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Abstract
The study examined the predictability of job security, job satisfaction on organizational commitment and workers’ performance within industries in Lagos State, Nigeria. A total of 294 employees sampled from three main sectors of the economy namely, para-military (immigrations), civic service and the organized private sector (Nigeria Bottling Company) were involved in the study. Four structured questionnaires were used to elicit their responses which were analyzed using Pearson product moment correlation and multiple regressions. The findings showed that job satisfaction and job commitment correlated with job performance. However, job security did not show significant correlation with performance. Also, there was no correlation between job security and organizational commitment. It was therefore, recommended that workers’ satisfaction with their job and job security should be vigorously pursued by management so as to elicit and sustain organizational commitment and improved performance of workers.

Introduction
The performance of workers at their workplace has been associated with job security, job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Organizational commitments reflect the extent to which an individual identifies with an organization and is committed to its goals. It is an important work attitude because committed individuals are expected to display a willingness to work harder to achieve organizational goals and a greater desire to stay employed at an organization (Kreitner & Kinicki, 2004). This implies that workers that are committed to their organizations can be as a result of job security or job satisfaction. It is also observed that among the factors which contribute to a healthy organizational climate, high morale and motivation is the extent to which employees have a sense of commitment to the organization and security of job. The extent of their commitment will have a major influence on the level of work performance also (Mullins, 1996).

Workers who are satisfied with their jobs remain committed to that organization. This is so because the general feeling of satisfaction with one’s job will be consistent with the idea that it is a pretty decent place to work hence the commitment (Manju, Katherine, Joey, Chuck & Harrison, 2002). Allen and Meyer (1990) in discussing organizational commitment distinguished three types of commitment; namely affective, continuance and normative. The affective commitment sees the emotional attachment of the worker to the organization, while continuance commitment sees the person’s perception (economic outlook) of the costs and risks associated with leaving the current organization and normative commitment sees it from the moral dimension, based on a person’s felt obligation and responsibility to the employing organization. In Nigeria, most employees’ commitment are based on continuance commitment because of scarcity of job opportunities. From this definition of Allen and Meyer, one could infer that job satisfaction and job security are concomitant to organizational commitment.

O’Reilly (1991) sees commitment from three processes, namely, compliance (where a person accepts the influence of others mainly to obtain something from others, such as pay):
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identification (where the individual accepts influence in order to maintain a satisfying relationship and to feel proud of belonging to the organization) and internalization (where the individual finds the values of the organization to be intrinsically rewarding and compatible with person values). In Nigeria, it is observed that workers at the para-military sectors are affected by compliance commitment while employees at the private sectors are mostly affected by the identification commitment. These definitions also indicate the inferred and the use of job satisfaction in securing organizational commitment.

It is against this background that this paper seeks to examine how job performance, job security and job satisfaction will influence organizational commitment with the almost intent of influencing workers' performance (improved productivity).

Review of Relevant Literature
Organizational Commitment

Organizational commitment has been of great interest to researchers because of its association with such desirable work behaviours as increased productivity, personnel stability, lower absenteeism rate, job satisfaction and organizational citizenship (Ugboro & Obeng, 2001; Meyer, Paunonen, Gallatly, Goffin & Jackson, 1989). Meyer and Allen (1991), corroborated by Dunham, Grube and Castaneda (1994) while reviewing organizational commitment, identified three types of organizational commitment namely; affective, continuance and normative. Allen and Meyer (1991) found that these three classifications of commitment are conceptually and empirically separable. Though there may be some overlaps between affective and normative commitment, both were relatively independent of continuance commitment.

Affective commitment is employee's emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the organization and its goals. This results from an agreement between individual and organizational values so that it becomes natural for one to become emotionally attached to and enjoy membership in the organization. Continuance commitment is willingness to remain in an organization because of personal investment in nontransferable investments. These investments include close working relationships with co-workers, retirement, career and skills that are unique to a particular organization. They also include years of employment in a particular organization, involvement in the community in which the employer is, and other benefits that make it too closely for one to leave and seek employment elsewhere. Normative commitment is that which is induced by a feeling of obligation to remain with an organization. This is natural predisposition to be loyal and committed to institutions like family, marriage, country, religion and employment organization because of socialization in cultures that place premium on loyalty and devotion to institutions.

Meyer, Allen and Smith (1993) submitted that common to the three types of commitment, is the view that commitment is a psychological state that characterizes the employee's relation with the organization, and has implication for the decision to continue or stop membership in the organization. Employees with a strong affective commitment remain with an organization because they want to; those with a strong continuance commitment remain because they have to and those with a strong normative commitment remain because they feel they ought to (stay).

According to Ugboro and Obeng (2001), over the years, two basic approaches have been used to study organizational commitment. Commitment – related attitudes and commitment – related behaviours. Each approach offers a different definition of organizational commitment as a partisan, affective attachment to the goals and values, and to the organization for its own sake, apart from purely instrumental worth. It is also the willingness of an employee to exert high level of effort for the organization, a strong desire for the organization, and an acceptance of its major goals and values. However,
commitment-related behaviour deals with pattern guided by internalized normative pressures to act in ways that meet organizational goals and interests.

**Job Security**

Job security occurs along the two dimensions of feelings namely, threat to total job and threat to job features (Greenhalgh & Rosenblatt, 1984). The first is the feeling of threats to one’s total job, i.e. threats to a total job. For instance, threat to a total job can come in the following ways: at one extreme one may be moved into a lower position within the organization, be moved to another job at the same level within the organization, or be laid-off temporarily. At the other extreme, the job loss may be permanent or one may be fired, or be forced into early retirement. The organizational change also may make the future of an entire division or a department uncertain in which case job losses may be imminent.

The second way in which job insecurity is manifested is in feelings of threats to job features, i.e. when some aspects of one’s job (features), are threatened. For instance, the organizational change may make it difficult to get ahead in the organization, maintain one’s current salary or pay increase. It may even affect one’s position in the company, freedom to schedule work, the variety of tasks performed, and the significance of jobs. Threats to job features may also take the form of difficulty in having access to resources that were previously readily available.

A third broad form of job insecurity may take the form of employees’ feeling of lack of power or inability to control events in their work environment, i.e., feelings of powerlessness. When employees feel powerless, or feel that the features of their jobs or entire jobs are threatened, it is said to be a sign of feelings of job insecurity. It follows that some but not all job threats, threats to job features, and powerlessness must occur for insecurity to be noticed.

**Job Satisfaction**

Job satisfaction is an affective or emotional response towards various facets of one’s job. People’s levels of job satisfaction are the result of work, pay, promotions, co-workers, and supervision. According to Kreitner & Kinicki (2004), five predominant models of job satisfaction focus on different causes. They are need fulfillment, discrepancy, value attainment, equity and dispositional/genetic components. Need fulfillment model propose that satisfaction is determined by the extent to which the characteristics of a job allow an individual to fulfill his or her needs. Karr (1992) confirmed that unmet needs can affect both satisfaction and turnover. Stone (1992) established that need fulfillment correlate with job satisfaction.

Discrepancies models propose that satisfaction is a result of met expectations. Met expectations represent the difference between what an individual expects to receive from a job, such as good pay and promotional opportunities, and what he or she actually receives. When expectations are greater than what is received, there is dissatisfaction. Wanous, Poland, Premack & Davis (1992) from their studies found that met expectations were significantly related to job satisfaction.

Value attainment model is that satisfaction results from the perception that a job allows for fulfillment of an individual’s important work value. Research by Perceive and Hockwater (2001) support the prediction that value fulfillment is positively related to job satisfaction. Equity model sees satisfaction as a function of how “fairly” an individual is treated at work. Satisfaction results from one’s perception that work outcomes, relative to inputs, compare favourably with a significant other’s outcomes/inputs. Cohen-Charash & Spector (2001) confirmed that employee’s perception of being treated fairly at work was
highly related to overall job satisfaction. The dispositional/genetic model is based on the belief that job satisfaction is partly a function of both personal traits and genetic factors.

This model implies that stable individual differences are just as important in explaining job satisfaction as are characteristics of the work environment. Weiss, Nicholas and Daus (1999), showed that there is positive and significant relationship between personal traits and job satisfaction. Also, genetic factors were found to significantly predict life satisfaction, well-being and general job satisfaction (Arvey, Bouchard, Segal & Abraham, 1989).

**Interplay of Concepts**

Studies by Rosenblatt and Ayalla, (1996); Meyer, Paunonen, Gallatly, Goffin, and Jackson, (1989), have shown that there is relationship between job security on one hand and organizational commitment and job satisfaction on the other. Rosenbalt and Ayalla (1996) found that job insecurity adversely affected organizational commitment, perceived organizational support, intention to quit and resistance to change. The importance of employees’ affective commitment to an organization was underscored by Meyer, Paunonen, Gallatly, Goffin and Jackson (1989). In their study, they found a positive relationship between affective commitment and different measures of employees’ job performance and a negative relationship between continuance commitment and employees job performance.

This negative relationship led Meyer et al (1989) to discourage the use of rapid promotion, non vested pension plans, organization-specific skills training, et cetera, to bind employees to the organization because they may not instill the desire to contribute to organizational effectiveness. In the view of this, it is suggested that fostering affective commitment in employees than continuance commitment will be beneficial to employers. The relationship between job satisfaction and performance is more complex than originally thought. It is not as simple as just satisfaction causing performance or performance causing satisfaction.

It is logical to think that any worker that is satisfied with his/her job will be more committed to the organization than one who is dissatisfied. Having a job one likes usually means one will be happy with one’s work generally. The good feelings one has towards the job probably rub off perceptions about the organization because the organization has a role in assigning one to a job. On the other hand, if one does not feel satisfied with the job, it would be easy to blame the organization for this problem, reflecting lower affective organizational commitment.

A number of researchers like Eby, Freeman, Rush and Lance, 1999; Igbaria and Greenhaus, 1992 have found that those satisfied with their jobs are more likely to be highly committed to the organization. Eby, Freeman, Rush & Lance (1999) found that job satisfaction affected affective organizational commitment even in the presence of intrinsic motivation. That is, job satisfaction partially mediated the effects of intrinsic motivation on affective organizational commitment. Igbaria & Greenhaus (1992) found that job satisfaction was much more predictive of organizational commitment than were ages, tenure, education, role ambiguity, role conflict, salary, promotability, or career opportunities. Ajala (2007) found that in Nigeria, job insecurity, job dissatisfaction, and poor wages have negative effects on workers’ commitment and productivity.

**Purpose of the Study**

There have been studies on the impact of job satisfaction, job security on organizational commitment and labour turnover (Eby et al, 1999; Nasrordin & Ramayah, 2003; Slattery, 2005) However, much studies have been conducted on the correlation of these variables, mostly single, on workers’ performance. Therefore this study will look at the
combined and single correlation of job security, job satisfaction, and job commitment on workers performance.

Research Questions
Five research questions were addressed in order to achieve the aforementioned purpose of the study.
1. What is the pattern of relationship between job satisfaction, job security, job commitment and workers' performance/productivity?
2. What is the overall effect of job satisfaction and job security on organizational commitment?
3. How much impact did job satisfaction and job security have on organizational commitment?
4. What is the overall effect of job satisfaction and job security on job performance?
5. How much impact did job satisfaction and job security have on job performance?

Methodology
Design
The ex-post-facto design method was used to carry out the research. It is appropriate because it affords the researcher the opportunity to obtain factual information about the independent variables which are already in existence and will not be manipulated by the researcher.

Participants
The participants in this study were two hundred and ninety-four employees that were randomly selected from three main sectors of the economy of Lagos State. Eighty four respondents were from the Immigration Service; 114 from Civil Service and 96 from private sector (Nigeria Bottling Company). They were made up of 210 Males and 84 females. There composition cuts across the top (90), middle (168) and lower (36) cadres of their respective establishments. Their working experience ranged between 5 and 25 years with a mean of 16 years.

Instrumentation
The main instrument used for the research were four questionnaires tagged “Job Security Scale”, “Job Satisfaction Scale”, “Job Commitment Scale” and “Performance Measurement Scale”. The questionnaires were designed on a four-point rating scale of Strongly Agreed (SA), Agreed (A), Strongly Disagreed (SD) and Disagreed (D) with the corresponding values of 4, 3, 2, 1.

Job Satisfaction Scale
An adapted and modified model of 1991 Prison Social Climate Survey (PSCS) developed by Saylor (1984) and used by Camp (1993) was used for this study. A six-item scale was developed that gave 0.88 Cronbach alpha value. Examples of the questions on the scale include “My parent job is usually interesting to me”, “My job is usually worthwhile”.

Job Security Scale
The modified adapted model of two questionnaires was used. The one-item measure of Hackman & Oldham’s 1974 (Job Diagnostic Survey) plus twenty-three item scale of job security of Ugboro & Obeng (2001) were adapted to give six-item scale measure of job security. The adapted version gave 0.87 Cronbach alpha value for its reliability. Some of the items on the scale are: “if I lose my present job, I will be laid off for a while”, “I have freedom to work with co-workers easily within the organization”.
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Job Commitment Scale

Due to the likely overlap of normative and affective types of commitment, a modified scale using Meyer et al (1989) ideas of organizational commitment, but concentrating on affective and continuance type of commitment, a six-item scale was developed to measure organizational commitment. This gave 0.85 Cronbach alpha value for its reliability. Examples of the questions on the scale are: “I feel a sense of belonging to my organization”, “I would feel guilty if I left this organization”.

Performance Measurement Scale

Items were adapted from Kreitner & Kinicki (2004) “Is your commitment to achieving your performance goal related to your behaviour”. It is an adapted six-item scale whose reliability locally gave 0.88 Cronbach alpha value. Some of the items of the scale are: “I am committed to my organizational performance goal”, “I am exerting maximum effort in pursuit of my performance goal”.

Data Analysis

Research Question 1: What is the pattern of relationship between job satisfaction, job security, job commitment and workers performance/productivity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Job satisfaction</th>
<th>Job security</th>
<th>Job commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>.359</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job security</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational commitment</td>
<td>.219</td>
<td>.577</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>20.2245</td>
<td>17.1429</td>
<td>12.8367</td>
<td>16.4286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard deviation</td>
<td>3.3023</td>
<td>2.6695</td>
<td>1.8027</td>
<td>3.4582</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 1, job satisfaction correlates with job performance ($r = 0.36; p < 0.05$), organizational commitment correlate with job performance ($r = 0.22; p < 0.5$) just as job satisfaction correlated significantly and positive with organisational commitment ($r = 0.58; p < 0.05$), job security did not significantly correlate with organizational commitment ($r = 0.09, p > 0.05$). Also, there is no significant correlation between job security and performance ($r = 0.04; p > 0.05$).

Research Question 2: What is the overall effect of job satisfaction and job security on organizational commitment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variation</th>
<th>Sum of squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean square</th>
<th>F-Ratio</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>1196.019</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>598.010</td>
<td>75.400</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>2307.981</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>7.931</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3504.000</td>
<td>293</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 2 above, the combination of the independent variables (job satisfaction and job security) correlated with the dependent variable (organizational commitment) and accounted for 33.7% of the variance ($R^2$ adjusted = .337): The analysis of variance of the multiple regression data yielded an F-ratio value which was found to be significant at 0.05 alpha level ($F = 74.40; p < 0.05$).
Research Question 3: How much impact did job satisfaction and job security have on organizational commitment?

Table 3: The predictive effects of each of the independent variables on the outcome measure (Organizational Commitment)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictive</th>
<th>Unstandardized coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>1.186</td>
<td>1.638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>.748</td>
<td>.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job security</td>
<td>3.634E-02</td>
<td>.019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 gives the relative effects of the independent variables on the dependent variable. Job satisfaction contributed significantly to organizational commitment ($\beta = .58; t = 12.14; p < 0.05$) while job security did not significantly contribute to organizational commitment ($\beta = 0.93; t = 1.96; p > 0.05$) though both jointly contributed significantly to organizational commitment ($t = 0.72; p < 0.05$).

Research Question 4: What is the overall effect of job satisfaction and job security on job performance?

Table 4: Multiple Regression Analysis on Job Performance Data by Job Satisfaction and Job Security

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multiple R</th>
<th>Multiple $R^2$</th>
<th>Adjusted R $R^2$</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.361</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>3.0896</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variation</th>
<th>Sum of squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean square</th>
<th>F-Ratio</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>417.360</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>208.680</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>2777.823</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>9.546</td>
<td>21.861</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3195.184</td>
<td>293</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 4 above, the combination of the independent variables (job satisfaction and job security) correlated with the dependent variables (job performance) and accounted for 12.5% of the variance ($R^2$ adjusted = .125). The analysis of variance of the multiple regression data yielded an F-ratio value which was found to be significant at 0.05 alpha level ($F = 21.86; p < 0.05$).

Research Question 5: How much impact did job satisfaction and job security have on job performance?

Table 5: The Predictive Effects of each of the Independent Variables on the Outcome Measure (Job Performance)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictive</th>
<th>Unstandardized coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>13.715</td>
<td>1.796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>.443</td>
<td>.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job security</td>
<td>1.6356E</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 gives the relative effects of the independent variables on the dependent variables. Job satisfaction contributed significantly to job commitment ($\beta = .36; t = 6.56; p < 0.05$) which job security did not significantly contribute to job performance ($\beta = .04; t = .81; p > 0.05$) through both jointly contributed significantly to job performance ($t = 7.63; p < 0.05$).
Discussion of Findings

The findings showed that job satisfaction correlated positively with organizational commitment \( r = .58 \). This is similar to that of Brown (1996) which is \( r = .53 \); and performance at work \( r = .58 \) similar to the finding of judge et al (2001) that the relationship between satisfaction and performance is \( r = .30 \); this is a weak relationship. It is a confirmation of analytical review that found a negligible relationship between satisfaction and performance (Brayfield & Crockett, 1955). Even meta-analysis research also found low true correlation (Laffaldano & Muchinsky, 1985). However, this current finding is in line with that of Ronznowski & Hulin (1992) that workers dissatisfied with their job will exhibit absenteeism, pursue personal tasks, moonlighting, and withdrawal from the job psychologically. This entire trait, if exhibited, reduces performance level at work but where these traits are absent workers are likely to be committed to work and improve their performance at work. The weak correlation between job satisfaction and performance may be due to non adequate reward of performance by organizations as confirmed by the finding of Lawler III & Porter (1967).

Since individuals who are committed to their jobs and are satisfied with the work usually display willingness to work harder (performance), there is a strong relationship between organizational commitment and job satisfaction as found in this research. Therefore, there is the need to increase job satisfaction so as to elicit higher levels of commitments and increase in workers’ productivity at the workplace. This is in line with the findings of Riketta (2002); Hackett, Lapierra & Hausdort (2001). This study established that job security did not correlate with performance.

This is true because job security is influenced by management decisions and other variables and not tied mainly to job satisfaction. An employee may be satisfied with his/her work yet, he/she may be laid off. These were the feelings of respondents from the organized private sector whose employers have greater decisions as to their retention. Also, civil servants see the issue of job security as a foregone conclusion once employed, hence, no thought or feeling of job security is considered when performance is to be evaluated.

The non-correlation between job security and job satisfaction in this study is a confirmation that employees that are not sure of their job (job insecurity) will not be satisfied with their job. This is in line with the work of Deavers (1997); Perry (1997) and Sharpe (1997) who found that downsizing reduces organizational commitment and job satisfaction. Organizations that downsized (job insecurity) have less satisfied and more depressed employees.

Implication of the Findings

Tett & Meyer (1993); Riketta (2002) and Hackett et al (2001) confirm the finding of this study that there is significant positive correlation between job satisfaction and job commitment on one hand and job satisfaction, job commitment and performance on the other hand. The implication is that managers or employers should increase job satisfaction of their workers in order to elicit higher levels of commitment. With higher levels of commitment there will be improved performance by workers hence increased productivity of workers and sustenance of the organization itself. With great satisfaction and commitment, workers are not likely to quit their job.

Managers are to note that important organizational outcomes, including increased workers’ productivity and performance can be increased through employee job satisfaction. Industrial social worker through advocacy role and dialogue should make management be aware and conscious that job satisfaction has implicit implication on workers performance/productivity. That unmet needs can affect both satisfaction and productivity of employees. Managers and supervisors are to enhance employees’ satisfaction by structuring
the work environment and its associated rewards and recognition to reinforce employees' values. Such reinforcement of value attainment will motivate employees to be committed to the organization and ascertain constant and improved performance.

Furthermore, an industrial social worker should be employed to monitor employees' fairness perceptions and to interact with employees in such a way that they feel equitably treated by management. Equitability perceptions are influenced by the extent to which management explain their decisions to employees; therefore management is encouraged to explain the rationale behind their decisions through team-work and getting employees involvement in decision-making process about important work outcomes. Social workers should emphasis some equitable treatment model such as perceptions of distributive and procedural justice that promote job performance, job satisfaction, organizational commitment and reduce counter productive work behaviour, psychological distress, absenteeism and thereby improve worker as well as organizational productivity.

Limitations and Conclusion

In conclusion, job security, job satisfaction and organizational commitment are better obtained through well packaged welfare programmes, decision procedure and conducive workplace environment that will make employees see management as having concern for them and they in turn will remain committed to the organization and subsequently perform to their best optimum as expected by the management.

Furthermore, with the assistance of industrial social worker, improved organizational communication, worker centered policies and good management-labour relations will reduce discontent and cynicisms among employees thereby giving rise to job satisfaction, job commitment and improved performance at work.
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