.

Sexton, C., (2014). Draugiem Group Study in Cathy, C. The Exact Amount of time employees should work daily. https://www.fastcompany.com/3035605/the-exact amount-of-time-you-should-

Sharma J. P., & Bajpai N. (2010). Organizational Commitment and its Impact on job satisfaction of employees. A comparative study in public and private sector in India; Int. Bulletin of Bus. Admin. 2010;9:7-19.

Sokefun, A. O., (2011). The Role of Motivation in Inducing Workers; Commitment in an Organization. *Babcock Journal of Management and Social Sciences.* Vol 9 (1 & 2) Pp 249- 280

Super, D., (1957). The Psychology of Careers. New York, Harpers.

Tangen, S., (2002). A theoretical Foundation for Productivity Measurement and Improvement of automatic Assembly Systems. Licentiate Thesis, Stockholm: Royal Institute of Technology, 2002, Chpt. 3 pp19-30.

Taylor, S., Orly, L., Nakiye, A. B., and Sehon, B., B (2008). Employee Commitments in MNCs: Impacts of organizational culture, HRM and Top Management Orientations. *International Journal of Human Resource Management. V*ol. 19 (4) Pp 501-527 https://doi.org/10 Taylor and Francis Online

Udo-Aka, U., (1983). Measuring Productivity: Issues and Problems in Productivity in Nigeria. Proceedings of a National Conference. Edited by Osoba, A. M. Pp 75

Wallace Foundation (2018). Central Office Creating Your Theory of Action. https://www.wallacefoundation.org.

Yousef, A. D. (2016). Organizational Commitment, job satisfaction and Attitudes toward Organizational Change: A study in the Local Government. *International Journal of Public Administration* http://www.tandfonline.com