

Organizational Commitment of a Non-Teaching Personnel in a State University in the Philippines

Elisa P. Payod^a, Marvin S. Canque^b, Lloyd Matthew C. Derasin^c

^aHuman Resource Department, Cebu Technological University, Main Campus, Cebu City, Philippines

^bCollege of Education, Cebu Technological University - Naga Campus, Naga City, Philippines

^cCollege of Technology, Cebu Technological University - Naga Campus, Naga City, Philippines

Article History: Received: XXXxx 20XX; Revised XX Xxx 20XX Accepted: XX Xxx 20XX; Published online: XXxx 20XX

Abstract:

This study aimed to assess the relationship between the length of service and employment status and the level of affective, continuance, and normative organizational commitment of the non-teaching personnel in the state university. It is also aimed to assess the difference in organizational commitment between the rank-and-file employees and the head of office. This study used a descriptive correlational method design. A total of thirty-four (34) head of office and eighty-two (82) rank and file employees are the actual respondents of the study. The data were collected using a structured questionnaire adapted from Meyer and Allen's organizational commitment and analyzed using a t-test of independent samples and Pearson's r correlation. The findings revealed that employment status and service length are positively associated with the affective and normative level of organizational commitment. Moreover, the findings revealed a significant difference in the level of normative organizational commitment between the head of office and rank and file employees. It is concluded that an employee's affective and normative commitment is affected by the length of service and individual's security of tenure and position level in the institution. It is recommended that the administration should recognize the contribution of the non-teaching personnel, particularly the rank-and-file in the institution. Thus, the top management must include in their priority plans and programs the upgrading of the employment position/status of the employee to sustain the level of organizational commitment as it is intricately linked to work performance.

Keywords: Human resources, organizational commitment, length of service, employment status, rank-and-file employee, head of the office

1. Introduction

Human resources are essential investment and a more crucial asset for any organization as it helps them succeed (Imam et al., 2013). Thus, their commitment is an essential predictor of employee loyalty, and organizational performance can take different forms. The context, direction, and development of commitment and the extent to which commitment influences behavior can affect employee performance in the workplace. So, the manager who acknowledges the subordinates' achievement and involvement will make the employees more cooperative and willing to serve the organization.

Employees are entrusted with the job in the organization in attaining its goals and objectives. Therefore, the management invests a lot in the training, seminars, and workshops to improve their skills and capabilities for them to be more productive in their job. As a result, it is often seen as a Human Resource variable that is very difficult to define. As individuals become increasingly responsible for managing their careers, they find themselves working harder to generate organizational commitment. Committed employees have been found less likely to leave the organization than those employees who are not committed. However, the organizational commitment remains a contested construct that has been conceptualized and measured differently. It has been characterized as the level of pledging of an individual towards organizations' practices and persuades one to act, and should view it from behavioral and attitudinal aspects.

The theory of organizational commitment of John Meyer and Nancy Allen (1997) contains three forms of commitment: the dominant framework for organizational commitment (Meyer et al., 2002). They conceptualized the three simultaneous mindsets encompassing affective, continuance, and normative organizational commitment. They stated that employees who have affective commitment want to stay employed in the organization. And emotionally attach to their job because they want to do so. The decision of the thought affective commitment is a conviction molded responsibility that a solid positive inclination joins all elements associated with the advancement of this part, and this is likely the most basic perspective in this type of duty. Affective commitment reflects responsibility on enthusiastic ties the employee creates with the association through positive work

encounters. An employee who has a high level of affective commitment, lower stress levels even work longer and harder than that employee who is not committed. Affective commitment empowers inspiration (Meyer and Allen, 1997). Employees dedicated to the organization, their occupations, and professions seem more joyful and can apply incredible quality time to their families and pastimes. The authors also stated that the second component, continuance commitment, refers to perceived costs when an employee leaves the organization. It is an attachment between social and economic of leaving the organization. The third component, normative commitment, concerns a perceived obligation to stay in the organization because they believe it needs to be. Furthermore, they emphasized that organizational commitment may give value to decision-making participation. Yet, employees' commitment is affected by behavior Beheshtifar & Herat (2013), and in organizational commitment, some behaviors that are visibility to act that plays essential roles in influencing the behavior of the employees, these are how outcomes are interpreted and how a person is willing to own the organization work.

With this, employees' organizational commitment becomes a fascinating and demanding topic for intellectual discourse, thus several studies were conducted. Hanaysha (2016), examined the effects of employee empowerment, teamwork, and employee training on organizational commitment. It was found out that the three variables mentioned have a significant positive impact to organizational commitment. On the other hand, Hulpia, Devos, & Keer (2011) also examined the relationship between school leadership and teachers' organizational commitment. Findings showed Teachers' organizational commitment is mainly related to the quality of the supportive leadership, cooperation within the leadership team, and participative decision-making. Additionally, Hulpia & Devos (2010) studied how distributed leadership can make a difference in teachers' organizational commitment. Findings revealed differences in the leadership practices that influenced organizational commitment. It includes the quality and distribution of leadership functions, social interaction, cooperation of the leadership team, and participative decision-making. Imam et al. (2013) also examined the impact of job satisfaction on a facet of organizational commitment (Affective, Continuance, and Normative Commitment) on Banking Sector Employees. It is revealed that increased job satisfaction increases the facets of the organizational commitment (affective, normative and continuance commitment). In like manner, Neining et al. (2010) conducted a longitudinal study on the effects of team and organizational commitment. The analyses confirmed the effects of organizational commitment on job satisfaction and intention to leave, and team commitment on team performance and altruism. Nongo & Ikanyon (2012) investigate the influence of corporate culture on employee commitment to the organization. It was found that involvement and adaptability significantly correlated with commitment. Ng & Feldman (2010) investigated the relationship between idiosyncratic deals and organizational commitment. It is revealed that the most substantial association between idiosyncratic deals and organizational commitment occurred for older workers who had low core self-evaluation.

The literatures above focused on teachers, faculty, nurses, employees in the private organizations and institutions. It focused also to the leadership practices, and job satisfaction, and things related to intrinsic characteristics of the person and the like. Thus, a study of organization commitment of non-teaching personnel in the academe maybe interesting to do considering the management of these institutions mainly focus on the development and growth of their teaching force just like in a state colleges and universities.

In the state universities and colleges particularly in the Philippines, the non-teaching personnel plays an essential role in the organization. As public servants, they play a vital role in attaining goals and be committed to performing their duties with the highest degree of integrity and delivering an honest and transparent service as much as possible. In addition, they serve a vital contribution to the institution's day-to-day activity or transaction. They have a wide variety of positions available, including support of the student learning, administrative functions, safety and security, facilities and maintenance group, technical support expert, finance and accounting, and many others.

Moreover, they manage the day-to-day financial and human resource aspects of operations and ensure they meet its strategic, operational, and financial objectives. It provides overall clerical and administrative services for the functions of the school. Maintain the resources and safe environment for better learning outcomes for the students. Yet, the quality of service they can provide to the clients is dependent on their level of organizational commitment.

This study's interest is to assess the organizational commitment of the non-teaching employees in a state university. The results could offer valuable insight to the non-teaching employees to evaluate themselves and work to become efficient and ready for whatever challenges their professional careers may pose. On the other hand, the results also serve as a foundation in formulating organizational policies to sustain the productivity of an organization. Hence, the study aimed to determine the relationship between the length of service and employment status/position level to the organizational commitment of the non-teaching employees and determine if there is a significant difference in the level of organizational commitment between rank-and-file employees and the head of office.

Statement of the Problem

This study aimed to determine the organizational commitment of the non-teaching personnel of a state university. Specifically, it sought to answer the following queries:

1. What is the profile of the non-teaching employees according to the following:
 - 1.1 Length of service;
 - 1.2 Employment Status?
2. Is there a significant difference in the level of organizational commitment between the head of office and rank and file?
3. Is there a significant relationship between the profile of the respondents and their level of organizational commitment?

2. Research Methodology

Research Method

The study used a descriptive-correlational research design to investigate the relationship between the profile of the respondents (length of service, employment status) and their level of organizational commitment. It is also used to determine the difference in the level of organizational commitment between rank-and-file and head of office to the non-teaching personnel of a state university.

Respondents of the study

All non-teaching personnel, regular, temporary, and casual employees of Cebu Technological University, Cebu City, Philippines, were the participants. However, to get a good desired number of respondents, this study used Cochran's method of sampling to determine the total number of respondents with the following consideration: (1) the desired difference of .20 between the sample mean and the actual population mean; (2) the margin of error of 5%; and (3) the level of confidence at 5% ($\alpha = 0.05$). However, all department heads of the non-teaching personnel in the entire CTU system are already considered respondents.

Inclusion Criteria for Selection of the Respondents

The major criteria of selection of the participants are the following: 1. non-teaching personnel of Cebu Technological University, 2. either temporary, Casual or holding a regular Plantilla item in any department or office in CTU, 3. holding supervisory or rank and file position, and 4. willing to share his/her experiences as non-teaching personnel of the university.

Research Instrument

This study used a modified questionnaire adapted from Meyer and Allen's Organizational Commitment (1997), an evaluation instrument for the non-teaching employees of the state tertiary institution. It is a structured questionnaire so that the respondents were able to answer it quickly. The researcher-made questionnaire was subjected to a dry run to determine any ambiguous statements; then revision was made. Finally, the data collected were consolidated, analyzed, and interpreted for a possible enhancement scheme to be done.

The survey questionnaire is composed of two (2) parts: the first part is about the profile of the respondent. The second part is a Likert scale, with a four-point response scale with 4 is the highest and 1 is the lowest in which the respondent requires to indicate his/her level of agreement or disagreement at all to the given statement. In this type of questionnaire, the respondent will be given four response choices. These options serve as the quantification of the participants' agreement or disagreement on each question item. The primary aim of the questionnaire is to determine the emerging factors on organizational commitment among rank-and -file and head of office.

Research Procedure

Sought permission to conduct the study and administered the survey to the targeted respondents. In answering the questionnaires, the respondents were instructed to encircle the scale which corresponds to their choice. After which, the questionnaires were retrieved, collated, tabulated, analyzed, and interpreted.

Data Treatment

Used the statistical package for social science (SPSS) to analyze the data. Inferential statistics were used: Pearson's r correlation coefficient to determine the significant relationship between the level of organizational commitment among rank-and-file and head of the office, and t- test of paired/independent samples to determine

significant difference between the level of organizational commitment between department head and rank-and-file employees.

Table 1. Correlation of the profile of the respondents and level of affective organizational commitment

	Pearson's r	P value	Decision	Interpretation
Length of Service	.202*	.031	Reject the null hypothesis	Significant Relationship
Employment Status	.292**	.002	Reject the null hypothesis	Significant Relationship

Correlation is significant at 0.05 level (2-tailed)
 Correlation is significant at 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Table above 1 revealed the correlation of the profile of the respondents and their affective commitment, and it is shown that the Pearson's r is positive 0.202 for the length of service. It is signified that there is a positive correlation between the two variables. Moreover, it is also reflected that the alpha value of 0.05 level of significance is bigger than the computed value of 0.031. It is meant that there is a significant relationship between the length of service and affective commitment. It is implied that the longer the employee in service, the higher his/her affective commitment to the organization.

On the other hand, the value of the Pearson's r correlation of the employment status and affective commitment is 0.292, which meant that the relationship is positive. Moreover, it is noticed in the table also that the alpha value of 0.01 is bigger than the computed p-value of 0.002, which meant the relationship is very substantial. It is implied that the better your employment status, the higher your normative commitment to the organization. Thus, employment status has a powerful impact on normative commitment of the employee.

Table 2. Correlation of profile of the respondents and level of continuance organizational commitment

	Pearson's r	P value	Decision	Interpretation
Length of Service	.024	.800	Accept the null hypothesis	No Significant Relationship
Employment Status	.062	.514	Accept the null hypothesis	No significant Relationship

It is shown in the table above that person's r correlation of length of service and continuance commitment is 0.024, which means there a positive correlation between the two variables. However, its computed p-value is .800, which is higher than the alpha value of 0.05 level of significance. In like manner, the Pearson's r correlation of the employment status and continuance commitment is positive 0.062, while its computed p-value is 0.514, which is higher also than the alpha value of 0.05 level of significance. It is implied that both the length of service and employment status has no significant relationship to the continuance commitment of the employees. Thus, regardless of how long the employee in service and irrespective of its employment status it has no impact/bearing on their continuance commitment.

Table 3. Correlation of the profile of the respondents and level of normative organizational commitment

	Pearson's r	P value	Decision	Interpretation
Length of Service	.047	.619	Accept the null hypothesis	No Significant Relationship
Employment Status	.187*	.046	Reject the null hypothesis	Significant Relationship

Correlation is significant at 0.05 level (2-tailed)

As shown in table 3, the value of the Pearson's r correlation in the normative commitment is 0.047, and it suggests that the relationship between the length of service and normative commitment is positive. However, it is observed that the alpha value of 0.05 level of significance is smaller than the computed p-value of 0.619. It is meant that length of service has no significant relationship to the employee's normative commitment. Thus, regardless of how long the employee is in the organization, its normative commitment will not be affected. On the other hand, a positive association between employment status and normative commitment is revealed in the data. It is meant the difference was enough to warrant a significant relationship between the two variables. It is implied that better/safer the employee's employment status, the higher his/her normative commitment.

Table 4. Difference of the level of organizational commitment between the head of office and rank and file employees.

	Mean	Standard Deviation	T Value	P value	Decision	Interpretation
Affective Commitment	3.29 - HO 3.10 - RR	.405 - HO .624 - RR	1.628	.058	Accept the null hypothesis	No significant difference
Continuance Commitment	2.808 - HO 2.773 - RR	.560 - HO .655 - RR	.058	.771	Accept the null hypothesis	No significant difference
Normative Commitment	3.00 - HO 2.743 - RR	.427 - HO .606 - RR	2.237	.012	Reject the null hypothesis	Significant difference

Significant difference at 0.05 level (2-tailed)

Table 4 presented the mean of the head of an office in affective commitment is slightly higher than the mean of the rank and file. However, it can also be gleaned that the alpha value of a 0.05 level of significance is lesser than the computed p value of 0.058. It is meant that the difference in their mean was not significant. It is implied that the difference was not enough to warrant/guarantee that the level of affective commitment of the head of an office is higher/better than the rank-and-file employees and vice versa. Thus, regardless of the position of the employees, their level of affective commitment is more likely the same.

In like manner, the mean of the head of an office in continuance commitment is also slightly higher than the mean of rank and file. It can also be gleaned in the table that the alpha value of a 0.05 level of significance is smaller than the computed p-value of 0.05. It is meant that the difference in their mean was not significant too. It is implied the difference was not enough to warrant/guarantee that the level of continuance commitment of the head of an office is higher/better than the rank-and-file employees and vice versa. Thus, the position of the employees would not matter when it comes to their level of continuance commitment.

Lastly, it is also shown in the table that the mean of the head of an office in the normative commitment is slightly higher than the mean of the rank and file, and the alpha value of 0.05 level of significance is bigger than the computed value of 0.012. It is meant that the difference was significant. It is implied that the difference was enough to warrant that the level of normative commitment of the head of office is higher/better than the rank and file. It is meant that the position of the employees would matter when it comes to their normative commitment. Thus, the higher/better the position and the more incentives an employee receives in the institution the safer his/her feelings to stay in the organization.

3. Discussion

Employee organizational commitment is always a significant factor to the success of the organization/institution, particularly in the delivery of quality services to the clientele. Hence, these study findings offered valuable insights in order to sustain employee's level of organizational commitment. The study's first finding informed us that an employee's position/employment status in the institution positively impacts to his/her affective commitment and normative commitment. It tells us that the more secure and stable the position, the stronger and the better his/her emotional attachment/bond to the organization. It also suggests that to strengthen his/her emotional attachment to the organization, his/her contribution must be acknowledged and recognized. In addition, providing better support emotionally and financially to protect and preserve the employees' welfare is a manifestation of valuing their contributions and showing care for their well-being in the institution. Similarly, if the institution provides favorable income, benefits and incentives and implements a fair merits system for rewards and promotion to the employee it will and can sustain the employee's love, dedication, and commitment to the organization. Thus, it made them feel the institution provided them security, safety as well as comfort and eventually give his/her commitment. This finding concurs to Clercq&Ruis (2007) that individual's position and tenure in the firm are positively associated to organizational commitment. It supported also the finding of Wong, Ngo, & Wong (2002) that perceived job security which is derived from actual work environment has positive significant impact to affective commitment.

In like manner, the positive association between employment position/status and normative commitment suggested that the stability and security in the institution motivates and encourages employees to stay and work productively in the institution. Moreover, it articulated that changing employees' status and upgrading job positions provided them positive experiences in the organization. Similarly, it made them realize that the organization considered them assets and willing to invest for their welfare. It will eventually make them believe that it is their moral obligation to stay and reciprocate the institution's action. This finding coincided Sharma &Warkentin (2018) that permanent employees demonstrate a stronger impact of organizational commitment and perceived organizational support on behavioral intention to comply with ISP as compared to temporary employees

Another captivating finding is the positive association of the length of service and the affective commitment of the employee to the institution. It highlighted the critical role of the length of service to affective commitment of the employee in the organization. This result informed us that the longer the employee in the organization, the stronger his/her bond in the organization. It implied that the employee value his/her personal experiences and intimate relationship to the institution.

Yet the finding negated Ahmad Al-Qariote& Al-Enezi (2006), that managers who serve in the shortest period of time has the higher organizational commitment than those who served more than 4 years already in the organization.

Finally, the last finding of the study is the significant difference of the level of normative organization commitment between rank-and-file employee and the head of office. This result informed us the higher the position of the employee, the broader and wider his/her job description and responsibility in the organization, signified better salary and additional compensation, and better opportunities. Eventually, makes the employee

thinks and believes as an asset in the organization and eventually the more the employee reciprocated the action of the institution. It supported the finding of Iqbal (2010) that managers and supervisors are more committed than ordinary workers. Similarly, it concurred to the finding of Hung and Wu (2016) the impact of position difference on employees' organizational commitment after a merger of life insurance companies that organization commitment of agent employees is higher than staff employees. Finally, the finding aligns to Kanchana&Panchanatham (2012) that first level teachers showed higher affective, continuance, and normative organizational commitment than the first level teachers.

4. Conclusion

The non-teaching personnel plays a vital role in the development and success of the academe. Thus, their level of organizational commitment should be sustained as it is very crucial and critical in the attainment of organizational goals. Two major factors that directly affect or impact to the non-teaching personnel level of affective and normative organizational commitment, such as length of service and employment status. Employee's emotional attachment to the institution is strengthened by keeping and letting him/her stay longer. Yet, it is affected by the individual employment position and tenure of office. The more secure and satisfying it is, the stronger the attachment. Thus, the administration/top management should also give importance and value to the contribution of the non-teaching personnel, particularly the rank-and-file, through inclusion in their priority plans and programs the upgrading of the employment position to sustain the level of organizational commitment as it is intricately linked to work performance.

References

- [1] Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63, 1-18.
- [2] Ahmad Al-Qariote, M. & Al-Enezi, A (2006). Organization commitment of managers in Jordan: A field study. *International Journal for public Administration*, 27 (5), 331-352. DOI: 10.1081/PAD-120028813.
- [3] Beheshtifar, M. & Herat, B. (2013). To promote employees' commitment via perceived organizational support. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*. 3 (1).
- [4] Clercq, D. & Ruis, I. (2007). Organizational commitment in Mexican small and medium-sized firms. The role of work status, organizational climate, and entrepreneurial orientation. *Journal on Small Business Management* 45(4), 467-490.
- [5] Hanaysha, J. (2016). Examining the effects of employee empowerment, teamwork, and employee training on organizational commitment. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 229, 298-306.
- [6] Hulpia, H., Devos, G., & Van Keer, H. (2011). The relation between school leadership from a distributed perspective and teachers' organizational commitment: Examining the source of the leadership function. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 47(5), 728-771.
- [7] Hulpia, H., & Devos, G. (2010). How distributed leadership can make a difference in teachers' organizational commitment? A qualitative study. *Teaching and teacher education*, 26(3), 565-575.
- [8] Imam, A., Raza, A., Shah, F., Raza, H. (2013). Impact of job satisfaction on facet of organizational commitment (Affective, Continuance, and Normative commitment): A study on banking sector employees in Pakistan. *World Applied Science Journal*, 28 (2): 271-277. DOI:10.5829/idosi.wasj.2013.28.02.12468
- [9] Iqbal, A. (2010). An empirical assessment of demographic factors, organizational ranks and organization commitment. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 5(3).
- [10] Kanchana, P. & Panchanatham, N. (2012). The influence of demographic factors on organizational commitment. *International Journal of Exclusive Management Research*, 5(2).
- [11] Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human resource management review*, 1(1), 61-89.
- [12] Meyer, J. P., & Parfyonova, N. M. (2010). Normative commitment in the workplace: A theoretical analysis and re-conceptualization. *Human resource management review*, 20(4), 283-294.
- [13] Neinger, A., Lehmann-Willenbrock, N., Kauffeld, S., & Henschel, A. (2010). Effects of team and organizational commitment—A longitudinal study. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 76(3), 567-579.
- [14] Ng, T. W., & Feldman, D. C. (2010). Idiosyncratic deals and organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 76(3), 419-427.
- [15] Nongo, E. S., & Ikonyon, D. N. (2012). The influence of corporate culture on employee commitment to the organization. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 7(22), 21-28.

- [16] Hung, C. and Wu, J. (2016). The impact of position difference on employees' organizational commitment after a merger of life insurance companies. *Emerging Market Finance and Trade*, 52, 843-852. DOI: 10.1080/1540496x.2015.1117870.
- [17] Sharma, S. & Warkentin, M. (2018). Do I really belong?: Impact of employment status on information security policy compliance. *Computers and Security*. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cose.2018.09.005>
- [18] Wong, Y., Ngo, H. & Wong, C. (2002). Affective organizational commitment of workers in Chinese joint ventures. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 17(7), 580-598. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/02683940210444049>.