Research Paper   .

PSYCHOLOGICAL CORRELATES OF CAREER COMMITMENT: AN EMPIRICAL STUDY AMONG SELECTED NON-ACADEMIC STAFF OF THE UNIVERSITY OF LAGOS.

Akinbode Gabriel Aunde & Alebiosu Deborah Tolulope
Department of Psychology
Faculty of Social Sciences
aakinbode@unilag.edu.ng

Abstract

The study examined the influence of employee engagement, job satisfaction and perceived organizational support on career commitment among non-academic employees of the University of Lagos workforce. A total of two hundred (200) workers from six major departments participated in the cross-sectional survey. Using Social exchange theory and organizational support theory career commitment presupposes essentially that the only way employees could reciprocate the organization's favourable treatment is through continued participation. Therefore, it was hypothesised that the Career commitment of highly engaged employees and satisfied employees would be significantly higher than that of the less engaged and poorly satisfied counterparts. Also, the career commitment of senior and management employees who reported organizational support will be significantly different from career commitment of junior employees with low or less organizational support. Unexpectedly, Results from the data analysis revealed that career commitment of was higher among the highly engaged and satisfied workers). The study established that workers in better job positions who received significant organizational support had higher career commitment than their counterparts who experienced less support. The study recommended that managers should mitigate the perceived consequences of declining career commitments by fostering a positive work environment, providing an opportunity for growth and development, recognise and reward employees, emphasis work-life integration and support employee well-being. Findings were discussed in the light of extant literatures.

Keywords: Employee Engagement, Job Satisfaction, Organisational Support, Career Commitment

Background of Study

Organizations are increasingly realizing that, in today's fast-paced, cutthroat business world, cultivating a dedicated workforce is essential to achieving their goals and objectives (Ellis & Sorensen, 2007; Ayodeji, Akinbode & Akinfala, 2015; Akinbode 2018). A person's devotion and loyalty to their chosen job path are shown by their level of career commitment. Career commitment is a crucial component of employee retention because it shows an employee's long-term intentions, aspirations, and investment in growing their careers within a particular company (Akingbola, K & Van Den Berg, 2017). Committed employees are more likely to stay with the company, perform at a higher level, and contribute to its success. The purpose of this study is to investigate the relationship between employees' career commitment and the organization's perception of employee engagement, job happiness, and organizational support that will impact employees' commitment to their careers in the organization.

Employee engagement pertains to the degree of zeal and commitment that staff members have towards their jobs and the company overall. Motivated, effective, and career-focused workers are more likely to be engaged. Organizations must maximize profits from their current capabilities to survive in the fiercely competitive business world of today, while also acknowledging and adapting to the fact that the business environment and organizations are dynamic (McCann, 2015). Organizations must put in a lot of effort to build a supportive work environment through employee engagement and well-being to improve or preserve competitive advantage, profitability, efficiency, and effectiveness (Cartwright & Holmes, 2006; Catteeuw, Flynn, & Vonderhorst, 2007; Akinbode, 2018). Employees who are engaged will work for the organization longer and consistently look for new, creative ways to improve it. In the end, a high-performing business is created where employees thrive, and production rises and stays stable (Cathead et al., 2007). Many definitions have been applied to the idea of employee engagement, meaning that there is not a single, widely accepted definition around which ground rules could be established. Instead, organisations are attempting to incorporate employee engagement in ways that best suit their needs, as opposed to concepts that have been scientifically proven (such as TQM, Lean Management, and Business Process Reengineering).

Engagement is a distinct mental state that is believed to predict a wide range of outcomes. It is characterized by vigour, dedication, and absorption and is associated with positive, rewarding work-

related results. While it is desirable for employees to be happy, contented workers may not always put their all into their work. Workers who are deeply devoted to their companies might not always be as deeply devoted to their work. Performance is correlated with satisfaction and loyalty, while overall employee involvement seems to be a predictor of performance. As time goes on, the definition of employee involvement has changed over time and is defined by the context in which it is utilized, a universal definition has not yet been established (Eli & Sorensen, 2017; Rafferty, Maben, West, & Robinson, 2015). Ellis & Sorenson (2015) define employee engagement as the ability and opportunity provided to an employee to voluntarily participate in the decision-making process and activities while also taking positive actions to further the organization's prestige and interests. This definition fits the relationship between an employee and his employer. Employee engagement with the company is determined by how they feel about their senior executives, and their level of faith in the organisation's values, policies, justice, and leadership. Organisation citizenship behaviour (OCB) and employee commitment are the two notions that give rise to the idea of employee engagement (Rafferty et al., 2015; Adekoya, Jimoh, Okorie & Olajide, 2019).

In today's firm, management is paying close attention to the concepts of employee engagement and well-being. Moreover, in the difficult and contemporary globalized executives in businesses require a high-performing workforce to expand and survive in the marketplace. To ensure that their organization has a sustainable and viable future, they must manage employee engagement, employee well-being, and the organization's goal successfully (Hill & Birkinshaw, 2012). They understand that a highly engaged workforce can boost productivity, innovation, and financial success, allowing workers to act as the organization's committees. Furthermore, it is claimed that empowered workers are better able to act quickly to address changes in the workplace and make decisions. As a result, the process of giving people more responsibility, authority, and power allows organizations to be more adaptable and responsive, which in turn promotes gains in both individual and organizational performance. For employees to thrive and contribute their expertise and human capital, organizations must establish an atmosphere that supports their engagement and well-being.

The term "job satisfaction" describes a person's nuanced perspective on his or her work. It is a happy emotional state brought on by the recognition that one's work contributes to the fulfilment of one's own goals. Vroom (1964) defined a worker's "job" as their immediate work assignment and position inside

a certain work organization. A behavioural viewpoint can be used to characterize satisfaction as a general notion. It is thought that organizational or individual conduct is goal-directed. Every human activity has a fundamental motivation, and most activities are attempts to optimize satisfaction by satiating several drives, some of which Maslow (1943) has recognized. Accordingly, the usual definition of satisfaction is when someone obtains what they need, want, anticipate, deserve, or believe they are entitled to. Conversely, job satisfaction relates to an individual's subjective assessment of their work and the sense of fulfilment they receive from it. Content workers are more devoted to their companies and are less likely to explore other career paths. Any combination of psychological, physiological, and environmental circumstances that cause a person to honestly say I am Satisfied with my Job, is what Hoppock (1935) defined as job satisfaction. A description like this highlights the range of factors that affect job satisfaction. According to Blum, Graef, & Hauenstein, 1968), an attitude which results from a balancing and summation of many specific likes and dislikes experienced in connection with the job, is what job satisfaction is. According to Vroom (1964), "the positive orientation of an individual towards all aspects of the work situation" is what constitutes job satisfaction. A "pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's or job experiences" is how Locke (1969) describes job satisfaction. These criteria lead to the conclusion that employee perception and expectations play a major role in determining the complicated mix of elements that make up job satisfaction. According to the current study, "a positive attitude or a pleasurable emotional state which results from specific work-related experiences" is how job satisfaction is conceptualized.

Moreover, the degree to which workers feel that their employer values their contributions is concerned about their well-being and supports their professional growth is known as perceived organisational support. Employees are more likely to experience a sense of dedication and loyalty to their employment when they perceive high-level support from their business. The idea of organisational support has been present in the management literature for almost 70 years, even if the formal term of perceived organisational support was not defined and measured until the 1980s (Zagenczyk, 2001). Various scholars have used varied terminology to describe perceived organisational support, and efforts have been made to clarify and simplify the idea. "Perceived organizational support" is defined by Eisenberger et al. (1986) as an employee's well-being (Ahmed, et al. 2011). Perceived organisational support relates to the extent to which a person feels that an

organisation loves him or her, cares about them, and offers assistance and support, according to Erdogan and Enders (2007). Three types of positive work conditions fairness, supervisor support, and perceived organisational support are intimately correlated with one other. In exchange, beneficial outcomes like job satisfaction and organisational commitment are attained. The organisational support theory (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002; Ellis & Sorensen, 2017; Ayodeji, Akinbode & Akinfala, 2015; Akinbode 2018) is supported by all these relationships. As a result, organizational support is investigated from the perspective of the employee. This is an assessment of the level of support that an employee believes or feels they receive from their employer. Put differently, the emphasis of perceived organizational support is on the organization's dedication to the individual. Perceived organizational support is split into two dimensions by Muse and Stamper (2007): POS-J (concern about employees' performance and outcomes) and POS-R (care about employees' well-being and respect). Employee perceptions of the organization's support are influenced by these two constructs. Any one of these components missing would have an impact on how the company is perceived overall for its support.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

This study seeks to address the problem of how employee engagement, job satisfaction, and perceived organizational support interact to influence career commitment amongst selected workers in the organisation. To investigate these problems, the study will consider various research questions such as the level of employee engagement among selected workers seems to be unsatisfactory in the organization. Many workers complain that they do not enjoy good co-worker relationships and Supervisory support from the management. Another problem is the seemingly low level of job satisfaction among selected workers in the organization. While some employees feel that reward and compensation and leadership style need to be improved, others believe the level of interaction and relationship with the Supervisors and top Management is relatively poor. Some employee still believes the level of organizational support for workers is not appreciable in the organization. It is because of this that this study examines the influence of employee engagement, job, Satisfaction and Perceived Organizational Support on Career Commitment among selected Non-Academic workers at the University of Lagos, Nigeria.

Objectives of the Study

This study seeks to address the problem of how employee engagement, job Satisfaction, and Perceived organizational support interact to influence career commitment amongst selected workers in the organization. To investigate this problem, the research seeks to achieve the following objectives.

1. To determine the influence of employee engagement on the career commitment of employees.
2. To examine the influence of job satisfaction on the career commitment of employees.
3. To investigate the independent and interactive influence of job position and perceived organizational support on the career commitment of employees.
4. To examine age differences in the career commitment of employees.
5. To determine the joint influence of employee engagement, job satisfaction, and perceived organizational support on career commitment.

Significance of Study

The findings of this study will enable and help the organization to develop strategies to increase employee's career commitment.

i This study can help organizations understand how employee engagement, job satisfaction, and perceived organizational support contribute to career commitment, allowing them to better position themselves as desirable employers in the talent market.

ii This study will also help the organization to identify the drivers of engagement, job satisfaction, and perceived organizational support that can develop a positive and supportive work environment that fosters career commitment.

Literature Review

The first findings in Perceived Organisational Support (POS) research were that employees should be concerned about their employers' responsibility for their welfare and interests if employers are concerned about their commitment to the work that has been assigned to them (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchinson, & Sowa, 1986). According to Eisenberger et al. (2002; p. 565), "employee believes that organization has an employee orientation which involves both, acknowledgement of their contribution as well as a sense of responsibility towards their well-being." This is the main idea of the organizational support theory. Perceived organization support according to Rhodes and Esienberger (2002), Researches conducted by Eisenberger, Cummings, Armeli & Lynch (1997) and Esienberger, Huntington, Hutchison, and Sowa (1986) among others has shown that employees' perception of organizational support is closely correlated with the organization's commitment to them. This POS benefits workers to interact with their organizations in the expectation that their efforts to accomplish the goals of the company will be recognized. Kurtessis et al. (2015) claim that in exchange for the additional work effort, POS offers

additional financial advantages in addition to socio-emotional ones.

On the other hand, a few others, such as Pazy and Ganzach (2006) and Makanjee, Hartzer, Uys (2006), have noted a relationship between POS and commitment, positive approach, and job satisfaction. As a result, it is possible to argue that POS encourages positive behaviour and attitudes in workers, which benefits the organization. Bell and Mengue (2002) conducted a particular study in which service Workers in the business reported that those with higher POS levels were politer, concentrated, and interested in the client's interest in comparison to other workers. Gyekye and Salminen (2007) contended that workers who obtain Organizational support typically benefit their organization through greater production, efficiency, and loyalty. POS is therefore an essential precondition for obtaining from workers the necessary production that will ultimately benefit the firm. It contributes to the development of a trusting environment within an organization, increasing its value.

According to Robbins and Judge (2015), organizing support is the process by which people arrange and make sense of their sensory experiences to provide context for their surroundings. When it comes to the perceptions of organizational support. This suggests that the corporation values the hard work that its employees put in, which encourages them to feel more accountable for helping the company achieve its goals and objectives. This simply relates to perceived organizational support, which will always improve employees' willingness to do more work because they know they will be rewarded for outstanding work. In return, this has demonstrated to the employees that the organization values their work.

Theoretical Framework of the study
Social Exchange Theory: Social exchange theory (Blau, 1964) suggests that employees who receive a high level of support from the organization are inclined to repay the organization. One Essential way to reciprocate the organization's favourable treatment is through continued participation (Allen, Shore & Griffeth, 2003; Wayne, Shore and Linden 1997). March and Simon's (1958) groundwork on the inducement contributions relationships between the organization and the employees also indicates that employees who receive more support as part of the inducements offered by the organization would have less desire to leave the organization. Since this theory discusses reciprocity, it is appropriate for this work. When workers feel that management is rooting for them, they will want to repay the favour by being devoted, content, and willing to put in their fair share of idea-generation work. According to

SET, when one person shows the other goodwill, a reciprocal relationship develops and the other party reciprocates by treating the first party well (Gouldner, 1960; Blau, 1964; Robinson, Perryman & Hayday, 2004; Salanova, Schaufeli, 2008; Zagenczyk, Gibney, Kiewitz & Restubog, 2009; Saradha, & Patrick, 2011). Furthermore, according to Blau (1964), social exchange theory is used in businesses to comprehend how managers may instil a sense of duty in their workforce and encourage actions that improve output and citizenship.

Research Questions:
The following research question is put forward to aid the study:
1 Will the career commitment of highly engaged employees be different from career commitment of employees who are lowly engaged?
2 Will the career commitment of highly satisfied employees be different from career commitment of lowly satisfied employees?
3 Will the career commitment of senior and management employees who reported organizational support be different from career commitment of junior employees with low organizational support?
4 Is there an age difference in the career commitment of non-academic employees of the University of Lagos?
5 Will employee engagement, job satisfaction, and perceived organizational support jointly influence career commitment among non-academic employees of the University of Lagos?

Research Hypotheses
1 The career commitment of highly engaged employees will significantly be different from career commitment of less engagement employees.
2 The career commitment of highly satisfied employees will significantly be different from the career commitment of less satisfied employees.
3 The career commitment of senior and management employees who reported organizational support will be significantly different from career commitment of junior employees with no organizational support.
4 There will be a significant age difference in the career commitment of non-academic employees of the University of Lagos.
5 Employee engagement, job satisfaction, and perceived organizational support will jointly influence career commitment among non-academic employees of the University of Lagos.

METHOD
Setting
The research was conducted at the University of Lagos located at Akoka, Yaba, and Lagos State among selected non-academic workers of the University of Lagos.

Participants and Sampling Technique

Two Hundred and One (201) non-teaching employees of the University of Lagos workforce participated in the survey.

Design

This study adopted a survey research design.

Instruments

Four instruments were used to collect data from participants in the study. The instruments are: Utrecht Work Engagement Scale, Minnesota Job Satisfaction Scale, Career Commitment Scale and Perceived Organizational Support Scale. They were prepared in a questionnaire format which has four sections: section A is the demographic section of the questionnaire which obtains demographic information of respondents such as gender, age, marital status, no of years worked, income level, position in the organization, educational qualification

1. Employee Engagement: Employee Engagement was measured by the Employee Engagement Scale developed by the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale. The scale is designed to determine engagement based on the assumption that it is a' positive work-related state of fulfilment that is characterized by vigour, dedication, and absorption '(Schaufeli, Bakker & Salanova, 2006). It is composed of three scales each measuring one of these three constructs. The scale is available in long and short form (17 or 9 items). The UWES-9 has been shown to have good construct validity, suggesting a high correlation to the theorized construct of engagement (Seppala et al, 2008). Tests have shown that the three scales have good internal consistency and test-retest reliability, indicating that the scale is reliable (Schaufeli, Salanova, Gonza´lez-Roma & Bakker, 2002; Schaufeli, Bakker & Salanova, 2006). The author(s) reported a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.93: (α for men=0.92; α for women=0-93). The values obtained for the different dimensions were 0.79 for absorption, 0.87 for dedication and 0.85 for vigour. Items are on a 6-point Likert scale from 0 (never) to 6(always/every day). The instrument provides three partial scores and a total score. The partial scores are obtained by adding the items corresponding to each subscale (vigour: items 1, 2, 5; dedication: items 3, 4, 7; absorption: items 6, 8, 9) and dividing the result by the number of items that compose it. The total score ranges from 0 to 6 points. A higher score indicates greater work engagement.

2. Job Satisfaction: Job satisfaction was measured by Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) scale: "long form" consists of 100 questions that make up 20 subscales measuring satisfaction with ability utilization , achievement, activity, advancement authority, company policies and practices, compensation, co-workers, creativity, independence, moral values, recognition, responsibility, security, social service, social status, supervision-human relations, supervision – technical, variety, and working conditions (Weiss, Dawis, England & Lofquist, 1967). Twenty of these items make up a frequently used measure of general job Satisfaction. These 20 items are referred to as the short form of the MSQ. The items can be separated into a 12–item subscale for intrinsic Satisfaction (such as satisfaction with the chance to use abilities and feelings of accomplishment from the job) and an 8-item subscale measuring extrinsic satisfaction (such as satisfaction with pay, chances for advancement, and supervision). Coefficient alpha values for the intrinsic satisfaction subscale ranged from .82 to .86 (Breeden, 1993, Chung, Wong & Wei, 1998). For the extrinsic satisfaction subscale, coefficient alpha values ranged from .70 to .82 (Breeden, 1993; Davy et al., 1997; Chung, Wong & Wei, 1998).

3. Perceived organizational support: Perceived organisational support was measured by the perceived organizational Support Scale developed by Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, & Sowa, 1986), to measure employee perception of the extent to which an organization is willing to reward greater efforts by the employee because the organization values the employee's contribution and cares about his or her well-being. The measure includes eight items that measure an employee's perceptions of the degree to which the organization might take that would affect the well-being of the employees. Coefficient alpha values ranged fromm.74 to.95 (Eisenberger, Cummings, Armeli, & Lynch, 1997; Eisenberger, Fasolo, & Davis-LaMastro, 1990). Perceived organizational support correlated positively with overall job satisfaction, organizational commitment, direct and indirect control at work, job discretion, interpersonal helping etc (Cropanzano, Howes, Grandey, & Toth, 1997; Eisenberger, Cummings, Armeli, & Lynch, 1997; Eisenberger et al., 1990; Hutchinson et al., 1998; Lee& Ashforth, 1993; Moorman, Blakely, & Neihoff, 1998).

4. Career Commitment: The career Commitment measure was obtained by using the Career Commitment Scale developed by Blau (1989). The scale is used to examine individuals' commitment towards their occupations, professions and careers. Coefficient alpha values range from.76 to.88 (Cohen, 1995, 1996, 1999; Reilly & Orsak, 1991; Somers & Birnbaum, 1998). Career commitment correlated negatively with work stress, emotional exhaustion, low accomplishment, and the low alternatives dimension of continuance commitment. Career commitment correlated positively with perceived performance and life satisfaction, and the

personal sacrifices dimension of continuance commitment (Cohen, 1999; Reilly & Orsak. 1991). Factor analysis showed that career commitment was empirically distinct from affective organizational commitment, continuance commitment, and normative commitment (Cohen, 1996). Response is obtained using a 5-point Likert type scale Where 1= strongly agree, 3=Unsure, and 5= strongly disagree.

Procedure
The researcher went to the organization where this study took place to consult with the human resource managers who are in charge in other to engage their employees in the study. The purpose of the study was explained to the employees. The human resource manager granted the researcher permission and asked the researcher to come back on a fixed date. In the Second phase, the researcher met with the respondents in their various organizations and sought their consent to participate in the research. The participants were told that the aim of the study was for academic purposes and that no information that they gave would be disclosed or used against them. They were given anonymity by telling them not to write their names or any personal information about them on the questionnaires. Questionnaires were given to participants who agreed to participate after establishing rapport. They were told that there was no right or wrong answer to the questions therein. The researcher ensured that participants understood the contents of the questions therein. The researcher ensured that participants understood the contents of the questionnaire and also ensured that they were properly completed before collecting them. Ample time will be given to the participants to read the questionnaire and ask questions where they are confused. The questionnaires were collected after filling them and they were scored according to the manual of the scales.

Hypotheses Testing
Hypothesis One: *states that the career commitment of highly engaged employees will be significantly different from the career commitment of employees who are lowly engaged.*

To investigate the influence of employee engagement on the report of career commitment among the research participants, a t-test for independent samples was conducted. The result is presented in table 2.1 below.

Table 2.1 shows that participants who were highly engaged (M = 18.67, SD =4.16) did not report greater career commitment than those who were less engaged (M = 19.16, SD =4.9). Specifically, employee engagement did not influence career commitment among respondents (t (198) = -.173, p> .05). Hence, hypothesis one is rejected.

Hypothesis two: *states that the career commitment of highly satisfied employees will significantly be different from the career commitment of less satisfied employees.*

The research hypothesis was developed to estimate the impact of job satisfaction on career commitment. The analysis was conducted using the t-test for independent samples. The result is presented in table 2.2 below.

Table 2.2: Independent Sample T-test showing the Impact of Job Satisfaction on Career Commitment

	Job Satisfaction	Mean (SD)	df	t	p	Cohen's D 95% Confidence Interval lower	Upper
Career Commitment	Low Job Satisfaction	17.36 (5.2)	198	-2.73	<.05	-.818	-.131
	High Job Satisfaction	19.63 (4.63)					

Table 2.2 shows that participants who reported higher job satisfaction (M = 19.63, SD =4.63) reported greater career commitment than those with low job satisfaction (M = 17.36, SD =5.2). Specifically, Career commitment was higher among workers who reported significant level of job satisfaction (t = -2.73, p< .05). Hence, hypothesis two is accepted.

Hypothesis Three: *states that the career commitment of senior and management employees who reported organizational support will be significantly different from the career commitment of junior employees with no organizational support.*

The purpose was to estimate the main and interactive influence of organizational support and job position on career commitment. This was analysed using the factorial analysis of variance (ANOVA). The result is presented in the table below.

Table 2.1: Independent Sample T-test showing the Impact of Employee Engagement on Career Commitment

	Engagement (N)	Mean (SD)	df	t	p	Cohen's D 95% Confidence Interval lower	Upper
Career Commitment	Low engagement	19.16 (4.9)	198	.173	>.01	-1.039	1.24
	High engagement	18.67 (4.16)					

Table 2.3: 2x2 ANOVA Comparison Organizational Support on Career Commitment

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	416.083ᵃ	7	59.440	2.676	.012
Intercept	23539.972	1	23539.972	1059.609	.000
Position in the Organization	84.059	3	28.020	1.261	.289
Organisational Support	39.154	1	39.154	1.762	.186
Position in the Organization * OS	378.109	3	126.036	5.673	.001
Error	4265.417	192	22.216		
Total	78026.000	200			
Corrected Total	4681.500	199			

a. R Squared = .089 (Adjusted R Squared = .056)

Table 2.3 shows that neither position in the organization (F = 1.261, p>.05) nor OS (Organizational support) (F = 1.762, p>.05) influenced the career commitment of non-academic employees of the University of Lagos. However, the interactive effects of the two variables influenced the career commitment of employees (F = 5.673, p<.05). As a result, hypothesis three is partially confirmed.

Hypothesis four: *states that there will be a significant age difference in the career commitment of non-academic employees of the University of Lagos.*

This was based on the analysis of the impact of age on career commitment. The analysis was conducted using one-way Analysis of variance (ANOVA). The result is presented in the table below.

Table 2.4: Analysis of Variance table showing the Impact of Age on Employees' Career Commitment

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	56.395	2	28.198	1.201	.303
Within Groups	4625.105	197	23.478		
Total	4681.500	199			

Table 2.4 includes the analysis of age on employees' career commitment using the analysis of variance technique. Findings show that there is no significant age difference in the career commitment of non-academic employees of the University of Lagos (F $(2, 197)$ = 1.201, P> .05). Hence, hypothesis four is rejected.

Hypothesis five: *states that employee engagement, job satisfaction, and perceived organizational support will jointly influence career commitment among non-academic employees of the University of Lagos.*

The hypothesis was tested using the multiple regression analysis test. This result is presented in Table 2.5 below.

Table 2.5: Table showing the Contribution of Employment Engagement, Job Satisfaction, and Organizational support on Career Commitment

Variable	Unstandardized Coefficients (B)	SE	Standardized Beta (β)	t	Sig
Employee Engagement	-.029	.022	-.096	-1.302	.194
Job Satisfaction	.086	.029	.221	3.015	.003
Organizational Support	.172	.054	.222	3.159	.002

Note. Constant = 12.126, F $(2, 196)$ = 5.55**, p <.01, R^2 = .078

Table 2.5 shows that employment engagement, job satisfaction, and organization support jointly predicted changes in career commitment (F $(2, 196)$ = 5.55**, p <.01). **R^2** indicates that approximately 7.8% of the variance in career commitment is explained by the contributions of employment engagement, job satisfaction, and organization support. Hence, hypothesis five is confirmed.

Discussion

The overall aim of this study was to investigate the influence of employee engagement, job satisfaction and perceived organizational support on career commitment among non-academic employees of the University of Lagos workforce. The study, therefore, presents findings on the empirical analysis of the influence of employee engagement, job satisfaction and perceived organizational support on worker's career commitment.

Work engagement: Our findings contrasted the prediction that the career commitment of highly engaged employees will be significantly different from the career commitment of less engaged employees (Cathead et al., 2007; Sofian, 2016; Robbins &Judge, 2015; Eli & Sorensen, 2017; Rafferty et al., 2015). The findings established significant feelings of bursting with energy, strong vigour, and capacity to deliver service but were simply not very enthusiastic about their job. This manifestation is probably because employees were not fully engaged in their work as expected due to job dissatisfaction and poor organisational support. According to Ronnis and Judge (2015), the experience of socio-emotional needs like recognition, nurturing, and benefits like pay and health insurance will boost the emotional need for commitment satisfaction, engagement and service delivery (Zagenczyk, Gibney, Kiewitz, & Restubog, 2009; Saradha., & Patrick, 2011). Interestingly, our present results seem to suggest that the workers have capacities to engage and deliver good service but choose to withhold such efforts, which at variance with several other previous findings (see: Cohen, 1995, 1996, 1999; Reilly & Orsak, 1991; Somers &Birnbaum, 1998; Schaufeli, Bakker & Salanova, 2006 Kurtessis et al. 2015).

Job satisfaction: Also, our findings supported the widely held prediction that the career commitment of highly satisfied employees will significantly be different from the career commitment of less satisfied employees which is consistent with (Eisenberger, Cummings, Armeli, & Lynch, 1997; Eisenberger et al., 1990; Breeden, 1993; Davy et al., 1997; Wong et al., 1998; Blau, 1964). According to Blau (1964) employees who receive a high level of support from the organization are inclined to repay the organization. It has also been established that employees reciprocate the organization's favourable treatment through continued participation that is demonstrated in commitment, satisfaction and work

engagement (Allen, Shore & Griffeth, 2003; Wayne, Shore and Liden 1997; Pazy & Ganzach, 2006; Makanjee, Hartzer, Uys, 2006; Eli & Sorensen, 2017; Rafferty et al., 2015). Cadre and job position: Findings that career commitment of senior and management employees is higher among workers that experience higher organizational support.

Age differences: Findings from the study contrasted the widely held prediction that older workers are usually committed to their career due to stability growth needs and younger workers exhibit less commitment, probably because of the tendency to experiment with a number of available career options until sometimes later when they feel that growth and stability are required to maintain a regular career. Our findings that the age factor did not influence the career commitment of non-academic employees of the University of Lagos therefore are not consistent with (Pazy & Ganzach, 2006; Makanjee, Hartzer, & Uys, 2006),

Conclusions

The research indicates that employee engagement and job satisfaction do not have a significant impact on the career commitment of non-academic staff at the University of Lagos. However, the combination of perceived organisational support and job position does have a significant interactive influence on their career commitment. It may be inferred from this that non-academic staff members are more inclined to be committed to their tasks when they have a beneficial employment status and a strong view of the positive support they get from the company. Furthermore, the study suggests that employee engagement, job happiness, and perceived organisational support have a significant and simultaneous impact on the career commitment of non-academic professionals. The importance of these findings resides in the fact that they emphasise the need to foster a supportive organisational atmosphere that recognises and commends the achievements of non-academic staff members, regardless of their job position. Universities may cultivate a non-academic workforce that is more dedicated and involved by providing essential assistance, opportunities for progression, and job satisfaction. As a consequence, this may lead to increased organisational performance and better service delivery to students and other stakeholders. To summarise, employee engagement and job satisfaction alone may not be enough to ensure career commitment among non-academic staff. However, when combined with perceived organisational support and favourable job positions, these factors can greatly enhance their commitment to their careers and the university as a whole.

Implications of the Finding

Categorically, the finding shows that employee engagement is not a significant predictor of career commitment in the selected institution (p >0.05). This implies that the engagement of employees within the University of Lagos does not impact their commitment to a longer career or a more sustainable one. This is similar when discussing job satisfaction since it has no significant influence on career commitment (p>0.05).

Conversely, the position held in the organization and perceived organizational support have a combined significant influence on career commitment (p<0.05). This implies that employees who find themselves in significantly higher positions with strong organizational support as perceived may have a greater effect on the employees in terms of their career commitment.

Finally, there is a joint significant influence of employee engagement, job satisfaction, and perceived organizational support on career commitment (R^2=0.78, p<0.05). This is so because the combination of all the elements is a greater good for the organization in terms of enhancing the employee's career commitment. It implies that the administrators and managers have more work to do to improve career commitment, especially with the use of perceived organizational support items.

Recommendations

The following recommendations were made:

i   Since employee engagement has no significant influence on career commitment, managers should identify other variables that have a pressing need of attention and ensure that they are integrated.

ii   Since job satisfaction has no significant influence on career commitment among the employees of the institution; managers should delve into technological advancement and employee-supportive strategies to increase career commitment in these modern times.

iii   There should be an increase in perceived organizational support to influence career commitment among the employees.

Iv   The joint significant influence of employee engagement, job satisfaction, and perceived organizational support on career commitment is an indication that more research work should be encouraged among employees to foster unity, peace and progress.

References

Adekoya, O.D., Jimoh, I., Okorie, G. & Olajide, M (2019). Significance of employee engagement and individual well-being on organizational performance in Nigeria. *International Journal of Sciences and Management Studies, 2* (5), 35-39.

Ahmed, S., Ahmad, F., & Joarder, M. H. R. (2011). Job Involvement as Predictor of Employee Commitment: Evidence from Pakistan. International Journal of Business and Management. 6(4).

Akingbola, K. & Van Den Berg, A. H. (2017). Antecedents, Consequences, and Context of Employee Engagement in Nonprofit Organizations, *Review of Public Personnel Administration,* 1-29

Akinbode, G.A. (2018). Behavioural and Attitudinal Outcomes of Psychological Contract Breach among some Selected Factory Workers. A Psychological Appraisal of Operational Challenges of SME's in Nigeria. *African Journal for the Psychological Studies of Social Issues, 20(3), 57-89.* Dept. of Psychology, University of Ibadan.

Akinbode, A.A. & Akinbode, G.A. (2017). Work-life Balance among Social Workers in some Selected Welfare Homes and Rehab Centers in Lagos State. Nigerian Journal of Psychological Research, 13. 53-62. Dept. of Psychology, University of Nigeria, Nzuka.

Ayodeji, F., Akinbode, G.A. & Akinfala, F.J.O (2015). Psycho-Physiological Outcomes of Work-Family and Family-Work Conflicts among Career Women: An Empirical Appraisal of Human Service Organisation in Nigeria. *Nigerian Journal of Management Studies,* 13(1), 205-229. Faculty of Business Admin., University of Lagos.

Allen, D. G., Shore, L. M., & Griffeth, R. W. (2003). The role of perceived organizational support and supportive human resource practices in the turnover process. *Journal of Management,* *29*(1), 99–118. https://doi.org/10.1177/014920630302 900107

Bell, S. & Mengue, B. (2002). The employee-organisation relationship, organisational citizenship behaviour, and superior service quality. *Journal of Retailing*, 78(2), 131-148.

Bertelli A.M. (2007). Determinants of bureaucratic turnover intention: Evidence from the department of the treasury. Journal of Publication Administration Research and Theory, 17(2), 235-258.

Biswas, S. & Bhatnagar, J. (2013). Mediator Analysis of Employee Engagement: Role of Perceived Organizational Support, P-O Fit, Organizational Commitment, and Job Satisfaction*, the Journal for Decision Makers, 38* (1): 27-40. 6).

Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. John Wiley and Sons Blum (1968)

Blum, G. S., Graef, J. R., & Hauenstein, L. S. (1968). Effects of interference and cognitive arousal upon the processing of organized thought. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 73*(6), 610–614.

Breeden, S. A. (1993). Job and occupational change as a function of occupational correspondence and job satisfaction. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 43*(1), 30–45. https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.1993.1028

Cartwright, S., Holmes, N. (2006). 'The meaning of work: the challenge of regaining employee engagement and reducing cynicism, *Human Resource Management Review*, 16, 199–208

Catteeuw, F., Flynn, E., Vonderhorst, J. (2007). Employee engagement: boosting productivity in turbulent times, *Organization Development Journal*, 25 (2), 151– 157

Chung, K.T., Wong, T.Y., Wei, C.I., et al. (1998) Tannins and Human Health: A Review. Critical Reviews in Food Science and Nutrition, 38, 421-464.

Chung, K.T., Wong, T.Y., Wei, C.I., et al. (1998) Tannins and Human Health: A Review. Critical Reviews in Food Science and Nutrition, 38, 421-464.

Cohen, A. (1993). Organizational Commitment and Turnover: A Meta-Analysis. *Academy of Management Journal,* 36, 1140-1157. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/256650

Cohen, A. D. (1996). Second Language Learning and Use Strategies: Clarifying the Issues 1. Minnesota: Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition, University of Minnesota.

Cohen, B. Z. (1999). Measuring the willingness to seek help. *Journal of Social Service Research,* *26*(1), 67–82. https://doi.org/10.1300/J079v26n01_0 4

Cohen, D., Nisbett, R. E., Bowdle, B. F., & Schwarz, N. (1996). Insult, aggression, and the southern culture of honor: An "experimental ethnography." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70*(5), 945–960. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.70.5.945

Cohen, J. (1999). Educating Minds and Hearts. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Cohen, N. (1995). Mentoring Adult Learners: A Guide for Educators and Trainers. Malabar, FL: Kreieger Publishing Company.

Cropanzano, R., Howes, J. C., Grandey, A. A., & Toth, P. (1997). The Relationship of Organizational Politics and Support to Work Behaviors, Attitudes, and Stress.

Journal of Organizational Behavior, 18, 159-180.

Eisenberger, R. (1986). Perceived Organizational Support, *Journal of Applied Psychology, 71* (3): 500-507. 12)

Eisenberger, R. (1997). Perceived Organizational Support, Discretionary Treatment, and Job Satisfaction, *Journal Applied Psychology, 82* (5): 812-820. 13)

Eisenberger, R., Cummings, J., Armeli, S., & Lynch, P. (1997). Perceived organizational upport, discretionary treatment, and job satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 82, 812–820.

Eisenberger, R., Fasolo, P., & Davis-LaMastro, V. (1990). Perceived organizational support and employee diligence, commitment, and innovation. Journal of Applied Psychology, 75, 51–59.

Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S. & Sowa, D. (1986) Perceived Organizational Support. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 71*, 500-507. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.71.3.500.

Eisenberger, R., Stinglhambert, F., Vandenberghe, C & Sucharski, I. (2002). Perceived Supervisor Support: Contributions to Perceived Organizational Support and Employee Retention, Journal of Applied Psychology, 87(3), 565-73, DOI:10.1037//0021-9010.87.3.565

Ellis, C. M., & Sorensen, A. (2007). Assessing employee engagement: the key to improving productivity. Perspectives, 15(1), 1-9.

Ellis, F. &Sorensen, J. (2017). Supporting workplace learning for high-performance work. *International Labour Organization.*

Erdogan, B., & Enders, J. (2007). Support from the Top: Supervisors' Perceived Organizational Support as a Moderator of Leader Member Exchange to Satisfaction and Performance Relationships. Journal of Applied Psychology, 92, 321-330.

Gouldner, A.W. (1960) The Norm of Reciprocity: A Preliminary Statement. American *Sociological Review*, 25, 161-178. https://doi.org/10.2307/2092623

Gyekye, S.A. & Salminen, S. (2007). Workplace Safety Perceptions and Perceived Organizational Support: Do Supportive Perceptions Influence Safety Perceptions? International Journal of Occupational Safety and Ergonomics, 13:2, 189-200.

Hill, S.A. and Birkinshaw, J. (2012) Ambidexterity and Survival in Corporate Venture Units. Journal of Management, 40, 1899-1931.

Hoppock, R. (1935). *Job satisfaction.* Harper.

Kurtessis, J.N., Eisenberger, R., Ford, M.T., et al. (2017) Perceived Organizational Support: A Meta-Analytic Evaluation of Organizational Support Theory. Journal of Management, 43, 1854-1884.

Lee, R. T., & Ashforth, B. E. (1993). A further examination of managerial burnout: Toward an integrated model. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 14*(1), 320. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.4030140103

Locke, E. A. (1969). What is job satisfaction? *Organizational Behavior & Human Performance, 4*(4), 309–336.

Maaravi, Y., Ganzach, Y., & Pazy, A. (2011). Negotiation as a form of persuasion: Arguments in first offers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 101*(2), 245–255. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0023331

Makanjee, C., Hartzer, Y., & Uys, I. L. (2006). The effect of perceived organizational support on organizational commitment of diagnostic imaging radiographers. *Radiography*, *12*(2), 118-126. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.radi.2005.04.005

March, J.G., & Simon, H.A. (1958). *Organizations.* Wiley.

Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review, 50*(4), 370–396.

Maslow, A. H. (1954). Motivation and personality, New York, NY: Harper.

McCann, M., & Barlow, A. (2015). Use and Measurement of Social Media for SMEs. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development, 22,* 273-287.

Moorman, R., Blakely, G.L. & Neihoff, B. (1998). Relationship Between Procedural Justice and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour? *Academy of Management Journal,* 41(3):351-357

Mowday, R. T., Porter, L. W., & Steers, R. M. (1982). Employee-organization linkages: The psychology of commitment, absenteeism, and turnover. New York: Academic Press.

Muse, L.A. & Stamper, C.L (2007). Perceived organizational support: Evidence for a mediated association with work performance *Journal of Managerial Issues* 19(4):517-535

Nunnally, J. (1970). Introduction to Psychological Measurement. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Inc.

Rafferty, S. Maben, R.T., West, P & Robinson, H. (2015). Work engagement: reflections on the state of play. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 20(1), 74-88.

Reilly, N. P., & Orsak, C. L. (1991). A career stage analysis of career and organizational commitment in nursing. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 39*(3), 311–330. https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-8791(91)90041-J

Rhoades, L. & Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived Organizational Support: A review of the Literature, Journal of Applied Psychology, 87 (4): 698-714.

Robbins, S. P. (2001). Organisational Behaviour (9th ed.). New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2015). Organizational Behavior (16th ed.). Pearson Education, Inc.

Robbinson, P. S. & Judge, T. A. (2017). *Organizational Behaviour*, Edisi 17, England: Pearson Education Limited. 33.

Robinson, D., Perryman, S. and Hayday, S. (2004) The Drivers of Employee Engagement. Brighton, Institute for Employment Studies.

Saks, A. M. (1996). The relationship between the amount and helpfulness of entry training and work outcomes. *Human Relations,* 49, 429–451.

Saks, M. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement, *Journal of Managerial Psychology,* 21(7), 600-619.

Salanova M, Schaufeli WB (2008) A cross-national study of work engagement as a mediator between job resources and proactive behaviour. *International Journal of Human Resource Management* 19: 116–131.

Saradha, H., & Patrick, H. A. (2011). Employee engagement in relation to organizational citizenship behavior in information technology organizations. Journal of Marketing and Management, 2(2), 74- 90.

Schaufeli, W.B., Bakker, A.B., & Salanova, M., (2006). The

Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., Gonza´lez-Roma´, V., & Bakker, A. B. (2002). The measurement of engagement and burnout: A confirmatory factor analytic approach. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 3, 71–92.

Schaufeli, W.B., Bakker, A.A. & Salanova, M. (2006). The measurement of work engagement with a short questionnaire: A cross-sectional study. *Educational & Psychological Measurement,* 66(4), 701-716.

Seppälä, P., Mauno A.S, Feldt, ÁT., Hakanen, J., Kinnunen, U., Tolvanen, T., Schaufeli, W.B (2008), ′The construct validity of the utrecht work engagement scale: multisample and longitudinal evidence′, *Journal of Happiness Studies,*

Somers, M. J., & Birnbaum, D. (1998). Work-related commitment and job performance: It's also the nature of the performance that counts. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 19*(6), 621–634.

Vroom, V. (1964) Work and Motivation. Wiley and Sons, New York.

Wayne, S. J., Shore, L. M., & Liden, R. C. (1997). Perceived organizational support and leader-member exchange: A social exchange perspective. *Academy of Management Journal, 40*(1), 82–111. https://doi.org/10.2307/257021

Weiss, D. J., Dawis, R. V., & England, G. W. (1967). Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. *Minnesota Studies in Vocational Rehabilitation, 22,* 120.

Zagenczyk, T. J., Gibney, R., Kiewitz, C., & Restubog, S. L. D. (2009). Mentors, supervisors, and role models: Do they reduce the effects of psychological contract breach? Human Resource Management Journal, 19, 237–259