

QUALITY OF WORK-LIFE AND JOB COMMITMENT AMONG EMPLOYEES OF NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HORTICULTURAL RESEARCH, OYO STATE, NIGERIA

Fapojuwo, O. E., Ajayi, M. T. and Soyoye, O.D.

Department of Agricultural Administration, Federal University of Agriculture, Abeokuta

Ogun State, Nigeria

Corresponding author email: kemifapojuwo@gmail.com

Abstract

This study assessed the quality of work life on employees' job commitment in National Institute of Horticultural Research NIHORT, Oyo State, Nigeria. A Simple random sampling technique was used to select 110 employees for the study. Data were obtained on the personal characteristics, quality of work life, organizational commitment and perceived constraints affecting employees' quality of work life with the use of a structured questionnaire and analyzed using frequency counts, mean and standard deviation, chi-square and correlation (PPMC) methods. Results showed that 66.7% of the respondents were between the age group of 31- 50 years with a mean age of 43.08years, 54.4% were male, 93.0% were married, 94.7% had tertiary education and 63.2% earned above ₦100,000:00 monthly. The major factors of quality of work life were promotional opportunities ($\bar{x} = 4.23$), opportunities for growth/career advancement ($\bar{x}=4.14$), retirement pensions/benefits ($\bar{x} = 4.05$), staff clinic ($\bar{x} = 3.72$) and training opportunities ($\bar{x} = 3.68$). The major perceived constraints faced by the respondents were a shortage of accommodation ($\bar{x} = 3.37$), shortage of transportation ($\bar{x} = 3.32$) and leadership style ($\bar{x} = 3.23$). The result also indicated a significant ($p < 0.05$) relationship between respondents age and job commitment ($r = 0.352$) but no significant ($p > 0.05$) association/relationships between sex, ($\chi^2 = 0.193$), marital status ($\chi^2 = 8.198$), income level ($r = -0.166$), educational level ($\chi^2 = 8.198$) and job commitment. A positive and significant relationship existed between the quality of work life and job commitment ($r = 0.554, p < 0.01$). It was concluded that quality of work life influences organizational commitment. Organizations should, therefore, ensure the provision of adequate housing/ accommodation and transportation scheme for employees' motivation and commitment.

Introduction

The concept of Quality of Work-life (QWL) is multidimensional and indicates the overall satisfaction in an individual's work-life which leads to a balanced work-life. It gives a sense of belonging, worth, respect as well as the satisfaction of the psychological needs of employees in an organization (Morin *et al*, 2003). Quality of Work-Life is defined as the favourable working environment (rewards, job security, career growth opportunities, participation in decision-making, occupational health and safety, work stress, job security, organizational and interpersonal relations, and relationship between life on and off the job) that provides, supports and promotes satisfaction and commitment among employees (Lau, 2000; Lau *et al*, 2001; Hsu and Kernohan, 2006; Connell, 2009; Adhikari and Gautam, 2010; Shahbazi *et al*, 2011; Ali *et al*, 2011). Indirectly, the definition indicates that an

employee who is not satisfied with reward may be satisfied with the job security, and or career opportunities provided by the organization for his/her personal, as well as professional's growth.

Quality of Work-Life enhances employees' job commitment and satisfaction by assigning meaningful jobs, giving opportunities for capacity development and ensuring job security. It also ensures adequate pay, rewards and benefits, and providing safe and healthy working conditions for the employees (Hiann and Einstein, 1990; Havlovic, 1991; Adhikari and Gautam, 2010; Shahbazi *et al*, 2011; Ali *et al*, 2011).

Organizational commitment has been a vital area of study among researchers for the past decades. Various outcomes of research have been produced with various interpretations of organizational commitment.

In addition, most research was also able to assist organizations to determine the employee's level of performance, and tenure in the organization (Malloy, 1996). Organization commitment refers to the employee's emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the organization. It is characterized by employees' willingness to contribute to organizational goals. Employees' assurance of growth and career advancement in an organization will positively influence their level of commitment to stay with that particular organization.

Hellrigel *et al* (1998) reported that organizational commitment indicates the intensity of an employee's involvement and how strongly they relate to the organization. It explained employees' efficiency at the workplace, their level of commitment towards their organizations as well as their intention and behaviour for quitting work and the rate of absenteeism.

Meyer and Allen (1991; 1997) in Salder (2014) proposed a three-component model of organizational commitment. These are affective commitment, continuance commitment, and normative commitment. Affective commitment refers to an emotional attachment, identification, and involvement that an employee has with its organization where he is happy to be a member of that organization. Continuance commitment is the willingness to remain in an organization because of the potential extra costs or few job alternatives in case one resigns from the Organization. Normative commitment is the commitment that a person has out of his feeling of moral obligation to his/her workplace (Meyer and Allen, 1991;1997; Gunlu, Aksarayli and Percin, 2009; Salder, 2014). All these three components of organizational commitment have implication for the continuous involvement of the employee in the organization (Ayeni and Popoola, 2007). Also, high level of organizational commitment provides a clear focus for human resource manager on the grounds that commitment is in itself good and positive that should lead to high level of work performance.

An effective Quality of Work Life (QWL) is basically a tool for improving working conditions (an employee's perspective) and greater organizational efficiency (mainly from an employer's perspective). Positive results of QWL have been supported by a number of previous studies, among which is reduced absenteeism, lower turnover rate, and improved job

satisfaction (Havlovic, 1991; Cohen *et al.*, 1997; King and Ehrhard, 1997).

In addition, organizational development towards the low level of the organizational hierarchy is a contribution of QWL (Asgari *et al.*, 2011). The Quality of Work- Life does not only contribute to an organization's ability to recruit quality human capital, it also enhances an organization's competitiveness and job design.

The traditional job design of scientific management focuses mostly on the division of labour, hierarchy, close supervision and the one best way of doing work. This has brought several benefits to the society but the disadvantage has been cited as the high human cost involved. This tends to create stress for the employees; stress is a major and expanding problem that ends in substantial cost to both employees and work organizations around the world (Hart and Cooper, 2001). Job stressors are divided into three main parts. These are the job factor, the individual factors and the organizational factors. According to Daniels (2004), the estimate cost of stress at work for health care and treatment cost, absenteeism and turnover are in the range of 20 billion Euros in the European Union and over 150 billion dollars in the US. It is evident that high turnover, absenteeism, and tension are positively related to occupational stress (Van de Ven, 2002).

The traditional job design needs to be replaced by an enriched job design. This request for redesigning of a job is to enhance Quality of Work Life (QWL). The main paradox is for the management or an organization to treat employees as human capital that needs to be developed and appreciated rather than simply being utilized for the organization gains and operations.

After years of economic development and income growth, compensation and benefits are no longer the only goals that employees pursue. Taylor and Cosenza (1998) mention that while money is still important, it is not sufficient to inspire employees' involvement or commitment to the organization. There is a changing value of the workforce indicating that employees today are more interested in elevating both their quality of life and quality of work life.

Beyond salary, employees expect to gain benefits from their work in terms of appreciation towards achievement, career development and growth. They also glamour for a harmonious organizational climate and a supportive managerial style as part of the considerations for

remaining with the organization. It is suggested that organizations offering a better quality of work life and supportive working environments will likely be at an advantage when it comes to hiring and retaining valuable people (May, Lau and Johnson, 1999; Cote and Heslin, 2003). This is supported by Steers and Mowday (1981); Asgari and Dadashi (2011); Turner and Park (2007); Diefendorff *et al.*, (2002) and Naheran *et al.*, (2014) who opined that better job characteristics and work environments will lead to high organizational commitment, which, in turn reduces the intention to resign.

Besides employees, employer's commitment, impacts on organizational operations and the practices of QWL also contribute to organizational performance.

Organizations that have been identified as the "best organizations to work for" were companies where employees enjoyed a high quality of work life which translated into exceptional growth and profitability (Lau and May, 1998). Generally, it is expected that employees are more likely to stay with their organization and be highly committed when they can see a strong linkage between the organization and their work.

Employees' happiness in their work place would be reflected in the quality of their work, draw out

positive feedback from their customers thereby contribute to organizational success. To ensure that employees give high job commitment, employers should provide quality work life. However, most employers have little understanding of how to satisfy their employees and how this influences their commitment to the organization. With regard to this problem, this study was conducted to examine the relationship between the organizational commitment and quality work life among employees.

Low organizational commitment may be a result of low pay (for lower level positions) and little opportunity for advancement. Absenteeism may also be a very costly issue because it can result in reduced productivity when lowly committed employees do not see any link between the tasks they do and the organization's profitability. To solve the problems of high turnover and absenteeism, it is important to analyze the two variables being studied and determine the factors that would affect commitment.

Analyzing the relationship between quality work life and organizational commitment is particularly crucial nowadays, as people often do not work at the same organization or job throughout their lifetime. It is also sometimes hard to find suitable people for certain positions. So once an ideal candidate is chosen, organizations will like to make a great effort to retain those employees.

Another reason why the quality work life can influence commitment is that a good work life may lead to a better family life and a reduction in stress (Cote and Heslin, 2003). Hence, there is a strong need to understand the factors that contribute toward quality work life among employees so that steps can be taken by the management to create conducive working environment that is in line with their expectations. According to Allen and Meyer (1990), commitment refers to the attitude of the employees toward their organization. When employees are committed, their personal goals may go in line with those of the organization that they work for.

Regardless of the title, or the institutions where they work, the employees shoulder heavy responsibilities toward ensuring development in their organization. In spite of our amazing technological advances, people do the work of the organization and are ultimately responsible for its success. Unfortunately, most organizations, large and small, fail to provide the

component that engages the hearts of their people or encourages them to work at their potential.

Studies conducted on organizational commitment have revealed that employees' commitment-related behaviours towards their organization is closely related to quality of work-life (Lee *et al.* 2007; Sirgy, *et al.* 2001; Efraty and Sirgy 1990; Efraty *et al.* 1991; Roehling *et al.* 2001; Sirgy *et al.* 2008; Fields and Thacker 1992).

Upon providing Quality of Work-Life (QWL), the expected output is employees' job involvement which focuses on a task or job and the following expectations will be organizational commitment. Organizations with high organizational commitment are perceived to have lower turnover rates and absenteeism study among researchers for past decades (Hellrigel, Slocum and Woodman, 2001).

Well motivated employees can mean many things to an organization, a willingness to cooperate with company objectives, a sense of common purpose consistent with organizational goals, enthusiasm in the job, happiness and moral behaviour. It can be confirmed that the success of any organization can be traced back to motivated employees (Ryan, 2012), however, most organizations do not provide good motivational quality work-life packages for their employees which will, in turn, lead to less commitment of the employees (Dockel, 2003). With regard to this problem, this study examined the relationship between organizational commitment and quality of work life among employees of the National Institute of Horticultural Research, Oyo State, Nigeria.

The objectives of the study were to:

- i) Ascertain the socioeconomic characteristics of employees in NIHORT.
- ii) determine the level of job commitment of employees.
- iii) ascertain the quality of work life provided by the organization to the respondents and
- iv) Identify respondents' perceived constraints to meeting their quality of work-life.

Hypotheses of the Study

The hypotheses of this study were:

Ho₁: There is no significant association between the respondents' socio-economic characteristics and their job commitment.

Ho₂: There is no significant relationship between employees' quality of work-life and the job commitment.

Research Methods

The unit of analysis was the individual level. The sampling frame of the study consisted of all the researchers (310 researchers) in National Institute of Horticultural Research (NIHORT). A simple random sampling technique was used to select 110 out of 310 researchers in NIHORT. . Data collection took place from July to September 2015 using self-administered questionnaire. However, 91 respondents returned the questionnaire which gave a total of 82.72% response rate.

To enhance the content validity of the measurement scales, analysis of the study was carried out by building upon relevant literature and studies that previously established scales. Different items were generated for Quality of Work Life using incentives and rewards and organizational commitment.

Organizational/Job commitment was measured by adapting the work of (Allen and Meyer, 1990, Modway *et al.*, 1982). The Quality of Work Life was assessed using different types of incentives and rewards used in NIHORT. The scores of the variables vary from 0.7 to 0.9. Data were analysed using frequency counts, percentages, means, Chi-square and Pearson Product Moment Correlation (PPMC) methods.

Results and Discussion

Personal Characteristics of Respondents

Age: Table 1 show that 65.9% of the respondents were between the age group of 31- 40 years. The mean age of the respondents is 43.08 years. It shows that the respondents are still young and are expected to be more active and committed to their work activities. These results also support that of Isaac (2011) who reported that most of the Agricultural employees in Southwest Nigeria were in the age range of 20 – 40 years. Also, researches show a significant relationship between personal characteristics (such as age) and commitment-related behaviors towards their organization (Steers 1977; Angle and Perry 1981; Mathieu and Zajac 1990; Allen and Meyer 1990; Meyer and Allen 1997).

Sex: There were more male (54.9%) than the female researchers. The dominance of male respondents in the research area is an indication that female researchers are still low on the job and the necessity to encourage more females to take up jobs with the organization. This result is similar to the findings of Banmeke and Ajayi (2010) who reported that there were more (84.4%) male researchers than female researchers in research institutes. In addition, gender is a determinant of organizational commitment (Steers 1977; Angle and Perry 1981; Mathieu and Zajac 1990; Allen and Meyer 1990; Meyer and Allen 1997; Norizan 2012)

Marital Status: Table 1 also shows that most (95.6%) of the respondents were married while 2.2% of the respondents were single and divorced respectively. These results agreed with the findings of Banmeke and Oose (2012) which reported that most researchers in the research institutes are married. It might result from our culture/tradition that encourages matured people to get married in this part of the world. Past studies also corroborated this finding that employees' commitment related behaviour towards their job is closely related to their marital status (Norizan 2012; Mathieu and Zajac 1990; Allen and Meyer 1990; Meyer and Allen 1997)

Religion: Majority (74.7%) of the respondents were Christians while 25.3% were Muslims.

Educational level: It was also observed that 96.7% of the researchers had one form of tertiary education or the other. The implication of this finding is that respondents were qualified for their job and were also well informed and skillful on the job while (5.3%) of the respondents had secondary education. This finding is supported by Mathieu and Zajac (1990); Allen and Meyer (1990); Meyer and Allen (1997) who reported that employees' level of education is one of the determinants of organizational commitment.

Income level: Majority (61.5%) of respondents earned above ₦100, 000:00 per month with a mean monthly income of ₦114,491.23. This implies that respondents earn a considerable high income far above the minimum wage in the country. The high income level is expected to positively influence their commitment to their jobs

Table 1: Distribution of Researchers' Personal characteristics (N = 91)

Variable	Frequency	Percent	Mean($\bar{x}$)
----------	-----------	---------	-------------------

Age			
<30 years	10	11.0	43.08
31- 40 years	60	65.9	
41- 50 years	12	13.2	
51 above	9	9.9	
Sex			
Male	50	54.9	
Female	41	45.1	
Marital status			
Married	87	95.6	
Single	2	2.2	
Divorced	2	2.2	
Religion			
Christianity	68	74.7	
Islam	23	25.3	
Educational Status			
Secondary education	3	3.3	
OND	7	7.7	
HND	31	34.0	
B.Sc	9	9.9	
M.Sc	9	9.9	
Ph.D	32	35.2	
Income level			
41,000- 50,000	1	1.1	114,491.23
51,000- 100,000	34	37.4	
Above 100,000	56	61.5	

Source: Field Survey 2015

Determinants of Employees' Quality of Work Life

Table 2 shows that the major determinants of quality of work life of the researchers were promotional opportunities ($\bar{x} = 4.23$), retirement benefits/pensions ($\bar{x}=4.05$), provision of staff clinic ($\bar{x}=3.72$) and training opportunities ($\bar{x}=3.68$). These findings actually agreed with the view of Dockel (2003) that employees should not only be rewarded financially

but offered opportunities to grow within an organization to improve their work quality and enhance their job commitment.

It is interesting to note that incentives such as call back pay ($\bar{x}=2.42$), gifts ($\bar{x}=2.67$) and interest-free loans ($\bar{x}=2.68$) were given low ratings by the researchers as determinants of work quality.

Table 2: Determinants of Quality of Work Life of the Employees

Statements	SA	A	U	D	S.D	$\bar{X}$	S.D
Promotional opportunities	19(33.3)	35(61.4)	1(1.8)	1(1.8)	1(1.8)	4.23	0.73
Retirement pensions	15(26.3)	32(56.1)	8(14.0)	2(3.5)	-	4.05	0.74
Staff clinic	8(14.0)	16(28.1)	3(5.3)	10(17.5)	20(35.1)	3.72	1.06
Training opportunities	16(28.1)	20(35.1)	10(17.5)	9(15.8)	2(3.5)	3.68	1.15
Free medical treatment	18(31.6)	17(29.8)	5(8.8)	11(19.3)	6(10.5)	3.53	1.39
Good office space	15(26.3)	18(31.6)	9(15.8)	12(21.1)	5(8.8)	3.40	1.29
Fringe benefits	14(24.6)	17(29.8)	9(15.8)	12(21.1)	5(8.8)	3.40	1.30
Availability of equipment	11(19.3)	18(31.6)	12(21.1)	15(26.3)	1(1.8)	3.40	1.13

Recognition for performance	5(8.8)	27(47.4)	19(17.5)	12(21.1)	3(5.3)	3.33	1.07
Disability insurance	8(14.0)	18(31.6)	9(15.8)	15(26.3)	8(14.0)	3.09	1.28
Accident insurance	7(12.3)	19(33.3)	8(14.0)	15(26.3)	7(12.3)	3.04	1.29
Lay off pay	8(14.0)	14(24.6)	10(17.5)	14(24.6)	11(19.3)	2.89	1.35
Vacation or leave pay	8(14.0)	15(26.3)	4(7.0)	17(29.8)	13(22.8)	2.79	1.42
Interest -free loan	8(14.0)	16(28.1)	3(5.3)	10(17.5)	20(35.1)	2.68	1.53
Gifts	4(7.0)	12(21.1)	10(17.5)	23(40.4)	8(14.0)	2.67	1.17
Call back pay	4(7.0)	10(17.5)	9(15.8)	17(29.8)	17(29.8)	2.42	1.28

Source: Field survey, 2015

Note: SA=Strongly Agree, A=Agree, U=Undecided, D=Disagree.

$\bar{x}$: Mean, SD: Standard deviation

Level of Job Commitment of the Employees

Table 3 shows the factors that improved respondents work commitment. Employees were usually delegated responsibilities by superiors has the highest mean ($\bar{x}$ =4.25) while giving of letter of recommendation by the superior ($\bar{x}$ =3.14) had the lowest mean. Also, opportunities for growth ($\bar{x}$ =4.14), my job is like a hobby ($\bar{x}$ =4.11), love my job ($\bar{x}$ =4.07) and enjoy my job ($\bar{x}$ =4.07) were scored high. These findings is corroborated with the view of Ramlall (2003) and

Handelsman (2003) who reported that employees' strive to work and stay committed/remain in organizations that provide good and positive work environment/conditions where employees feel that they are valued and making differences.

It is however interesting to note that factors such as conducive work environment ($\bar{x}$ =3.68), provision of special amenities ($\bar{x}$ =3.25) and letter of recommendation ($\bar{x}$ =3.14) were given low ratings.

Table 3: Distribution of Employees' Level of Commitment

Statements	SA	A	U	D	S.D	$\bar{X}$	S.D
Employee is usually delegated responsibilities	19(33.3)	33(57.9)	5(8.8)	-	-	4.25	0.60
There are opportunities for growth in my workplace	16(28.10)	33(57.9)	8(14.0)	-	-	4.14	0.63
My job is like my hobby to me.	20(35.1)	27(47.4)	7(12.3)	2(3.5)	1(1.8)	4.11	0.88
I like my job more than average workers	16(28.1)	33(57.9)	5(8.8)	2(3.5)	1(1.8)	4.07	0.82
I find real enjoyment in my work	22(38.6)	23(40.4)	7(12.30)	4(7.0)	1(1.8)	4.07	0.97
My job is usually interesting enough to keep me from getting bored	17(29.8)	29(50.9)	8(14.0)	3(5.3)	-	4.05	0.81
There is sick leave.	14(24.6)	33(57.9)	4(7.0)	4(7.0)	2(3.5)	3.93	0.96
Most days I am enthusiastic about my work.	16(28.1)	26(45.6)	10(17.5)	4(7.0)	1(1.8)	3.91	0.95
I feel my job is more interesting than other jobs I could get.	19(33.3)	22(38.6)	9(15.8)	6(10.5)	1(1.8)	3.91	1.0
There is job security.	16(28.1)	25(43.9)	10(17.5)	4(7.0)	2(3.5)	3.86	1.0
My salary keeps me committed.	14(24.6)	27(47.4)	8(14.0)	7(12.3)	1(1.8)	3.81	1.0
There is a conducive environment.	13(22.8)	23(40.4)	13(22.8)	6(10.5)	2(3.5)	3.68	1.0
Special amenities are provided for good work conditions.	12(21.1)	15(26.3)	12(21.1)	11(19.3)	7(12.3)	3.25	1.32
Letter of recommendation is given to good work.	4(7.0)	21(36.8)	16(28.1)	11(19.3)	5(8.8)	3.14	1.0

Source: Field survey, 2015.

Note: SA= Strongly agree, A= Agree, U= Undecided, D= Disagree, SD= Strongly disagree

 $\bar{X}$:Mean, SD: Standard deviation.**Respondents perceived constraints to meeting their quality of work life**

Table 4 shows that the major perceived constraints faced by the respondents were shortage of housing and accommodation ($\bar{x}$ =3.37), shortage of transportation ($\bar{x}$ =3.32) and leadership style ($\bar{x}$ =3.23). The result also shows that constraints such

as delay in promotion ($\bar{x}$ =2.60), job insecurity ($\bar{x}$ =2.53) and salaries not paid on time ($\bar{x}$ =2.12) were given low rating. It shows that if the employees are provided with accommodation and transport facilities, it would improve their quality of work life. Moreso, an improved leadership style would boost the quality of life of the employees.

Table 4: Respondents' perceived constraints affecting their quality of work life

Challenges	VS	S	U	NS	NVS	$\bar{X}$	S.D
Shortage of housing and accommodation	19(33.3)	10(17.5)	8(14.0)	13(22.8)	7(12.3)	3.37	1.45
Shortage of transportation	14(24.6)	14(24.6)	12(21.1)	10(17.5)	7(12.30)	3.32	1.35
Leadership style	10(17.5)	17(29.8)	11(19.3)	14(24.6)	5(8.8)	3.23	1.25
No training	10(17.5)	16(28.1)	7(12.30)	9(15.8)	14(24.6)	3.12	1.81
Leadership style of chief executive	12(21.1)	11(19.3)	12(21.1)	10(17.5)	12(21.1)	3.02	1.44
No or low insurance scheme	9(15.8)	13(22.8)	9(15.8)	17(29.8)	9(15.8)	2.93	1.34
No allowance	11(19.3)	11(19.3)	6(10.5)	20(35.1)	9(15.8)	2.91	1.40
Unfairness on the path of the management	10(17.5)	8(14.0)	10(17.5)	15(26.3)	14(24.6)	2.74	1.43
No appreciation for hard work	9(15.8)	7(12.3)	14(24.6)	13(22.8)	14(24.6)	2.72	1.38
No conducive environment	8(14.0)	11(19.3)	5(8.8)	20(35.1)	13(22.8)	2.67	1.39
Delay in promotion	6(10.5)	11(19.3)	6(10.5)	22(38.6)	12(21.1)	2.60	1.30
Job insecurity	7(12.3)	6(10.5)	10(17.5)	21(36.8)	13(22.8)	2.53	1.29
Salaries are not paid on time	6(10.5)	5(8.8)	3(5.3)	19(33.3)	24(42.1)	2.12	1.33

Source: Field survey, 2015

Note: VS= Very severe, S= Severe, U= Undecided, NS= Not severe, NVS= Not very severe

 $\bar{X}$ =Mean, SD= Standard deviation

Hypotheses Testing

Ho1: There is no significant association between the researchers' socioeconomic characteristics and their job commitment was tested using a chi-square analysis and Pearson Product Moment Correlation (PPMC) and the results are presented in Tables 5 and 6. The socioeconomic characteristics considered were age, sex, marital status, religion, educational status and income level. The significance of the association was determined at 0.05 levels for the once tested using chi-square analysis, and the significance of the relationship was determined at 0.01 levels for the once tested using correlation (PPMC). The chi square results showed no significant ($p > 0.05$) association between researchers sex, ($\chi^2 = 0.193$, $df = 1$), marital status ($\chi^2 = 0.244$, $df = 1$), educational status ($\chi^2 = 8.198$, $df = 5$) and job commitment. The finding implies that researcher's job commitment is not influenced by their sex, marital status and educational status. Several studies have been conducted over the past years, with inconsistent findings, which have left many aspects of the relationships between sex and organizational commitment unclear. While the relationship among sex, marital status, educational level, and organizational commitment have been widely explored, the results have been inconsistent and unstable depending on socio cultural variables and peculiarities of the study areas. Some studies demonstrated that male employees were more committed than female employees (Boon *et al.*, 2006), while others found no significant effects of gender on organizational commitment. In NIHORT environment the commitment of female researchers towards the organization was higher than those of their male counterparts.

These findings is also in contrast to the findings of Steers 1977; Angle and Perry 1981; Mathieu and Zajac 1990; Allen and Meyer 1990; Meyer and Allen 1997; Norizan 2012 who all reported that some personal characteristics like gender, marital status and rank of employees influence their job commitment.

Table 6 also shows a significant ($p < 0.01$) relationship between age ($r = 0.352^{**}$) and job commitment. This is so because most of the researchers are young e and tends to be agile in work activities. However, the researcher's income level ($r = -0.166$) is not significantly ($p > 0.01$) related to job commitment, though the higher the pay the less commitment to

work which is contrary to a-priori expectation that higher income should stimulate better quality of work life. This might be due to the fact that income alone does not affect the researchers' commitment to their job but other factors as promotion opportunities, provision of medical services, leave bonuses, career advancement, good leadership styles, good transportation and housing, good working environments among others.

Table 5: Test of Association between Respondents' Personal Characteristics and Job Commitment

Variables	Chi-square value	DF	P value	Decision
Sex	0.193	1	0.66	NS
Marital status	0.244	2	0.88	NS
Educational status	8.198	5	0.146	NS
Religion	0.752	1	0.384	NS

Source: Field Survey, 2015

Table 6: Test of Relationship between Respondent's Personal Characteristics and Job Commitment

Variables	R	P value	Decision
Age	0.352**	0.01	S
Income level	-0.166	0.21	NS

Source: Field Survey, 2015

Ho2: There is no significant relationship between employee's quality of work life and their job commitment.

This hypothesis was tested using Pearson Product Moment Correlation (PPMC) and the result is presented in Table 7

Table 7 indicated that there is a positive and significant relationship between quality of work life and job commitment ($r = 0.554^{**}$, $p < 0.01$). This might be due to the importance of organizational commitment to the development of employees' work environment and attachment to their work. This positive relationship with job commitment may provide essential tools for organizational development. Organizations that endorse high QWL can enhance employee's commitment and involvement in organizational tasks and goals (Louis, 2006; Almarshad 2015).

The results

Table7: Test of Relationship between Employees' Quality of Work-Life and their Job Commitment

Variable	R value	P value	Decision
Relationship between quality of work-life and job commitment	0.554**	0.001	Significant

Source: Field Survey, 2015

Conclusion and Recommendations

The findings of the study established that the major quality of work-life factors that tend to create problems/affect job commitment of employees include shortage of housing and accommodation the shortage of transportation, leadership style, delay in promotion, lack of recommendation and job insecurity. Addressing these challenges will enhance employees' job commitment in NIHORT.

The study recommends that organizations should provide conducive and qualitative work environment for their employees. This could be in form of accommodation within the organization or a housing estate designated for the staff. Transport facilities could be provided to move the staff to and fro where they stay currently. Leadership training could also be organized from time to time to boost the leadership styles of the organizations. The leaders could be sent abroad to attend refresher courses to boost their performances.

References

- Adhikari, D.R., and Gautam, D.K. (2010): Labor Legislations for Improving Quality of Work Life in Nepal. *International Journal of Law and Management*, 52(1), 40-53.
- Allen, N.J. and Meyer, J.P. (1990): The Measurement and Antecedents of Affective, Continuance and Normative Commitment to the Organization; *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 63 (1), 18-38.
- Angle, H.L. and Perry, J.L. (1981): An Empirical Assessment of Organizational Commitment and Organizational Effectiveness, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 26(1), 1-14. Retrieved on November 12, 2016, from <http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=00018392%28198103%2926%3A1%3C1%3AAEAOOC%3E2.0.CO%3B2-A>
- Ayeni, C. O., and Phopoola, S. O. (2007): Work Motivation, Job Satisfaction, and Organizational Commitment of Library Personnel in Academic and Research Libraries in Oyo State, Nigeria, *Library Philosophy and Practice*
- Asgari, M.H. and Dadashi, M.A. (2011): Determining the Relationship between Quality of Work Life (QWL) and Organizational Commitment of Melli Bank Staff in West Domain of Mazandaran in 2009-2010, *Australian Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences*, 5(8), 682-687.
- Banmeke, T. O. A. and Ajayi M. T. (2010): The Use of Information and Communication Technologies (ICTs) by Agricultural Researchers in Edo State, Nigeria, *The Journal of Development Communication*, 21(1): 53-61. Retrieved on November 12, 2016 from <http://www.aidcom.com/jdc0610.html#a1>
- Banmeke, T.O.A and Oose, M.O. (2012): Assessment of usage of Social Network Tools (SNTs) among Agricultural Researchers in South Western Nigeria, *Communications of the International Information Management Association (IIMA)*, 12 (3); 35-49. Retrieved on November 12, 2016 from <https://www.google.com/#q=Banmeke+and+Oose+2012>
- Chen Huang, C. (2005): The effect of quality of work life on organizational commitment. Human resource management quoted in Asgari, M.H. and Dadashi, M.A. (2011); Determining the Relationship between Quality of Work Life (QWL) and Organizational Commitment of Melli Bank Staff in West Domain of Mazandaran in 2009-2010, *Australian Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences*, 5(8), 682-687.
- Cohen, S.G., Chang, L. and Ledford, G.E. (1997): A Hierarchical Construct of Self-Management Leadership and its Relationship to Quality of Work Life and Perceived Work Group Effectiveness, *Personnel Psychology*, 50 (2), 275-308.
- Connell, J. and Hannif, Z. (2009): Call centers, quality of work life and HRM practices - An in-house/outsourced comparison. *Employee Relations*, 31(4), 363-381.
- Cote, S., and Heslin, P. (2003): 'Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment'.
- Daniels, K. (2004): Linking Work Conditions to Unpleasant Affect: Cognition, Categorization and Goals, *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology* 77(3); 343-363.

- Diefendorff, J. M., Brown, D. J., Kamin, A. M., and Lord, R. G. (2002): Examining the Roles of Job Involvement and Work Centrality in Predicting Organizational Citizenship Behaviors and Job Performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23(1), 93-108.
- Dockel, A. (2003): The Effect of Retention Factors on Organisational Commitment: An Investigation of High Technology Employees. Unpublished Master of Human Resource Thesis, University of Pretoria retrieved from <http://www.sajhrm.co.za/index.php/sajhrm/article/viewFile/91/91> on November 12, 2016
- Efraty, D. and Sirgy, M. J. (1990): The Effects of Quality of Working Life (QWL) on Employee Behavioral Responses. *Social Indicators Research*, 22(1), 31-47.
- Efraty, D., Sirgy, M. J. and Claiborne C. B. (1991): The Effects of Personal Alienation on Organizational Identification: A Quality-of-Work-Life Model. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 6 (1), 57-78.
- Efraty, D., Sirgy, M. J. and Siegel P. (2000): The Job/Life Satisfaction Relationship among Professional Accountants: Psychological Determinants and Demographic Differences, In Diener, E. and Rahtz, D. (Eds). *Advances in Quality of Life Theory and Research*, Klumer Academic Publishers, *Social Indicators Research Series*, Volume 4, 129-157
- Fields, M. and Thacker J.W. (1992): The Influence of Quality of Work Life on Company and Union Commitment: A Examination of Pre Post Changes. *Academy of Management Journal*, 35, 439-450.
- Gunlu, E. Aksarayali, M. and Percin, N.S. (2009): Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment of Hotel Managers in Turkey. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management* 22(5), 693-717.
- Havlovic, S.J. (1991): Quality of Work Life and Human Resource Outcomes, *Industrial Relations* 30 (3), 469-479.
- Hart, P. M., and Cooper, C. L. (2001): Occupational Stress: Toward a more Integrated Framework. In Anderson, N., Ones, D.S., Sinangil, H.K. and Viswesvaran, C. (Eds.), *Handbook of Industrial, Work, and Organizational Psychology* 2, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishers, 93 – 114.
- Hellriegel, D., Slocum, J. W., and Woodman, R. W. (2001): *Organizational Behaviour (9th ed.)* Ohio: South-Western Publishing.
- Hian, C.C., and Einstein, W.O. (1990): Quality of Work Life (QWL): What can Unions Do? *Advanced Management Journal*, 55 (2), 17-22.
- King, A.S. and Ehrhard, B.J. (1997): Diagnosing Organizational Commitment: An Employee Cohesion Exercise, *International Journal of Management*, 14(3), 317-325.
- Lau, R.S.M. and May, B.E. (1998): A Win-win Paradigm for Quality of Work Life and Business Performance", *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 9(3), 211-226.
- Lau, R.S.M. (2000): Quality of work life and performance: An Ad hoc Investigation of Two Key Elements in the Service Profit Chain Model, *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, 11(5), 422 – 437.
- Lau, T., Y.H., Wong, K.F., Chan, and M., Law. (2001): Information Technology and the Work environment-does it change the way people interact at work. *Human Systems Management*, 20(3), 267-280.
- Mathieu, J. E. and Zajac D.M. (1990): A Review and Meta-Analysis of the Antecedents, Correlates, And Consequences Of Organizational Commitment, *Psychological Bulletin*, 108 (2), 171-194.
- May, B.E., Lau, R.S.M., and Johnson, S.K. (1999): A Longitudinal Study of Quality of Work Life and Business Performance, *South Dakota Business Review* 58(2), 3-7
- Meyer, J. P. and Allen N. J. (1991): A Three-Component Conceptualization of Organizational Commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1(1), 61-89
- Meyer, J. P., Allen N. J. and Smith, C.A. (1993): Commitment to Organizations and Occupations: Extension and Test of a Three Component Conceptualization. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78 (4), 538-551.
- Meyer, J. P. and Allen N. J. (1997): *Commitment in the Workplace Theory, Research and Application*, Sage Publications.
- Morin, C.M., Rodrigue, S. and Ivers, H. (2003); Role of Stress, Arousal, and Coping Skills in Primary Insomnia, *Psychosomatic Medicine* 65:259–267 ,retrieved on November 10,2016 from

<https://www.researchgate.net/publication/10842836>

- Mowday, R. T., Porter, L. W. and Steers, R. M. (1982): *Employee-Organization Linkages: The Psychology of Commitment, Absenteeism, and Turnover*, New York: Academic Press.
- Ramlall, S. (2003): Managing Employee Retention as a Strategy for Increasing Organizational Competitiveness. *Applied H.R.M. Research*, 8 (2), 63-72. Retrieved on November 12, 2016 from http://www.xavier.edu/appliedhrmresearch/2003-Winter/MS%208_2_%20Ramlall.pdf
- Roehling P.V., Roehling, M.V. and Moen P. (2001): The Relationship between Work-Life Policies and Practices and Employment Loyalty: A Life Course Perspective. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues*, 22, 141–170.
- Shahbazi, B., Shokrzadeh, S., Bejani, H., Malekinia, E., and Ghoroneh, D. (2011); A Survey of Relationship between the Quality of Work Life and Performance of Department Chairpersons of Esfahan University and Esfahan Medical Science University; *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 30, 1555 – 1560 retrieved on November 2, 2016 from <http://www.sciencedirect.com>
- Sirgy, M. J., Efraty, D., Siegel, P., and Lee, D. J. (2001). A New Measure of Quality of Work Life (QWL) based on Need Satisfaction and Spillover Theories. *Social Indicators Research*, 55(4), 241–302.
- Sirgy, M. J., Reilly, N., Wu J. and Efraty, D. (2008): A Work-Life Identity Model of Well-Being: Towards a Research Agenda Linking Quality-of-Work-Life (QWL) Programs with Quality of Life (QOL). *Applied Research in Quality of Life*, 3(3), 181-202
- Steers, R. M. (1977): Antecedents and Outcomes of Organizational Commitment. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 22 (1), 46-56.
- Steers, R. M. and Mowday, R. T. (1981): Employee Turnover and Post-decision Accommodation Process, In Cummings, L. and Staw, B. (Eds.), *Research in Organization Behavior* (Vol. 3), Greenwich, Connecticut: JAI Press, 235-281
- Taylor, S.L. and Cosenza, R.M. (1998): Reducing Turnover in Public Accounting Firms: An Internal Marketing Strategy, *Journal of Professional Services Marketing*, 17 (2), 135-147
- Turner, B.A., and Park, A.(2007): Multidimensional Commitment of Intercollegiate Student-Athletes: Its Effects on Intention to Leave and Satisfaction, *Journal for the Study of Sports and Athletes in Education*
- Van de Ven, A.H.(2002): 2001Presidential Address—Strategic Directions for the Academy of Management: This Academy is for you! *Academy of Management Review*, 27: 171–184.