check for updates

MODERATING ROLE OF EMOTIONAL LABOUR IN JOB CHARACTERISTICS AND ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT RELATIONS

Check for updates

iD **Ndidi G. Oranika[1]**
iD **Ejike A. Okonkwo[2+]**
iD **Uche J. Aboh[3]**

[1,2,3]Department of Psychology, Enugu State University of Science and Technology, Nigeria.
[1]Email: ndoranika@gmail.com Tel: 07032937897
[2]Email: aejyke@yahoo.com Tel: 08037431759
[3]Email: james.aboh@esut.edu.ng Tel: 08036739299

(+ Corresponding author)

ABSTRACT

This cross-sectional study investigated the moderating role of emotional labour in job characteristics and organizational commitment relations among secondary school teachers in Enugu urban area of Enugu State, Nigeria. One hundred and eighty (180) teachers, comprising 62 men and 118 women between the ages of 22 to 61 years were sampled using multi-stage sampling techniques. The 18-item Organizational Commitment Scale, 21-item Job Characteristics Scale and 10-item Emotional Labour Scale were the measures for data collection. Results of moderated regression analysis revealed that the various dimensions of job characteristics and emotional labour did not equally predict organizational commitment. And the two components of emotional labour did not equally moderate. Job characteristics and emotional labour accounted for 9.6% of the variance in affective commitment of the teachers, 10.6 % of variance in continuance commitment and 18.6% in normative commitment. Specifically, feedback from agents' dimension of job characteristics independently predicted normative commitment while the other dimensions did not predict any dimension of organizational commitment. Surface acting negatively predicted affective commitment while deep acting positively predicted continuance commitment. Deep acting strengthened the relationship between feedback from agents and affective commitment while surface acting weakened the relationship between feedback from agents and continuance commitment. Surface acing strengthened the relationship between feedback from job and continuance commitment. Surface acting also strengthened the relationship between dealing with others and normative commitment. This study has recommended that policy makers in teaching/education should consider job characteristics and emotional labour in order to enhance organizational commitment.

Contribution/ Originality: This study is one of very few studies in non-Western context which investigated the relations among emotional labour, job characteristics and organizational commitment using moderated regression. It has shown that emotional labour strengthens the relationship between job characteristics and organizational commitment.

1. INTRODUCTION

Unequivocally, teachers seem to play important roles in the delivery of quality services in terms of education and development of students. And it could be suggested that this delivery of quality services stems from the teachers' commitment to their duties and the organization. To this end, today, responsible organizations strive to

127

provide enabling work environment and ensure that the organizational framework gives shape, support and satisfaction to its employees that will enhance organizational commitment (Adeyinka, Ayeni, & Popoola, 2007).

Organizational commitment is a psychological link between an employee and his or her organization that makes it less likely that the employee will voluntarily leave the organization (Allen & Meyer, 1996) and the extent to which an employee develops an attachment and feels a sense of allegiance to his or her employer (Redmond, 2010). According to Mowday, Porter, and Steers (1982) organizational commitment is an employee's strong belief in an organization's goals and values, a willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of an organization and a strong desire to remain a member of the organization. Organizational commitment is the state in which an employee identifies with the organization and its goals and wants to remain a member of that organization (Gautam, Van Dick, & Wagner, 2004). Committed employees in any organization must possess sense of belonging to the organization, sense of excitement in the job, and confidence in management leadership (Mullins, 1993) hence Martins and Nicholls (1999) viewed organizational commitment as encapsulating (giving all of you while at work). This commitment involves using time constructively; paying attention to details, making extra effort to attain the organizational goals etc. And it causes the mobilization of all the capacities of the employee to achieve the goals laid down by the organization and prohibits any separation between employee and the organization (Zannad & Rouet, 2003). According to Meyer and Allen (1997) and also supported by Herscovitch and Meyer (2002) three component model of commitment are three "mind-sets" which characterize an employee's commitment to the organization namely; affective, continuance and normative commitment. Affective commitment refers to employee's perception of the emotional attachment or identification with the organization. Affective commitment has three factors: individual and organizational value congruence characterizing an employee's belief and in acceptance of organizational goals and values; an obsession for helping organization to achieve its goals; and a definite desire to maintain organizational membership out of choice (Arfat & Riyaz, 2013).

Continuance commitment is an attachment to an organization based on an employee's awareness of the costs associated with discontinuing membership (Jandaghi, Borghei, Matin, & Dastani, 2010). It is an employee's perception of the cost of leaving the organization to another place. Employees with strong continuance commitment stay with the organization out of self-interest (Alexander, Rani, & Wendy, 2010).

Normative commitment may be defined as an obligation to remain with an organization (Buchko, Weinzimmer, & Sergeyev, 1998). Normative commitment is the employee's perception of their normal obligation to the organization. It may be the consequence of an internalized norm, developed by the person prior to joining the organization through the values inherent or other socialization processes, that one should be loyal to one's organization (Arfat & Riyaz, 2013). Common to these three approaches is the view that commitment is a psychological state that characterizes the employee's relationship with the organization and has implications for the decision to continue membership of it. According to Kumari and Priya (2017) organizational commitment is an individual's identification with and involvement in the organization characterized by strong beliefs in and acceptance of the organization. Such internalized normative pressures to be committed may be dependent on some organizational factors such as job characteristics and emotional labour which are the key variables explored in this study. The connection between job characteristic and employee commitment is via motivation. Job characteristic model of Hackman and Oldham (1975) is one of the most important models of job designing. Giving credence to this, studies (e.g. Sadler-Smith, El-Kot, and Leat (2003)) have suggested that job designing has a lot of influence on the attitude, beliefs, and feelings of organization employees such as organizational commitment. And the basic model of job designing involves job characteristics such as skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy and feedback (Richard & Oldham, 1976).

According to this model, in order to enhance employee's motivation and organization commitment, every job must have these five core characteristic: skill variety, task significance, task identity, autonomy and feedback.

Skill variety refers to the various skills and talents that are required for jobs to be completed (Kwon & Banks, 2004). Task identity is the degree to which the job requires completion of a whole identifiable piece of work; that is, doing a job from beginning to end with visible outcome. It measures the ability of an employee to perform a specific task that results in an identifiable outcome (Hadi & Adil, 2010). Task significance is the degree to which the job has a substantial impact on the lives of other people, whether those people are in the immediate organization or in the world at large. It is employees' feelings toward the impact of a task on the lives of others in an organization or in society (Morris & Venkatesh, 2010). Autonomy is the degree to which the job provides substantial freedom, independence, and discretion to the individual in scheduling the work and in determining the procedure to be used in carrying it out. Task autonomy represents freedom and independence provided to the employee to make task-related decisions such as work scheduling and procedures selection (Na-Nan & Pukkeeree, 2013). Job feedback is the degree to which carrying out the work activity required by the job provides the individual with direct and clear information about the effectiveness of his/her performance.

These tend to impact three psychological states in the employees which include; experienced meaningfulness of work (the extent to which the work is seen as making a difference to others), felt responsibility (the extent to which the employee assumes responsibility for his/her work), and knowledge of results (the extent to which the employee is aware of the quality of his/her work).

Many studies (e.g. (Faraji et al., 2015; Obi-Nwosu, Chiamaka, & Tochukwu, 2013)) have been conducted regarding the relationship between job characteristics model and organizational commitment. According to Greenberger and Strasser (1986) job characteristics are the extent to which a job is structured to provide regular feedback, as well as, a sense of personal control (personal control is an individual's belief that he/she can effect a change in a desired direction). They further argued that job characteristics are attributes of job that motivate employees through the employees' perceived job characteristics, which further influence their motivation and determine their organizational commitment. In addition, Lawler (1992) stated that an increase in perceived control strengthens emotional bond with an organization. Chiu and Chen (2005) add that job characteristics are those attributes of job, which have motivational functions or features for employees. Oliver, Bakker, Demerouti, and De Jong (2005) claimed that perceived job characteristics would influence the motivation and commitment of employees. This is in line with Mottaz (1988) that job characteristics such as variety and autonomy are well established determinants of organizational commitment. Hackman and Lawler (1971) suggested that job characteristics such as skill variety, task identity, autonomy and feedback motivated employees in their job.

Empirical studies have also provided strong connections among these variables. For example, Sneed and Herman (1990) in a study found job characteristics for supervisory and non-supervisory staff to be positively related with organizational commitment while individually they found skill variety, dealing with others, feedback and autonomy to be the only significant individual job characteristics.

Extant literature (e.g. (Chiu & Chen, 2005; Faraji et al., 2015; Mottaz, 1988; Obi-Nwosu et al., 2013)) show the widespread of studies on the relationships between job characteristics and organizational commitment. However, the moderating role of emotional labour in the relationships between job characteristics and organizational commitment has not been studied (Lapointe, Morin, Courcy, Boilard, & Payette, 2012). In support of this, Hennig-Thurau, Groth, Paul, and Gremler (2006) stated that the role of emotional labour in organizational setting is still underdeveloped despite the emerging literature. Given the limited research in this area, organizational behavior scholars call for a broader integrative view of emotions in the workplace (Bono, Foldes, Vinson, & Muros, 2007) because of the role of emotion in the relationship between job characteristics and organizational commitment (Ching-Sheue, 2015; Ye, 2016) hence the need for the present study to fill this research gap.

Emotional labour is the act of expressing organizationally desired emotions during service transactions (Morris & Feldman, 1996). It refers to situations whereby employees, especially those in client contact service occupations, are required to display emotions that may differ from the emotions they actually feel (Hochschild, 1979). Emotional

labor is the effort, planning, and control needed to express organizationally desired emotions during interpersonal transactions (Morris & Feldman, 1996). The concept of emotional labor has particular relevance to service encounters because the behavior of employees strongly affects customers' perceptions of product quality (Bowen, Siehl, & Schneider, 1989). Emotional labor involves both surface and deep acting (Hochschild, 1983). Surface acting occurs when employees display an emotion that could involve both "suppression of felt emotions and faking of unfelt emotions" (Morris & Feldman, 1996). Employees (e.g. teachers) may pretend to be friendly and helpful to angry or upset students. In contrast, employees create expected or required emotions within themselves in deep acting (Hennig-Thurau et al., 2006). For example, teachers may approach and deal with angry students in a sympathetic and understanding way (Hochschild, 1983). While deep acting attempts to modify internal feelings to be consistent with display rules, surface acting modifies outward displays to be consistent with display rules (Glomb & Tews, 2004). Cho, Rutherford, and Park (2013) stated that if employees express positive emotions when interacting with customers, the customers are likely to perceive these emotions. That is to say that if emotional labour is properly applied by an employee, such can help to moderate job demand characteristics.

1.1. Theoretical Overview and Hypothesis Development

Hackman and Oldham (1975) theory is arguably one of the important theories linking job characteristics and emotional labour to organizational commitment. The theory posits that enriching and motivating job characteristics (skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy, and feedback) will bring about positive cognitive, psychological, and emotional conditions such as deep acting or surface acting for the employees. For example, if teachers as employees in school setting are allowed to use varieties of skill, they are more likely to display deep acting based on emotional labour. Deep acting attempts to modify internal feelings to be consistent with display rules while surface acting modifies outward displays to be consistent with display rules (Glomb & Tews, 2004). Such emotional display in the light of job characteristics could moderate the employee's commitment to the work and the organization. In addition, the theory argues that if an employee is not given autonomy, it is not possible for the employee to succeed (Gomez-Mejia, Balkin, & Cardy, 2007) thus having implications for organizational commitment. This means that job characteristics, all things being equal, is likely to predict employees' commitment and such prediction could be moderated by emotional labour.

Lending further support to the job characteristics model is the three-component theory (Meyer & Allen, 1990) which demonstrates how job characteristics and emotional labour relate to organizational commitment. These three forms, labeled affective, continuance, and normative commitment, respectively, refer to components of organizational commitment (Meyer & Allen, 1990). These components of commitment may not be achieved in a school setting if the issues of emotional labour and job characteristics are not taken into cognizance. That is to say that for a teacher to be committed to his or her organization on the bases of affective, normative or continuance commitment as enshrined in the three component theory, the issue of emotional labour and job characteristics should not be ignored. For instance, if the teaching environment is designed to enable teachers enjoy adequate job characteristics such as skill variety, autonomy and latitude to display appropriate emotions then teachers' commitment will be enhanced.

In further support of the job characteristics theory (Hackman & Oldham, 1975) the affective events theory (Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996) shows that emotions are critically important to how employees handle workplace situations. The model states that there is a relationship between the employees' internal influences and their reactions to incidents that happen during their workday that affect their commitment to the organization. For example, affective events theory was found to be relevant in studies (e.g., (Cole, Walter, & Bruch, 2008; Walter & Bruch, 2009)) which examined emotions in organizations. According to the theory, the nature of the job and the requirements for emotional labor affect behavior and work attitudes (Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996) resulting in

positive and negative emotional labour that may lead to work attitudes, such as organizational commitment (Ashkanasy, 2002).

1.2. Job Characteristics and Organizational Commitment

The association between job characteristics and organizational commitment has continued to attract the attention of researchers. For example, Obi-Nwosu et al. (2013) in a study of private sector workers in Anambra state of Nigeria found that only two dimensions of job characteristics namely dealing with others and task identity predicted organizational commitment while the remaining dimensions did not. Also comparing organizational commitment and job characteristics among private and public sector managers, a study (Flynn & Tannenbaum, 1993) found a strong relationship between job characteristics and organizational commitment among private sector managers than their counterparts in the public sector. In a similar study, examined the relationship between factors of job characteristics and organizational commitment using 100 employees working at Cement factory. From the research findings, there is a significant relationship between factors of job characteristics and organizational commitment where task identity is the dominant factor that influenced organizational commitment.

In another study, Al-Tit and Suifan (2015) found positive influence in the relationship between job characteristics and organizational commitment. Faraji et al. (2015) in a study of 152 hospital employees in Iran found a direct and significant correlation between job feedback and dimension of job characteristics and organizational commitment. Sneed and Herman (1990) in their study using supervisory (n=45) and non-supervisory staff (n=172) found job characteristics for supervisory and non-supervisory staff positively related with organizational commitment while individually they found skill variety, dealing with others, feedback and autonomy to be the only significant individual job characteristics. A study by Feather and Rauter (2004) involving permanent and temporary teachers in Victoria, Australia, revealed a positive relationship between organizational commitment and organizational identification, variety, skill utilization and organizational behavior.

Bhuian and Mengue (2002) explored the effect of job characteristics on organizational commitment among expatriate salespersons. The findings revealed a higher level of organizational commitment when they perceived their job provided higher level of autonomy, identity, and feedback. A study conducted earlier by Bhuian, Al-Shammari , and Jefri (1996) observed similar findings that job autonomy, task identity, and feedback impacted job satisfaction, while task variety influenced employees' commitment. Given the findings, it is crucial to give emphasis on the job design aspects, particularly autonomy and feedback, in promoting positive job attitudes, such as commitment and satisfaction, among employees. Amiri, Mirhashemi, and Parsamoein (2013) using a sample drawn from a learning organization consisting of 293 participants found a significant correlation between the components of job characteristics (autonomy, task identity, feedback, and job challenge) and organizational commitment. Kang and Liu (2018) in a study of University PE teachers in Jiangsu and Zhejiang area, China found positive relationship between job characteristics and organizational commitment. Ozturk, Hancer, and Im (2014) in a study of 252 hotel workers in Turkey found that the job characteristics, interaction, feedback, and autonomy had significant impacts on affective commitment. Taghavi and Gholami (2015) also found positive correlations between job characteristics and organizational commitment.

1.3. Emotional Labour and Organizational Commitment

Previous studies have shown the link between emotional labour and organizational commitment. In a study (e.g. Ye (2016)) which investigated how the level of emotional labor is related to affective commitment among 218 clinicians in the public hospitals in China. The findings indicate that there is a significant relationship in the level of emotional labor and affective commitment, except surface acting with colleagues. Similarly, Ghalandari, Jogh, Imani, and Nia (2012) in a study of 136 nurses in a community hospital investigated the effects of emotional labor

strategies on organizational commitment by considering the role of emotional intelligence. The findings revealed significant influence of emotional labor strategies influences on organizational commitment.

Brotheridge (2006) in a study of frontline bank employees in Greece found no significant correlations between deep and surface acting and organizational commitment. Also, Chiu and Ko (2016) in a study of 425 technicians found a positive and significant correlation between organizational commitment and emotional labor.

1.4. Nigerian Context

Lack of organizational commitment is one of the organizational factors that can lead to the collapse of the teaching profession if not given proper attention. For instance, if teachers are not committed to the organization, such behaviour will affect performance and when performance is affected, the quality of teaching is affected.

Despite the fact that organizational commitment is an issue of global relevance, and remarkable amount of research has been conducted on a widespread organizational commitment and its antecedents and consequences, there have, ironically, been few studies of these concerns in diverse national contexts, specifically non-Western contexts. Most studies (e.g. (Al-Tit & Suifan, 2015; Faraji et al., 2015; Flynn & Tannenbaum, 1993)) have concentrated majorly on the relationship between job characteristics and organizational commitment, few on the relationship between emotional labour and organizational commitment (e.g. (Ghalandari et al., 2012; Ye, 2016)) and relatively little research has been done on the moderating role of emotional labour in the relationship between job characteristics and organizational commitment. All these studies with the exception of Feather and Rauter (2004); Ching-Sheue (2015); Kang and Liu (2018) focused on other populations than teachers.

In Nigeria, as regards organizational commitment of workers (especially those in public sectors), there is divergence of opinions among researchers (Salami, 2008). For example, some believe that Nigerian workers in the public sector are not committed to their organizations (Olugbile, 1996). Others believe that they are committed to organizational goals but that at times it is the organizations that do not show commitment to the plight of the workers (Alarape & Akinlabi, 2000). Interestingly, these studies (e.g , (Ebeh, Uhiara, Agbor, & Nwankwo, 2015; Obi-Nwosu et al., 2013)) which were carried out in Nigeria including (Anomneze, Ugwu, Enwereuzor, & Ugwu, 2016) which focused on teachers, failed to establish the moderating role of emotional labour in job characteristics as predictors of organizational commitment. This research gap is particularly problematic and calls for research involving African population, hence this present study in non-Western context of Nigeria testing the following hypotheses:

1. Job characteristics (skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy, feedback from agents, feedback from the job and dealing with others) will significantly predict organizational commitment (affective, continuance and normative).
2. Emotional labour (surface acting and deep acting) will significantly predict organizational commitment (affective, continuance and normative).
3. Emotional labour (surface acting and deep acting) will significantly moderate the prediction of organizational commitment (affective, continuance and normative) by job characteristics (skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy, feedback from agents, feedback from the job and dealing with others).

2. METHOD

2.1. Participants and Procedure

Participants were 180 teachers comprising 62 males and 118 females between the ages of 22 to 61 years. Using multi-stage sampling techniques participants were drawn from six (6) Secondary Schools in Enugu Urban, Enugu State, Nigeria. Permission for the conduct of the study using teachers from Enugu State was obtained from the Commissioner of Education, Enugu State. The researchers identified with the principals of the six schools in order to inform them of the study and get their cooperation. Copies of the questionnaire were administered to the

participants and instructions given. They were allowed to go home with the copies and returned on a later date. One hundred and ninety two (192) copies (96%) of the questionnaire were returned and 12 (6.3%) copies were discarded due to errors in completion, hence, 180 (93%) copies of the questionnaire were scored and analyzed for hypotheses testing.

2.2. Measures

Three scales were used. They include 18-item Organizational Commitment Scale (Meyer, Allen, & Smith, 1993) 21-item Job Characteristics Scale (Hackman & Oldham, 1975) and 10-item Emotional Labour Scale (Cukur, 2009).

2.3. Organizational Commitment Scale

Organizational commitment was assessed using 23-item Organizational Commitment Scale (Meyer et al., 1993). Sample item reads: 'If I had my life to live over again, I would still choose to work for this organization'. There are both direct scoring and reverse scoring items. Ratings were made using 7-point scale, ranging from 1(strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree) with internal consistency value of .94 (Meyer et al., 1993). Using African sample, Gbadamosi (2006) obtained internal consistency alpha reliability coefficients of .73 (affective commitment), .74 (continuance commitment) and .66 (normative commitment). Obi-Nwosu et al. (2013) in a Nigerian sample reported the following Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficients: .65 (affective commitment), .70 (continuance commitment) and.50 (normative commitment). Similarly, Ujoatuonu, Apex-Apeh, and Onu (2016) in another Nigerian sample obtained internal consistency Cronbach alpha of .71. In addition, Okonkwo, Obodo, and Aboh (2019) obtained a Cronbach's alpha of .76 for the overall organizational commitment scale. The present researchers also obtained Cronbach's alpha of .73 for the overall scale items.

2.4. Job Characteristics Scale

Job characteristics were measured using 21–item Job Characteristics Scale (Hackman & Oldham, 1975) validated for Nigerian use by Omoluabi (2000). The scale has seven subscales measuring seven (7) principal job characteristics (skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy, feedback from the job, feedback from agents and dealing with others). Sample items include: 'The job requires me to use a number of complex or high-level skills' (skill variety), 'The job provides me the chance to completely finish the pieces of work I begin' (task identity), 'The outcomes of my work can affect other people in very important ways' (task significance), 'The job gives me almost complete responsibility for deciding how and when the work is done' (autonomy), 'The job is set up so that I get almost constant "feedback" as work, about how well I am doing' (feedback from job), 'People almost always let me know how well I am doing on the job' (feedback from agents), and 'Dealing with other people is an essential and crucial part of doing job' (Dealing with others). There are both direct scoring and reverse scoring items. Each of the sub-scales could be scored separately. Ratings were made using 7-point scale, ranging from 1(very inaccurate) to 7 (very accurate) with internal consistency values of .71 (skill variety), .59 (task identity), .66 (task significance), .66 (autonomy), .71 (feedback from the job), .78 (feedback from agents) and .59 (dealing with others) or the seven subscales reported by Hackman and Oldham (1975). Obi-Nwosu et al. (2013) in a Nigerian sample reported The following Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficients: .72 (skill variety), .50 (task identity) .48 (task significance), .40 (autonomy), .68 (feedback from job), .64 (feedback from agents) and .58 (dealing with others). Obodo, Okonkwo, and Aboh (2019) reported Cronbach's alpha of .54. The present researchers also obtained Cronbach's alpha of .78 for the overall job characteristics scale.

2.5. Emotional Labour Scale

Emotional labour was assessed using 10-item Emotional Labour Scale (Cukur, 2009). This 10-item scale was designed to measure emotional labour of teachers. Sample item include: "I try to control my feelings to have

133

emotions I need to display on my job when sharing sad news with students". Ratings were made using 5-point scale ranging from 1(not at all) to 5 (very true). All items have factor loadings that were statistically significant and loadings ranging between .46 and .71. Cukur (2009) reported internal consistency reliability of .79. Using Nigerian sample, Anomneze et al. (2016) reported Cronbach's alpha of .73 (surface acting) and .72 (deep acting) for the subscales. The present researchers obtained Cronbach's alpha of .72 for the overall emotional labour scale.

3. RESULTS

Results in Table 1, indicate that gender, years of experience marital status were not significantly related to affective commitment of the teachers. Among the predictor variables, only task identity ($r= -.17$, $p < .05$), autonomy ($r= -.13$, $p < .05$), feedback from the job ($r= -.16$, $p < .05$) and surface acting emotional labour ($r= -.23$, $p < .001$) were significantly related to the affective commitment of the teachers, though, negatively.

The other descriptive and correlation tables were not shown because the demographic and predictor variables were found not to be related to normative and continuance dimensions of organizational commitment.

Results in Table 2 indicate that the first Moderated Hierarchical Multiple Regression in which affective commitment was the criterion variable, the control variables (gender, age, years of experience and marital status) entered in step 1 of the equation were unable to explain any significant variance in affective commitment either as a block or as individual variables. In step 2, when skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy, feedback from agents, feedback from the job, dealing with others, surface acting emotion labour and deep acting emotional labour were entered as a block, they added 9.6% variance in affective commitment ($\Delta R^2 = .096$, $p< .05$), with all of the job characteristics facets and emotional labour facets not contributing significantly in predicting affective commitment, which failed partly to confirm hypotheses 1 and 2. The entry of the two-way interaction terms at step 3 revealed an insignificant two-way interactions between skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy, feedback from agents, feedback from the job, dealing with others and surface acting emotional labour, hence hypothesis 3 was partly not confirmed. However, in this step 3, surface acting negatively predicted affective organizational commitment. Furthermore, the entry of the two-way interaction terms between skill varieties, , task identity, task significance, autonomy, feedback from agents, feedback from the job, dealing with others and deep acting emotional labour in step 4 yielded a significant interaction ($\Delta F^2 = 3.47$, $p< .01$), therefore, hypothesis 3 was partly confirmed. Precisely, in this step, deep acting positively moderated the relationship between feedback from agents and affective organizational commitment. Meaning that, deep acting emotional labour interacted with feedback from agents and as such, made the relationship between feedback from agents' dimension of job characteristics and affective commitment of teachers stronger.

From the second Moderated Hierarchical Multiple Regression in which continuance commitment was the criterion variable, control variables (gender, age, years of experience and marital status) entered in step 1 of the equation were unable to explain any significant variance in continuance commitment either as a block or as individual variables. In step 2, when skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy, feedback from agents, feedback from the job, dealing with others, surface acting emotion labour and deep acting emotional labour were entered as a block, they added 10.6% variance in continuance commitment ($\Delta R^2 = 106$, $p< .05$), with only deep acting ($\beta = .28$, $p< .01$) contributing significantly and positively in predicting continuance commitment, which partly confirms hypothesis 2.

Table-1. descriptive statistics and correlations among the study variables.

(N=180)

No.	Variable	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1	Affective Commitment	17.39	2.71	1													
2	Gender	0.66	0.48	0.08	1												
3	Age	37.03	9.54	0.08	0.13	1											
4	Years of Experience	0.34	0.47	-0.01	0	0.52	1										
5	Marital Status	0.62	0.49	0.06	0.3	0.59	0.32	1									
6	Skill Variety	12.27	3.79	-6	-0.19	-0.03	0.02	-0.07	1								
7	Task Identity	14.53	3.9	-.17*	-0.05	0.01	0.01	-0.08	0.09	1							
8	Task Significance	13.12	3.64	-0.09	0	0.03	-0.01	-0.03	0.12	0.3	1						
9	Autonomy	13.72	3.58	-.13*	-0.16	-0.15	-0.01	-0.08	0.19	0.05	0.07	1					
10	Feedback from Job	13.56	3.29	-.16*	0.06	0.07	-0.02	0.11	-0.09	0.45	0.16	0.06	1				
11	Feedback from Agents	14.86	4.13	-0.06	-0.14	-0.08	0.16	-0.1	-0.06	0.35	0.13	0.16	0.46	1			
12	Dealing with Others	15.75	3.78	-0.04	-0.14	-0.04	0.16	-0.01	0.23	0.37	0.31	0.09	0.29	0.4	1		
13	Surface acting Emotional	16.16	3.69	-.23**	-0.14	0.01	0.01	-0.06	0.06	0.11	0.3	0.17	0.06	0.05	0.06	1	
14	Deep acting Emotional	16.4	3.45	-0.09	0.07	0.04	0.1	-0.03	-0.14	0.01	0.27	0.01	-0.04	0	0.22	0.4	1

Note: * = $P<.05$, ** and ** = $p <.001$. Gender was coded 0 = Females, 1 = Males; Age; Marital status was coded 0 =single, 1 = married; Years of Experience was coded 0 = Short Years of experience, 1 = Long Years of Experience.

Table-2. Moderated regression showing the moderating role of emotional labour in the relationship between job characteristics, affective, continuance and normative organizational commitment.

(N = 180)

Variables	Affective commitment				Continuance commitment				Normative commitment			
	Step1 β	Step2 β	Step3 B	Step4 B	Step1 B	Step2 B	Step3 B	Step4 β	Step1 B	Step2 B	Step3 B	Step4 B
Gender	.07	.06	.09	.08	.07	.03	.02	.01	.15*	.18*	.15	.13
Age	.10	.15	.09	.12	-.17	-.21*	-.18	-.23*	-.09	-.04	-.02	-.06
Years of experience	-.07	-.11	-.03	-.11	.11	.10	.08	.17	.21*	.12	.08	.15
Marital status	.00	-.01	-.01	-.01	.15	.18	.15	.16	.01	.00	-.00	.00
Skill variety		-.05	-.48	-.36		.04	.86*	.87*		.03	-.21	-.29
Task identity		-.13	-.44	-.71		-.03	.44	.57		-.14	.15	.05
Task significance		.00	.51	.74		-.02	.37	.51		-.10	-.68	-.73
Autonomy		-.06	-.13	.36		-.09	-.54	-1.07*		.06	-.34	-.39
Feedback from agents		-.17	-.78	-1.38		.03	.87*	1.15*		.18*	.52	.78
Feedback from the job		.08	-.00	-.26		-.09	-1.24**	-.54		.13	.13	.78
Dealing with others		.09	-.09	-.11		.02	.17	.13		.12	1.13**	.97
Surface acting EL		-.16	-.97*	-.03		.07	.38	-.52		.09	.92*	.26

Deep acting EL		-.07	-.35	-.1.49*		.28**	.81**	2.19***		.28	.08	1.12
SA x SV			.49	.36			-.88	-.88			.24	.32
SA x TI			.38	-.53			-.61	-.14			-.37	-.27
SA x TS			-.64	.00			-.67	.57			.83	1.02
SA x AUTO			.10	-.09			.62	.57			.59	.83
SA x FA			.88	-.01			-1.18*	-1.26			-.50	-.10
SA x FJ			.14	.46			1.58*	2.15**			-.01	.05
SA x DO			.29	.04			-.32	.04			-1.49**	-1.45**
DA x SV				.31				-.43				.65
DA x TI				1.19				-.62				.01
DA x TS				-.94				-.29				-.09
DA x AUTO				-.41				.65				-.20
DA x FA				1.57*				-.28				-.71
DA x FJ				.12				-1.45				-.89
DA x DO				.22				-.29				.17
Adjusted R^2	.008	.042	.054	.135	.009	.069	.168	.206	.032	.180	.216	.234
ΔR^2	.015	.096*	.049	.101**	.031	.106*	.125***	.060*	.054*	.186***	.064*	.041
F	.666	1.59	1.51	2.08	1.39	2.02	2.81	2.79	2.48	4.03	3.47	3.10
ΔF	.666	1.99*	1.32	3.47**	1.39	2.26*	3.83***	2.27*	2.48*	4.52***	2.09*	1.60

Note: * = $p < .05$, ** = $p < .01$, *** = $p < .001$. SV = skill variety, TI = task identity, TS = task significance, AUTO = autonomy, FA = feedback from agents, FJ = feedback from the job, DO = dealing with others, SA = surface acting emotional labour and DA = deep acting emotional labour.

The entry of the two-way interaction terms at step 3 revealed a significant two-way interactions between skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy, feedback from agents, feedback from the job, dealing with others and surface acting emotional($\Delta F^2 = 3.83$, $p < .001$), therefore hypothesis 3 was partly confirmed. Specifically, surface acting emotional labour negatively moderated the relationship between feedback from agents and continuance organizational commitment. This shows that surface acting weakened the relationship between feedback from agents and continuance commitment. And also surface acting emotional labour positively moderated the relationship between feedback from job and continuance organizational commitment. In this case, surface acting strengthened the relationship between feedback from job and continuance commitment. Furthermore, the entry of the two-way interaction terms between skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy, feedback from agents, feedback from the job, dealing with others and deep acting emotional labour in step 4 yielded no significant interaction ($\Delta F^2 = 2.27$, $p < .05$), thus, also partly not confirming hypothesis 3. This shows that deep acting did not moderate continuance commitment. From the third Moderated Hierarchical Multiple Regression in which normative commitment was the criterion variable, the control variables (gender, age, years of experience and marital status) entered in step 1 of the equation were able to explain 5.4% significant variance in normative commitment as a block ($\Delta R^2 = .054$, $p < .05$) and as individual variables only gender ($\beta = .15$, $p < .05$) and years of experience ($\beta = .21$, $p < .05$) contributed significantly and positively. In step 2, when skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy, feedback from agents, feedback from the job, dealing with others, surface acting emotion labour and deep acting emotional labour were entered as a block, they added 18.6% variance in normative commitment ($\Delta R^2 = 186$, $p < .001$), with only feedback from agents ($\beta = .18$, $p < .05$) contributing significantly and positively in predicting normative commitment, which also partly confirmed hypotheses 1 and 2. The entry of the two-way interaction terms at step 3 revealed a significant two-way interactions between skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy, feedback from agents, feedback from the job, dealing with others and surface acting emotional ($\Delta F^2 = 2.09$, $p < .05$), thereby partly confirming hypothesis 3. Specifically, surface acting emotional labour positively moderated the relationship between dealing with others and normative organizational commitment. Meaning that, surface acting emotional labour interacted with dealing with others and as such, made the relationship between dealing with others dimension of job characterists and normative commitment of teachers stronger. Furthermore, the entry of the two-way interaction terms between skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy, feedback from agents, feedback from the job, dealing with others and deep acting emotional labour in step 4 yielded an insignificant interaction, therefore, hypothesis 3 was partly not confirmed.

4. DISCUSSION

Contrary to the first hypothesis, findings have shown that none of the components of job characteristics (skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy, feedback from agents, feedback from the job and dealing with others) significantly predicted organizational affective and continuance components of organizational commitment, thus the first hypothesis was partly disconfirmed. In support of the first hypothesis, feedback from agents' component of job characteristics was found to positively predict normative organizational commitment, hence partly confirming the first hypothesis. It shows that as information received by the teachers about their job performance increased (feedback from agents), their obligation to remain with the organization (normative commitment) also increased. The present findings which indicate that feedback from agents positively predicted normative organizational commitment have given credence to previous findings (e.g. (Dunham, Grube, & Castañeda, 1994) which found job characteristics especially feedback to be positively associated with organizational commitment. This lends credence to the need to design teaching environment in a way which will make teachers have clear, specific and detailed knowledge of their results while doing the job in order enhance their obligation to remain with the organization. In partial confirmation of the second hypothesis, the findings indicate that surface acting emotional labour negatively predicted affective organizational commitment while deep acting positively

predicted continuance organizational commitment. Normative organizational commitment was not predicted by emotional labour. In the former, as the teachers experienced display of emotion that could involve both suppression of felt emotions and faking of unfelt emotions increased their perception of the emotional attachment or identification with the organization decreased and vice versa. Following this result, teachers should not be made to fake unfelt emotion in order to avoid reduced affective organizational commitment. This negative association between surface acting and affective commitment is in congruence with previous studies (e.g. (Ghalandari et al., 2012; Ye, 2016)) which found emotional labour to be significantly related to affective commitment. In the later, as the teachers created expected or required emotions within themselves (deep acting emotional labour) increased, their attachment to an organization based on their awareness of the costs associated with discontinuing membership (continuance organizational commitment) also increased. Considering this positive association, teachers should be allowed to display the required emotion in order to enhance their continuance organizational commitment. This positive association between deep acting and continuance commitment lends credence to assumptions that a positive relationship may exist between deep acting and organizational commitment.

In partial support of the third hypothesis, first, findings of the present study show that deep acting emotional labour positively moderated the relationship between feedback from agents and affective commitment. This positive moderation is an indication that as the teachers created expected or required emotions within themselves (deep acting emotional labour), it strengthened the relationship between information received by the teachers about their job performance (feedback from agents) and their perception of the emotional attachment or identification with the organization (affective commitment). Second, surface acting negatively moderated the relationship between feedback from agents and continuance commitment. This shows that display of unfelt emotion (surface acting) by the teachers weakened the association between information received by the teachers about their job performance (feedback from agents) and their awareness of the costs associated with discontinuing membership (continuance commitment). Moreover, surface acting positively moderated the relationship between feedback from job and continuance. This also demonstrates that display of unfelt emotion (surface acting) by the teachers strengthened the relationship between information received by the teachers about their job performance (feedback from job) and their awareness of the costs associated with discontinuing membership (continuance commitment). Surface acting also positively moderated the relationship between dealing with others and normative commitment. In addition, this indicates that display of unfelt emotion (surface acting) by the teachers strengthened the relationship between dealing with others and obligation to remain with the organization (normative commitment).

5. IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY

These moderating roles of emotional labour in the present study as shown in the present study have made theoretical and practical contributions to existing literature. First, the findings have to a certain degree given credence to the contributions of job characteristics theory (Richard & Oldham, 1976) three-component theory (Meyer & Allen, 1990) and affective events theory (Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996) to the understanding of the relationship between job characteristics, emotional labour and organizational commitment of teachers.

Second, practically, in line with these theories, designing the teaching environment to increase the information received by the teachers about their job performance (feedback from agents) will enhance their obligation to remain with the organization (normative commitment). Policies in teaching environment should not make teachers to fake unfelt emotion (surface acting) in order to avoid reduced affective organizational commitment. In the same vein, creating conditions which allow teachers display felt emotions (deep acting) will associate with enhanced continuance commitment. The positive moderation of the relationship between feedback from agents and affective commitment by deep acting emotional labour suggest that teachers should be allowed to display their felt emotion in order to strengthen their emotional attachment to the organization through giving them appropriate information regarding their performance outcome. Moreover, teachers could be allowed to fake their emotion when dealing with

others in order to strengthen their normative commitment because surface acting positively moderated the relationship between dealing with others and normative commitment. In contrast, teachers should not be allowed to fake unfelt emotion in order avoid reduced continuance commitment through provision of information regarding their performance outcome since surface acting negatively moderated the relationship between feedback from agents and continuance commitment.

6. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

Although the present study has made relevant theoretical and practical contributions, it has some limitations. First, since the sample size represented only teachers from six secondary schools within Enugu urban which is located in Eastern Nigeria, the external validity of the findings is limited; hence the generalization should be done with caution. To this end, future studies in this area should cover teachers in the other states of Nigeria in order to ensure geographical spread. The use of cross-sectional survey and self report could not allow cause-effect relationship. Longitudinal studies and experimentation are likely to provide better data and more robust findings.

7. CONCLUSION

Job characteristics especially feedback from agents positively predicted normative commitment, hence the need for Nigerian Union of Teachers, Ministry of Education and other organizations saddled with the responsibility of managing human resources to make policies that will provide adequate information to teachers about their job performance (feedback from agents) in order to enhance their obligation to remain with the organization (normative commitment). Considering the moderating roles of emotional labour, these policies should also allow teachers express their emotions as felt in order enhance organizational commitment in the light of job characteristics.

REFERENCES

Adeyinka, T., Ayeni, C., & Popoola, S. (2007). Work motivation, job satisfaction and organizational commitment of library personnel in academic and research libraries in Oyo state, Nigeria. *Library Philosophy and Practice, 9*(2), 1-6.

Al-Tit, A. A., & Suifan, T. S. (2015). The mediating role of job characteristics in the relationship between organizational commitment and job satisfaction. *International Journal of Business and Management, 10*(9), 215-222.

Alarape, A., & Akinlabi, F. (2000). Influence of perceived organizational support and discretionary treatment on work attitude of industrial workers. *African Journal for the Psychological Study of Social Issues, 5*(1), 23-36.

Alexander, N. A., Rani, T. B., & Wendy, H. A. (2010). The impact of employee perceptions of training on organizational commitment and turnover intentions: A study of multinationals in the Chinese service sector. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 22*(1), 1765-1787.

Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1996). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: An examination of construct validity. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 49*(3), 252-276.

Amiri, H., Mirhashemi, M., & Parsamoein, K. (2013). The prediction of employees' organizational commitment based on their perception of job characteristics and job roles. *Journal of Behavioral Sciences in Asia, 1*(2), 50-63.

Anomneze, E. A., Ugwu, D. I., Enwereuzor, I. K., & Ugwu, L. I. (2016). Teachers' emotional labour and burnout: Does perceived organizational support matter. *Asian Social Science, 12*(2), 9-22. Available at: https://doi.org/10.5539/ass.v12n2p9.

Arfat, A., & Riyaz, A. R. (2013). Exploring a common theme of organizational commitment: A way to consensus. *Pacific Business Review International, 6*(1), 65-71.

Ashkanasy, N. M. (2002). Studies of cognition and emotion in organisations: Attribution, affective events, emotional intelligence and perception of emotion. *Australian Journal of Management, 27*(1_suppl), 11-20. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/031289620202701s02.

Bhuian, S. N., Al-Shammari , E. S., & Jefri, O. A. (1996). Organization commitment, job satisfaction and job characteristics: An empirical study of expatriates in Saudi Arabia. *International Journal of Commerce & Management, 6*(3), 57-80.

Bhuian, S. N., & Mengue, B. (2002). An extension and evaluation of job characteristics, organizational commitment and job satisfaction in an expatriate, guest worker, sales setting. *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management, 22*(1), 1-11.

Bono, J. E., Foldes, H. J., Vinson, G., & Muros, J. P. (2007). Workplace emotions: The role of supervision and leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*(5), 1357-1367.

Bowen, D. E., Siehl, C., & Schneider, B. (1989). A framework for analyzing customer service orientations in manufacturing. *Academy of Management Review, 14*(1), 75-95. Available at: https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1989.4279005.

Brotheridge, C. M. (2006). The role of emotional intelligence and other individual difference variables in predicting emotional labor relative to situational demands. *Psicothema, 18*(1), 139-144.

Buchko, A. A., Weinzimmer, L. G., & Sergeyev, A. V. (1998). Effects of cultural context on the antecedents, correlates, and consequences of organizational commitment: A study of Russian workers. *Journal of Business Research, 43*(3), 109-116.

Ching-Sheue, F. U. (2015). The effect of emotional labour on job involvement in preschool teachers: Verifying the mediating effect of psychological capital. *Journal of Educational Technology, 14*(3), 145-156.

Chiu, S.-F., & Chen, H.-L. (2005). Relationship between job characteristics and organizational citizenship behavior: The mediational role of job satisfaction. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal, 33*(6), 523-540. Available at: https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.2005.33.6.523.

Chiu, H., & Ko, C. (2016). *Study on correlation between organizational commitment and emotional labor of Spa technicians.* Paper presented at the Proceedings of 10th IASTEM International Conference, Singapore, 23rd January 2016.

Cho, Y.-N., Rutherford, B. N., & Park, J. (2013). Emotional labor's impact in a retail environment. *Journal of Business Research, 66*(11), 2338-2345.

Cole, M. S., Walter, F., & Bruch, H. (2008). Affective mechanisms linking dysfunctional behavior to performance in work teams: A moderated mediation study. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 93*(5), 945-958. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.93.5.945.

Cukur, C. S. (2009). The development of the teacher emotional labor scale (TELS): Validity and reliability. *Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice, 9*(2), 559-574.

Dunham, R., Grube, J., & Castañeda, M. (1994). Organizational commitment: The utility of an integrative definition. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 79*(3), 370-380.

Ebeh, R. E., Uhiara, A. C., Agbor, N., & Nwankwo, B. E. (2015). Demographic and organizational antecedents of commitment among SME employees in Imo State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Science and Research, 4*(6), 1214 - 1223.

Faraji, O., Ramazani, A., Hedaiati, P., Aliabadi, A., Elhamirad, S., & Valiee, S. (2015). Relationship between job characteristics and rganizational commitment: A descriptive analytical study. *Iranian Red Crescent Medical Journal, 17*(11), e19815-e19815.

Feather, N. T., & Rauter, K. A. (2004). Organizational citizenship behaviours in relation to job status, job insecurity, organizational commitment and identification, job satisfaction and work values. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 77*(1), 81-94.

Flynn, D. M., & Tannenbaum, S. I. (1993). Correlates of organizational commitment: Differences in the public and private sector. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 8*(1), 103-116. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1007/bf02230396.

Gautam, T., Van Dick, R., & Wagner, U. (2004). Organizational identification and organizational commitment: Distinct aspects of two related concepts. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology, 7*(3), 301-315.

Gbadamosi, G. (2006). Predictors and correlates of Charlatan behavior in a non-western context. *Journal of Global Business and Technology, 2*(1), 23-32.

Ghalandari, K., Jogh, M. G. G., Imani, M., & Nia, L. B. (2012). The effect of emotional labor strategies on employees job performance and organizational commitment in hospital sector: Moderating role of emotional intelligence in Iran. *World Applied Sciences Journal, 17*(3), 319-326.

Glomb, T. M., & Tews, M. J. (2004). Emotional labor: A conceptualization and scale development. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 64*(1), 1-23. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/s0001-8791(03)00038-1.

Gomez-Mejia, L. R., Balkin, D. B., & Cardy, R. L. (2007). *Managing human resources* (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education International.

Greenberger, D. B., & Strasser, S. (1986). Development and application of a model of personal control in organizations. *Academy of Management Review, 11*(1), 164-177. Available at: https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1986.4282657.

Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1975). Development of the job diagnostic survey. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 60*(2), 159-170.

Hackman, J. R., & Lawler, E. E. (1971). Employee reactions to job characteristics. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 55*(3), 259 - 286.

Hadi, R., & Adil, A. (2010). Job characteristics as predictors of work motivation and job satisfaction of bank employees. *Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology, 36*(2), 294-299.

Hennig-Thurau, T., Groth, M., Paul, M., & Gremler, D. D. (2006). Are all smiles created equal? How emotional contagion and emotional labor affect service relationships. *Journal of Marketing, 70*(3), 58-73.

Herscovitch, L., & Meyer, J. P. (2002). Commitment to organizational change: Extension of a three-component model. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(3), 474-487.

Hochschild, A. R. (1979). Emotion work, feeling rules, and social structure. *American Journal of Sociology, 85*(3), 551-575. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1086/227049.

Hochschild, A. R. (1983). *The managed heart*. Berkeley & Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.

Jandaghi, G., Borghei, R., Matin, H. Z., & Dastani, N. (2010). An examination of the relationship between empowerment and organizational commitment. *Journal of Human Sciences, 7*(2), 1155-1172.

Kang, X.-L., & Liu, L. (2018). Discussion of the relationship between perceived job characteristics and organizational commitment of university PE teachers-from the aspect of job stress. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Mathematics, 21*(2), 317-327.

Kumari, P., & Priya, B. (2017). Organizational commitment: A comparative study of public and private sector bank managers. *International Journal of Business and Management Invention, 6*(1), 38-47.

Kwon, I. G., & Banks, D. W. (2004). Factors related to organizational and professional commitment of internal auditors. *Managerial Auditing Journal, 19*(5), 606-622. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1108/02686900410537748.

Lapointe, E., Morin, A. J., Courcy, F., Boilard, A., & Payette, D. (2012). Workplace affective commitment, emotional labour strategies and burnout: A multiple mediator model. *The International Journal of Business and Management, 7*(1), 3-21.

Lawler, E. E. (1992). *Pay and organizational effectiveness. A psychological review*. New York: McGraw Hill.

Martins, H., & Nicholls, L. (1999). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment in relation to work performance and turnover intentions. *Human Relations, 42*(1), 625-638.

Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1997). *Commitment in the workplace*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Meyer, J. P., Allen, N. J., & 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., & Allen, N. J. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology, 63*(1), 1-18. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8325.1990.tb00506.x.

Morris, M. G., & Venkatesh, V. (2010). Job characteristics and job satisfaction: Understanding the role of enterprise resource. *MIS Quarterly, 34*(1), 143-161. Available at: https://doi.org/10.2307/20721418.

Morris, J. A., & Feldman, D. C. (1996). The dimensions, antecedents, and consequences of emotional labor. *Academy of Management Review, 21*(4), 986-1010. Available at: https://doi.org/10.2307/259161.

Mottaz, C. J. (1988). Determinants of organizational commitment. *Human Relations, 41*(6), 467-482.

Mowday, R. T., Porter, L. W., & Steers, R. M. (1982). *Employee-organization linkages the psychology of commitment, absenteeism, and turnover*. London, UK: Academic Press Inc.

Mullins, L. T. (1993). *Management and organizational behaviour* (5th ed.). London: Financial Times Management.

Na-Nan, K., & Pukkeeree, P. (2013). Influence of job characteristics and job satisfaction effect work adjustment for entering labor market of new graduates in Thailand. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, *4*(2), 95-103.

Obi-Nwosu, H., Chiamaka, J., & Tochukwu, O. (2013). Job characteristics as predictors of organizational commitment among private sector workers in Anambra State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Asian Social Science*, *3*(2), 482-491.

Obodo, P. A., Okonkwo, E. A., & Aboh, U. J. (2019). Job characteristics and job satisfaction among police officers in Enugu urban. *Practicum Psychologia*, *9*(1), 139-157.

Okonkwo, E. A., Obodo, P. I., & Aboh, U. J. (2019). Contributions of job characteristics in organizational commitment of police officers in Enugu Urban, Nigeria. *Nigerian Journal of Psychological Research*, *15*(1), 57-61.

Oliver, J., Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & De Jong, R. D. (2005). Projection of own on others' job characteristics: Evidence for the false consensus effect in job characteristics information. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, *13*(1), 63-74.

Olugbile, O. (1996). *Nigeria at work: A survey of the psychology of work among Nigeria guarantee trust bank Plc Lagos*. Lagos: University of Lagos.

Omoluabi, P. F. (2000). *Validation of job characteristics scale in Nigeria*. Lagos: PPC Consultants.

Ozturk, A. B., Hancer, M., & Im, J. Y. (2014). Job characteristics, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment for hotel workers in Turkey. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, *23*(3), 294-313.

Redmond, B. F. (2010). Self-efficacy theory: Do i think i can succeed in my work? Work attitudes & motivations. *Journal of Information & Knowledge Management*, *6*(1), 36-42.

Richard, H. J., & Oldham, G. (1976). Motivation through the design of work: Test of a theory. *Organizational Behavior & Human Performance*, *16*(2), 250-279.

Sadler-Smith, E., El-Kot, G., & Leat, M. (2003). Differentiating work autonomy facets in a non-Western context. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *24*(6), 709-731. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1002/job.200.

Salami, S. O. (2008). Demographic and psychological factors predicting organizational commitment among industrial workers. *The Anthropologist*, *10*(1), 31-38. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/09720073.2008.11891026.

Sneed, J., & Herman, C. (1990). Influence of job characteristics and organizational commitment on job satisfaction of hospital foodservice employees. *Journal of the American Dietetic Association*, *90*(8), 1072-1076.

Taghavi, S., & Gholami, A. (2015). The effect of job characteristics on organizational commitment of oil industry employees (Case Study: Employees of Offshore Oil Company in Lavan Island). *International Journal of Reviews in Life Sciences*, *5*(10), 1119-1126.

Ujoatuonu, I. V. N., Apex-Apeh, C. O., & Onu, A. U. (2016). Team psychological safety, spirit at work and organizational commitment among personnel of Enugu electricity distribution company. *Nigerian Journal of Psychological Research*, *12*(1), 21-25.

Walter, F., & Bruch, H. (2009). An affective events model of charismatic leadership behavior: A review, theoretical integration, and research agenda. *Journal of Management*, *35*(6), 1428-1452. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206309342468.

Weiss, H. M., & Cropanzano, R. (1996). Affective events theory: A theoretical discussion of the structure, causes and consequences of affective experiences at work. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, *18*(1), 1–74.

Ye, T. (2016). *Relationship between emotional labour, leader member social exchange, and affective commitment. An empirical study of clinicians in hospitals in China*. Project Submitted as Partial Requirement for the Conferral of Master of Science in Business Administration.

Zannad, H., & Rouet, V. (2003). *Organizational commitment in innovative companies*. Paper presented at the 12th Conference of the International Association of Strategic Management.