

## Work Engagement, Organizational Commitment, Self Efficacy and Organizational Growth : A Literature Review

Ogechi Lily Agu

Samuel Adegboyega University, Ogwa, Nigeria

### Abstract

Employers recognize that business success depends on the human capital that drives and Supports company objectives. Work engagement, organizational commitment and self-efficacy will create a positive attitude in records management personnel in organizations. The literature gathered shows that employees and organizational commitment could have strong relationship with self-efficacy. When an employee is engaged actively in his work, there is work commitment and organizational commitment leading to self –efficacy. In order to enhance employees work engagement, knowledge and commitment, the organization can take proactive measures such as provide effective training, counseling, effective communication and leadership skills. This study therefore looks at work engagement, organizational commitment and self-efficacy , a tool for organizational development.

**Keywords:** Work engagement, organizational commitment, self-efficacy, employees

## Introduction

Many organizations are facing major challenges resulting in restructuring, reengineering and downsizing. Most organizations in Nigeria have experienced and are experiencing restructuring, reengineering, and downsizing which creates a sense of job insecurity among workers. Organizations need committed workers in order to face the worldwide economic competition. The need for factors that predict organizational commitment has become more critical. One of the factors that could lead to healthy organizational climate, increased morale, motivation and productivity is organizational commitment.

In 1990, William Kahn, a researcher and professor at the Boston University School of Management, defined the concept of work engagement as “the harnessing of organizational members’ selves to their work roles.” (Kahn, 1990). The concept was later expanded to describe when employees feel positive emotions toward their work, find their work to be personally meaningful, consider their workload to be manageable, and have hope about the future of their work (Macey, 2008).

Organizational commitment has emerged as a promising area of research with the study of industrial/organizational psychology in recent time (Adebayo, 2006; Meyer and Allen, 1997; Morrow, 1993). As regards organizational commitment of Nigerian workers, there is divergence of opinions among researchers. Some researchers believed that Nigerian workers are not committed to their organizations (Olugbile, 1996). Others believed that they are committed to organizational goals but it is the organizations that do not show commitment to the plight of the workers (Alarape & Akinlabi, 2000). They believe that organizational commitment reflects one side of the reciprocal relationship between the employer and the employee and as such each party has to play its role.

Unfortunately, there has been lack of research efforts in linking personal and psychological

characteristics of workers to organizational commitment. Instead, most research efforts had been focused on linking situational factors such as job characteristics and organizational characteristics to organizational commitment (Mowday, Porter & Steers 1982). Indeed some researchers found that organizational commitment is a function of several variables such as job satisfaction, motivation, participative decision making, organizational support, financial reward, communication, promotion prospects, and leadership styles (Alarape & Akinlabi, 2000; Brown, 2003; Salami & Omole, 2005).

Organizational commitment is defined as an employee’s level of identification and involvement in the organization (Mullins, 1999). Meyer and Allen (1997) defined organizational commitment as a psychological state that characterizes employee’s relationship with the organization with its implications for the decision to continue membership in the organization. According to Meyer and Allen’s (1997) three-component model of commitment, there are three “mind sets” which each characterizes an employee’s commitment to the organization: affective, continuance and normative commitment. Affective commitment refers to employees’ perception of the emotional attachment or identification with the organization. Continuance commitment refers to employees’ perception of the cost of leaving the organization to another place. Normative commitment is the employees’ perception of their normal obligation to the organization.

Mowday, Porter and Steers (1982) saw organizational commitment as a 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. Mowday et al. (1979) suggested that employees who exhibit high organizational commitment are happier at their work, spend less time away from their jobs and are less likely to leave the organization. Demographic factors such as age, gender, marital status, education level and work experience have

been found to be significantly related to organizational commitment (Dodd-McCue and Wright, 1996; Mannheim et al., 1997; Morrow, 1993; Wiedmer, 2006). Santos and Not-Land (2006) found significant relationship between job tenure and organizational commitment. However, Wiedmer (2006) found that education level and age were not significant predictors of job satisfaction and organizational involvement. Job satisfaction is defined as a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experience. It is a result of employee's perception of how well their job provides those things that are viewed as important (Luthan, 1998). A number of previous researchers have reported mixed findings on the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment. For instance, Curry, Wakefield, Price and Mueller (1986) found no significant relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment.

However, other researchers (Busch et al., 1998; Chiu-Yueh, 2000; Feinstein & Vondraek, 2006; Freund, 2005) found that job satisfaction was a significant predictor of organizational commitment. Some researchers (Mannheim et al., 1997) argued that job satisfaction reflects immediate affective reactions to the job while commitment to the organization develops more slowly after the individual forms more comprehensive valuations of the employing organization, its values, and expectations and one's own future in it. Therefore, job satisfaction is seen as one of the determinants of organizational commitment (Mannheim et al., 1997). It is thus expected that highly satisfied workers will be more committed to the organization. Achievement motivation is the desire to perform in terms of a standard of excellence or to be successful in competitive situations. Persons who have high need for achievement assume personal responsibility for the solution of tasks or problems, set moderately difficult goals, take calculated risks, and have strong desire for feedback on their performance as indexed by compensation (Lawson & Shen, 1998). Previous researchers

found significant relationship between need for achievement and organizational commitment (Dodd-McCue & Wright, 1996; Mannheim et al., 1997). Most researchers agree that motivation is important in work organizations; and that individual employees attempt to satisfy many needs through their work and through their relationship with an organization (Li, 2006). Hence employees with high need for achievement will likely be more committed to their organizations.

Research findings have indicated that Work engagement, organizational commitment and self-efficacy will create a positive attitude in any organizations. The literature gathered shows that employees and organizational commitment could have strong relationship with self-efficacy. When an employee is engaged actively in his work, there is work commitment and organizational commitment and this will lead to self-efficacy. The implications of Work engagement, organizational commitment and self-efficacy of organizational members toward their attitude to work are the main problems this paper will unravel.

### **Objectives of the study**

The objectives of this study are :

- a. To find out whether Work engagement, organizational commitment and self-efficacy are factors to be considered in achieving greater goals in organizations
- b. To find out if organisational commitment could lead to healthy organizational climate, increased morale, motivation and productivity in organization
- c. To ascertain the implications of work engagement, organizational commitment and self-efficacy on the behavior of organizational members
- d. To find out how organization can effectively affect the work commitment of its members

## Literature Review

### Work Engagement

Modern organizations need energetic and dedicated employees: people who are engaged with their work. These organizations expect proactivity, initiative and responsibility for personal development from their employees (Bakker, 2010). Engaged employees are fully involved in, and enthusiastic about their work. Kahn (1990) was the first scholar to define "personal engagement" as the "...harnessing of organization member's selves to their work roles: in engagement, people employ and express themselves physically, cognitively, emotionally and mentally during role performances" (p. 694).

### Employee engagement

Employee engagement, also called worker engagement, is a business management concept. An "engaged employee" is one who is fully involved in, and enthusiastic about their work, and thus will act in a way that furthers their organization's interests.

Employee Engagement is the extent to which employee commitment, both emotional and intellectual, exists relative to accomplishing the work, mission, and vision of the organization. Engagement can be seen as a heightened level of ownership where each employee wants to do whatever they can for the benefit of their internal and external customers, and for the success of the organization as a whole. Employee engagement was described in the academic literature by Schmidt et al. (1993) as a modernized version of job satisfaction, Schmidt et al.'s influential definition of engagement was "an employee's involvement with, commitment to, and satisfaction with work. Employee engagement is a part of employee retention." This integrates the classic constructs of job satisfaction (Smith et al., 1969), and organizational commitment (Meyer & Allen, 1991). Harter and Schmidt's (2003) most recent meta-analysis can be useful for understanding the impact of engagement. Employee engagement is

derived from studies of morale or a group's willingness to accomplish organizational objectives which began in the 1920s.

In the postwar mass production society that required unity of effort in execution, (group) morale scores were used as predictors of speed, quality and militancy. With the advent of the knowledge worker and emphasis on individual talent management (stars), a term was needed to describe an individual's emotional attachment to the organization, fellow associates and the job. Thus the birth of the term "employee engagement" which is an individual emotional phenomenon whereas morale is a group emotional phenomenon of similar characteristics. In other words, employee engagement is the raw material of morale composed of 15 intrinsic and extrinsic attitudinal drivers (Scarlett Surveys, 2001). Engaged employees care about the future of the company and are willing to invest discretionary effort (Seijts, 2006). Engaged employees feel a strong emotional bond to the organization that employs them (Robinson), which results in higher retention levels and productivity levels and lower absenteeism. When reliably measured, positive employee engagement can be causally related or correlated to specific positive business outcomes by workgroup and job type. Scarlett Surveys (2001) refers to these statistical relationships as engagement economics.

Nowadays, there are two different schools of thought with regard to the definition of work engagement. On the one hand Maslach and Leiter (Maslach, 1997) assume that a continuum exists with burnout and engagement as two opposite poles. The second school of thought operationalizes engagement in its own right as the positive antithesis of burnout (Bakker, 2007). According to this approach, work engagement is defined as a positive, fulfilling, work-related state of mind that is characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption (Schaufeli, 2002). Vigor is characterized by high levels of energy and mental resilience while working, the willingness to invest effort in one's work, and persistence even in the

face of difficulties; dedication by being strongly involved in one's work, and experiencing a sense of significance, enthusiasm, inspiration, pride, and challenge; and absorption by being fully concentrated and happily engrossed in one's work, whereby time passes quickly and one has difficulties with detaching oneself from work (Schaufeli,2002).

### **Work engagement as a unique concept**

Work engagement as measured by the UWES is positively related with, but can nevertheless be differentiated from, similar constructs such as job involvement and organizational commitment (Hallberg,2006), in-role and extra-role behavior (Schaufeli, 2006); personal initiative (Salanova 2008),(Hallberg,2007), and workaholism (Schaufeli,2006). Moreover, engaged workers are characterized by low levels of burnout (González-Roma, 2006), as well as by low levels of neuroticism and high levels of extraversion (Langelaan,2006 ). Also they enjoy good mental and physical health (Schaufeli, 2008).Most recently, Christian, Garza, and Slaughter (2011) meta-analyzed over 90 engagement research studies. They found that engagement is distinct from job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and job involvement (Christian, 2011).

### **Main drivers of Work Engagement**

Research has identified two key sets of variables that drive work engagement:

- **Job Resources:** Work engagement is found to be positively associated with job resources such as social support from co-workers and from one's superior, performance feedback, coaching, job control, task variety, opportunities for learning and development, and training facilities. These resources are helpful in reducing the impact of job demands on strain, but they are also useful in the achievement of work goals, and they stimulate learning, personal growth and development. One consistent finding is that the motivational potential of job resources is

particularly salient in the face of high job demands (Bakker, 2008).

- **Personal Resources:** personal resources, such as optimism, self-efficacy and resilience are functional in controlling the environment and exerting impact on it in a successful way. Furthermore, engaged employees have several personal characteristics that differentiate them from less engaged employees. Examples are extraversion, conscientiousness and emotional stability. Psychological capital (Bakker, 2010) also seems to be related to work engagement.

### **Engagement and performance**

Engagement is related to better performance. Salanova, Agut and Peiró (2005), Salanova, (2005) found a positive relationship between organization resources, work engagement and performance among employees, working in Spanish restaurants and hotels. There are several possible reasons why engaged employees show higher performance than non-engaged employees (Bakker,2009):

- 1) They often experience positive emotions;
- 2) They experience better health;
- 3) They create their own job and personal resources;
- 4) They transfer their engagement to others (cross-over).

### **The downside of work engagement**

There is also a possibility of becoming 'over-engaged'. For example, it can distort the work-life balance when employees take work home (Geurts ,2003). Over-engagement may also lead to workaholism (Halbesleben 2009).

### **Organizational Commitment**

Organizational commitment has an important place in the study of organizational behavior. This is in part due to the vast number of works that have found relationships between organizational commitment and attitudes and

behaviors in the workplace (Porter et al., 1974, 1976; Koch & Steers, 1978; Angle & Perry, 1981). Furthermore, Batemen and Strasser (1984) states that the reasons for studying organizational commitment are related to “(a) employee behaviors and performance effectiveness, (b) attitudinal, affective, and cognitive constructs such as job satisfaction, (c) characteristics of the employee’s job and role, such as responsibility and (d) personal characteristics of the employee such as age, job tenure” (p. 95-96).

Organizational commitment has been studied in the public, private, and non-profit sector, and more recently internationally. Early research focused on defining the concept and current research continues to examine organizational commitment through two popular approaches, commitment-related attitudes and commitment-related behaviors. A variety of antecedents and outcomes have been identified in the past thirty years (Angle & Perry, 1981; Mowday et al, 1979; Hall, 1977). Multiple definitions of organizational commitment are found in the literature. Bateman and Strasser state that organizational commitment has been operationally defined as “multidimensional in nature, involving an employee’s loyalty to the organization, willingness to exert effort on behalf of the organization, degree of goal and value congruency with the organization, and desire to maintain membership” (p.95). Mowday, Porter and Steers (1979) defined organizational commitments "the relative strength of an individual's identification with and involvement in a particular organization. It can be characterized by three factors;

- (a) a strong belief in and acceptance of organization's goals and values,
- (b) a willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization, and
- (c) a strong desire to maintain membership in the organization.

Porter et al.'s (1974, pg 4) definition of commitment is: strength of an individual’s

identification with and involvement in a particular organization. It has developed an instrument to measure organizational commitment and the instrument has been used extensively by other researchers. Mowday, Steers, and Porter (1979) identified commitment-related attitudes and commitment-related behaviors. Sheldon (1971) defines commitments as being a positive evaluation of the organization and the organizations goals. According to Buchanan (1974) most scholars define commitment as being a bond between an individual (the employee) and the organization (the employer).

Meyer and Allen (1991) and Dunham et al (1994) identified three types of commitment; affective commitment, continuance commitment, and normative commitment. Normative commitment is a relatively new aspect of organizational commitment having been defined by Bolon in 1993. Affective commitment is defined as the emotional attachment, identification, and involvement that an employee has with its organization and goals (Mowday et al, 1997, Meyer & Allen, 1993; O’Reily & Chatman). Porter et al (1974) further characterize affective commitment by three factors (1) “belief in and acceptance of the organization’s goals and values, (2) a willingness to focus effort on helping the organization achieve its goals, and (3) a desire to maintain organizational membership”. According to Meyer and Allen (1997), some employees exhibit a strong belief and acceptance of new organization's goals and values. This group of employees also has a strong desire to maintain membership. This form of commitment is called organization affective commitment. Mowday et al (1979) further state that affective communication is “when the employee identifies with a particular organization and its goals in order to maintain membership to facilitate the goal” (p.225). Meyer and Allen (1997) continue to say that employees retain membership out of choice and this is their commitment to the organization.

The second commitment is called normative commitment (Wiener, 1980). According to Wiener, this group of employees does not develop a strong emotional attachment to the organization. However, employees who possess high levels of this commitment continue to work productively as a result of cultural and organizational ethics that direct their behavior. Normative commitment (Bolon, 1993) is the commitment that a person believes that they have to the organization or their feeling of obligation to their workplace. In 1982, Weiner discusses normative commitment as being a “generalized value of loyalty and duty”. Meyer and Allen (1991) supported this type of commitment prior to Bolon’s definition, with their definition of normative commitment being “a feeling of obligation”. It is argued that normative commitment is only natural due to the way we are raised in society. Normative commitment can be explained by other commitments such as marriage, family, religion, etc. therefore when it comes to one’s commitment to their place of employment they often feel like they have a moral obligation to the organization (Wiener, 1982).

Continuance commitment is the willingness to remain in an organization because of the investment that the employee has with “nontransferable” investments. Nontransferable investments include things such as retirement, relationships with other employees, or things that are special to the organization (Reichers, 1985). Continuance commitment also includes factors such as years of employment or benefits that the employee may receive that are unique to the organization (Reichers, 1985). Meyer and Allen (1997) further explain that employees who share continuance commitment with their employer often make it very difficult for an employee to leave the organization.

Meyer, Allen, and Smith (1993) says that the three types of commitment are a psychological state “that either characterizes the employee’s relationship with the organization or has the implications to affect

whether the employee will continue with the organization”. Meyer et al (1993) continue to say that generally the research shows that those employees with a strong affective commitment will remain with an organization because they want to, those with a strong continuance commitment remain because they have to, and those with a normative commitment remain because they feel that they have to. Meyer and Allen (1997) define a committed employee as being one “stays with an organization, attends work regularly, puts in a full day and more, protects corporate assets, and believes in the organizational goals”. This employee positively contributes to the organization because of its commitment to the organization. Organizational commitment refers to the attachment, emotionally and functionally, to one’s place of work and can be examined in several ways. Organizational commitment focuses on a bond linking individuals to the organization (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990).

What is organizational commitment, why should managers want it in their workforce, and is there any cost-effective way to secure it? The concept of organizational commitment has attracted considerable attention over recent years and has become a central objective of human resource management. As Guest, (1987) indicated, HRM policies are designed to “maximize organizational integration, employee commitment, flexibility and quality of work” For the topic in question our focal interest refers to “Commitment” which can be described as attachment and loyalty. Individuals can display this attachment and loyalty at a variety of levels: their job, profession, department, boss or organization. Realistically then, commitment may therefore be diverse and divided between any of these. More specifically, organizational commitment has been defined by Mowday (1992) as consisting of three components: “identification with the goal’s and values of the organization, a desire to belong to the organization and a willingness to display effort on behalf of the organization.” Therefore, organizational commitment is another key construct in explaining the

dynamics each staff in the organization. Organizational commitment has been studied extensively during the past three decades. Studies have found strong positive relationships between organizational commitment and desirable outcomes such as performance, adaptability and job satisfaction (Angle & Perry, 1985). Some studies have also found negative relationships between organizational commitment and potentially costly work outcomes such as absenteeism and turnover and it is reported that organizational commitment to be a better predictor of turnover than job satisfaction (Angle & Perry, 1985).

Organizational Commitment is highly valuable. Studies have highlighted that commitment has a great impact on the successful performance of an organization. This is because a highly committed employee will identify with the goals and values of the organization, has a stronger desire to belong to the organization and is willing to display greater organizational citizenship behavior i.e., a willingness to go over and beyond their required job duties. And if human resources are said to be an organization's greatest assets, then committed human resources should be regarded as an organization's competitive advantage. In fact, vast numbers of studies have found positive relationships between organizational commitment and employee behaviors such as a greater effort exerted by the employee in performing tasks, higher employee retention, better work attendance, increased willingness to engage in citizenship behavior and higher delivery of service quality. In essence, this shows an all-round higher employee performance effectiveness. Moreover, in today's fast paced and dynamic business environment, organizations can no longer guarantee "a job for life" which has made the notion of organizational commitment even more pertinent. It is therefore in the organization's best interest to elicit this kind of behavior.

Organizational commitment concerns the extent to which an organizational member is loyal and willing to contribute to the

organization. The sense of cohesion among members in the organization is the key to organizational effectiveness. Only when organizational members have a sense of belonging with organizational mission, goals, and values will they contribute all efforts to their work and the organization (Jaskyte & Lee, 2009; Sinclair et al., 2005). Salancik (1977) considered that organizational commitment was the behavior of an individual expressed in correspondence to his/her reliance on a specific organization. To some scholars, organizational commitment can explain individual and organizational behaviors (Becker et al., 1996). It is also believed that organizational commitment can effectively predict the resignation of employees (Porter et al., 1974). In light of its significance, organizational commitment has been explored as a hot issue in the literature of organizational management. Meyer et al. (1990) summed up the conceptualizations of organizational commitment into two mainstreams. One is the viewpoint proposed by Becker in 1960 that organizational commitment is a mechanism for employees to desire to stay and work in the organization. The other is the idea presented by Porter and other scholars in 1974 that organizational commitment concerns the individual's organizational identification and involvement.

Porter et al. (1974) regarded organizational commitment as a kind of attitudinal inclination toward the organization, which can be characterized into three types:

- (1) Value commitment containing a strong belief in and acceptance of organizational goals and values;
- (2) Retention commitment with a strong desire to remain a part of the organization; and
- (3) Effort commitment with a willingness to contribute more efforts to the interests of the organization.

While there are multiple schools and scholars of organizational commitment, their



ultimate goals to find out the ways in which employees identify with the organization and desire to commit to the organization. A number of scales of organizational commitment have been developed from various definitions of organizational commitment. Porter et al. (1974) applied the theory of individual and organization goal congruence to the development of Organizational Commitment. With regard to the relationship of self-efficacy and organizational commitment, little research has been found in the current scientific literature of organizational management. In terms of value commitment, Jawahar et al. (2008) noted from their study that self-efficacy can effectively predict task performance and significantly help to achieve organizational goals. Therefore, this study presumed that an employee with higher self-efficacy is more likely to accept organizational goals and values.

### **Self Efficacy in Organizations**

The concept of self-efficacy was first proposed by Bandura in 1977. It refers to one's perceived capabilities to execute the courses of action, with emphasis placed on performing skills rather than possessing skills, to achieve a given mission (Bandura, 1986). Hellervik et al. (1992) also noted that to effectively achieve a mission one must make better use of various kinds of skills and possess a belief of self-efficacy. It is because that success often results from continuous trials. Especially in a changeable, self-doubters are apt to suffer setbacks and give up, while self-confident people are more likely to keep at it and succeed. Hence, it is arguable that the interaction between an individual and the environment will be partially influenced by perceived self-efficacy. As proposed by Bandura (1986), a personal belief of self-efficacy may influence one's behavior, way of thinking and emotional reactions in a difficult situation.

Self-efficacy is a useful concept for explaining human behavior as research reveals that it plays an influential role in determining an individual's choice, level of

effort, and perseverance (Chen et al., 2004). According to Bandura (1997), self-efficacy can be developed and enhanced from four major sources: enactive mastery experience, vicarious experience, verbal persuasion, and psychological and affective states. Reasonable and accurate estimate of self-efficacy is quite important to an individual in pursuit of success. An individual who fails to achieve a given mission due to overestimated self-efficacy will be situated in a predicament, lose self-confidence and suffer unnecessary setbacks. In contrast, an individual who underestimates self-efficacy is likely to limit the development of personal capabilities and potentials, and lose plenty of opportunities.

According to Bandura (1986), the optimal self-efficacy Perception is the one that surpasses slightly the scope of one's capabilities. Such perception will prepare an individual with the willingness and abilities to take challenges and the motivation to develop and advance personally. Based on the definition of self-efficacy by Bandura (1986) and the scales of self-efficacy developed by Bandura(1997) and Brown et al. (2005), this study intended to assess self-efficacy perception in terms of interpersonal relationships, capabilities of control task and judgment. There is a need for trust and self-efficacy among employees towards their organization. Employee commitment will create a positive and negative scenario for the organization and itself. If the employees have trust towards the organization and self-efficacy, it will give a good sign where the productivity of the work is high and low turnover. If it is negative, it can cause job dissatisfaction and may cause turnover to occur and productivity is low.

Self-efficacy is people's level of motivation; affective states and actions are based on what they believe more on what is objectively the case (Bandura, 2006). It is also defined as people's belief about their capabilities to produce designated levels of performance that exercise influence over events that affect their lives. Self-efficacy belief determined how

people feel, think, motivate themselves and behave.

Such beliefs produce these diverse effects through four major processes. They include cognitive, motivational, and affective and selection processes (Bandura, 1986). A strong sense of efficacy enhances human accomplishment and personal wellbeing in many ways. People with high assurance in their capabilities approach difficult tasks as challenges to be mastered rather than as threats to be avoided. Such an efficacious outlook fosters intrinsic interest and deep engrossment in activities. They set themselves challenging goals and maintain strong commitment to them. They heighten and sustain their efforts in the face of failure. They quickly recover their sense of efficacy after failures or setbacks. They attribute failure to insufficient effort or deficient knowledge and skills, which are acquirable. They approach threatening situations with assurance that they can exercise control over them. Such an efficacious outlook produces personal accomplishments, reduces stress and lowers vulnerability to depression (Bandura, 1991). In contrast, people who doubt their capabilities shy away from difficult tasks, which they view as personal threats. They have low aspirations and weak commitment to the goals they choose to pursue. When faced with difficult tasks, they dwell on their personal deficiencies, on the obstacles they will encounter, and all kinds of adverse outcomes rather than concentrate on how to perform successfully. They slacken their efforts and give up quickly in the face of difficulties.

They are slow to recover their sense of efficacy following failure or setbacks. Because they view insufficient performance as deficient aptitude it does not require much failure for them to lose faith in their capabilities. They fall easy victim to stress and depression (Bandura, 1991). Self-efficacy is described as part of reciprocal process that determines behavior - a person feels confident in his or her ability to carry out behavior and to achieve a desired result. This confidence

comes from the interaction of personal, behavioral and environmental factors. A person draws upon his other own knowledge and feelings, obtains technical advice and support and then tries out behavior. That person then observes the results, makes judgments and conclusions. If the behavior produces the desired results, it is more likely to be tried again and the person's belief in one (self-efficacy) will increase. People's beliefs about their efficacy can be developed by four main sources of influence.

- The most effective way of creating a strong sense of efficacy is through mastery experiences. Successes build a robust belief in one's personal efficacy. Failures undermine it, especially if failures occur before a sense of efficacy is firmly established.
- The second way of creating and strengthening self-beliefs of efficacy is through the vicarious experiences provided by social models. Seeing people similar to one succeed by sustained effort raises observers' belief that they too possess the capabilities master comparable activities to succeed.
- Social persuasion is a third way of strengthening people's beliefs that they have what it takes to succeed. To the extent that persuasive boosts in perceived self-efficacy lead people to try hard enough to succeed, they promote development of skills and sense of personal self-efficacy (Bandura, 1991).

In short, perceived self-efficacy is concerned with people's belief in their capabilities to exercise control over their own functioning and over events that affect their lives. Belief in self-efficacy affect life

choices, level of motivation, quality of functioning, resilience to adversity and vulnerability to stress and depression. People's beliefs in their efficacy are developed by four main sources of influence. They include mastery experiences, seeing people similar to oneself manage task demand successfully, social persuasion that one has the capabilities to succeed in given activities and inferences from emotional states that indicate personal strength (Bandura, 1991). People must therefore, have a robust sense of efficacy to sustain the perseverant effort needed to succeed. The nature and scope of perceived self-efficacy undergo changes throughout the course of the lifespan. Perdue et al. (2007) conducted a study of the relationship between self-efficacy and job satisfaction from the perspective of career decision theory, indicating that significantly positive correlations exist between self-efficacy and job satisfaction and that high self-efficacy helps one to adjust to the working environment. Hence, this study presumed that there are significantly positive correlations between self-efficacy and retention commitment. On the aspect of effort commitments, Fu et al. (2009) empirically found from a sample study of sales persons that there are significantly positive correlations self-efficacy and selling effort. It implies that there are significantly positive correlations between self-efficacy and effort commitment.

### Conclusion

This study examined the concepts of employee engagement, the definition of organizational commitment and self – efficacy, their concept and how the workplace can change to move in the direction of greater employee engagement, organizational commitment and self-efficacy of records management personnel in organization. The level of employee engagement can range from high to low depending on the individual employee. This variability in work engagement is related to key aspects of company performance and is influenced by many aspects of organizational structure and

functioning. Although engagement is expressed by individual workers through their work performance, their work behavior is often a reflection of the kind of organizational environment where they are working thereby leading to organizational commitment and development.

Thus, even though promoting greater engagement can be done at the level of the individual employee (through better manager communication and appropriate use of other work incentives. It appears equally important to improve employee engagement through effective leadership and actions at the organizational level. To promote higher levels of employee engagement, companies must make themselves the kinds of organizations with which employees want to engage and this will in no doubt lead to self-efficacy. A strong sense of efficacy enhances human accomplishment and personal wellbeing in many ways. People with high assurance in their capabilities approach difficult tasks as challenges to be mastered rather than as threats to be avoided. Such an efficacious outlook fosters intrinsic interest and deep engrossment in activities. They set themselves challenging goals and maintain strong commitment to them.

### Reference

- Adebayo, D.O. (2006). The moderating effect of self-efficacy on job insecurity and organizational commitment among Nigerian public servants. *Journal of Psychology in Africa*, 16(1): 35-43.
- Alarape, A.I. & Akinlabi, F.M.(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.
- Angle, H. L.& Perry, J. L.(1981). An empirical assessment of organization commitment and organizational effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 26, 1-13.

- Angle, H.L. & Perry, J.L. (1983). Organizational commitment: Individual and organizational influences. *Work and Occupations*, 10, 123-146.
- Bateman, T. & Strasser, S. (1984). A longitudinal analysis of the antecedents of organizational commitment. *Academy of Management Journal*, 21, 95-112.
- Bakker, A.B., & Bal, P.M. (n.d). Weekly work engagement and performance: A study among starting teachers. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*
- Bakker, A.B., Demerouti, E. (2007). Using the Job Demands-Resources model to predict burnout and performance. *Human Resource Management*, 43, 83-104
- Bakker, A.B. & Demerouti, E. (2008). Towards a model of work engagement. *Career Development International* 13, 209-223
- Bakker, A.B., & Xanthopoulou, D. (2009). The crossover of daily work engagement: Test of an actor-partner interdependence model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94, 1562-1571
- Bakker, A.B., & Leiter, M.P. (Eds.) (2010). *Work engagement: A handbook of essential theory and research*. New York: Psychology Press
- Bandura, A. (1977). *Social Learning Theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Bandura, A. (1982). Self-efficacy mechanism in human agency. *Am. Psychologist.*, 37(2): 122-147.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social Foundations of Thought and Action*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Bandura A. (1988). *Organizational Application of Social Cognitive Theory*. *Australian J. Manage.*, 13(2): 275-302.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: W.H. Freeman and Comp.
- Becker T. E, Billings R. S, Eveleth D. M, & Gilbert N.L. (1996). Foci and Base of Commitment: Implications for Job Performance. *Acad. Manage. J.*, 39(2): 464-482.
- Brown S.P, Brown E.J, Leigh T.W. (2005). The Attenuating Effect of Role Overload on Relationships Linking Self-Efficacy and Goal Level to Work Performance. *J. Appl. Psychol.*, 90(5): 972-979.
- Brown, B.B. (2003). *Employees' Organizational Commitment and their Perception of Supervisors' Relations-Oriented and Task-Oriented Leadership Behavior*. Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Human Development. Falls Church, Virginia.
- Buchanan, B., II. (1974). Building organizational commitment: The socialization of managers in work organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 19, 533-546.
- Buchanan, Bruce, II. (1979). Government managers, business executives, and organizational commitment. *Public Administration Review*, 34, 339-347.
- Busch, T., Fallan, L. & Pettersen, A. (2000). Disciplinary differences in job satisfaction self-efficacy, goal commitment and organizational commitment among faculty employees in Norwegian Colleges: An empirical assessment of indicators of performance. *Quality in Higher Education*, 4(2): 137-157.
- Chen G, Gully MS, Eden D. (2004). General self-efficacy and self-esteem: Toward theoretical and empirical distinction between correlated self-evaluations. *J. Organ. Behave.*, 25: 375-395.
- Christian, M. S., Garza, A. S., & Slaughter, J. E. (2011). Work engagement: A quantitative review and test of its relations with task and

- contextual performance. *Personnel Psychology*, 64, 89-136
- Curry, J.P., Wakefield, D.S., Price, J.L. and Mueller, C.W.(1986). On the causal ordering of job satisfaction and organizational commitment. *Academy of Management Journal*, 29: 847-858 .
- De los Santos, S. & Not-Land, E.( 2006). Factors related to commitment of extension professionals in the Dominican Republic: Implications for theory and practice. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 35(3):57-63 (2006). Retrieved 11th July 2006 from <http://pubs.aged.tamu.edu/jae/pdf/vol35-03-57.pdf>
- Dodd-McCue, D. and Wright, G.B. (1996). Men, women and attitudinal commitment: The effects of workplace experiences and socialization. *Human Relations*, 49:1065-1089
- Feinstein, A.H. and Vondrasek, D. (2006). *A Study of Relationship between Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment among Restaurant Employees*. Retrieved 15th July 2006 from <http://hotel.unlv.edu/pdf/jobSatisfaction.pdf>
- Freund, A.(2005). Commitment and job satisfaction as predictors turnover intentions among welfare workers. *Administration in Social Work*, 29(2): 5-21.
- Fu FQ, Richards KA, Jones E .(2009).The Motivation Hub: Effects of Goal Setting and Self-Efficacy on Effort and New Product Sales. *J.Pers. Selling Sales Manage.*, 29(3): 277–292.
- Geurts, S.A.E., & Demerouti, E. (2003). Work/Non-work interface: A review of theories and findings. in M. Schabraq, J. Winnubst & C.L. Cooper (Eds.), *The handbook of work and health psychology* (2nd ed.; pp. 279-31
- González-Roma, V., Schaufeli, W.B., Bakker, A., Lloret, S. (2006). Burnout and engagement: Independent factors or opposite poles? *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 68, 165-174
- Hall, Douglas.(1977). Organizational identification as a function of career pattern and organizational type. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 17, 340-350
- Hallberg, U., Johansson, G. & Schaufeli, W.B. (2007). Type A behaviour and work situation: Associations with burnout and work engagement. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 48, 135-142
- Halbesleben, J.R., Harvey, J. & Bolino, M.C. (2009). Too engaged? A conservation of resources view of the relationship between work engagement and work interference with family. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(6), 1452-65
- Harter, James K., Frank L. Schmidt, and Corey L. M. Keyes (2003). *Well-Being in the Workplace and its Relationships to Business Outcomes. Flourishing: the Positive Person and the Good Life*: 205–244. Retrieved 2006-11-08.
- Hellervik LW, Hazucha JF, Schneider R.J. (1992). Behavior change: Models, methods, and a review of the evidence”, In M. D. Dunnette &L. Hough (Eds.). *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology*. (Vol. 30), Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists.
- Koch, J. & Steers, R. (1978). Job attachment, satisfaction, and turnover among public sector employees. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 12, 119-1282).
- Jaskyte K, Lee M. (2009). Organizational Commitment of Social Workers: An Exploratory Study. *Adm. Social Work*, 33(3): 227-241.
- Jawahar IM, Meurs JA, Ferris GR, Hochwarter W.A .(2008). Self-Efficacy and Political Skill as Comparative Predictors of Task and Contextual Performance: A Two-Study Constructive Replication. *Hum. Perform.*,21: 138–157.Tsai et al.

- Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33,
- Lawson, R.B. and Shen, Z. (1998). *Organizational Psychology: Foundation and Applications*. Oxford University Press, New York
- Langelaan, S., Bakker, A.B., Van Doornen, L.J.P. & Schaufeli, W.B. (2006). Burnout and work engagement: Do individual differences make a difference? *Personality and Individual Differences*, 40, 521-532
- Li, L. (2006) Human motivation in the work organization: Theories and implications. *New Asia College Academic Annual*, XIX: 253-263 (2006). Retrieved 13th July 2006 from <http://www.cqmextra.cqm.org/cqmjournal.nsf/reprints/rp11300-72k>.
- Luthans, E. (1998). *Organizational Behavior*. Irwin/McGraw-Hill, New York .
- Prati, L.M. (2004). *Emotional Intelligence as a Facilitator of the Emotional Labor Process*. A Dissertation submitted to the Department of the Management in partial fulfillment of the requirement for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy. The Florida State University, College of Business, 692-724
- May, D. R., Gilson, R. L., & Harter, L. M. (2004). The psychological conditions of meaningfulness, safety and availability and the engagement of the human spirit at work. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 77, 11-37
- Maslach, C., Jackson, S.E., & Leiter, M. (1997). *The truth about burnout: How organizations cause personal stress and what to do about it*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass
- Mathieu, J. E., & Farr, J. L. (1991). Further evidence for the discriminant validity of measures of organizational commitment, job involvement, and job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76, 127-133
- Mannheim, B., Baruch, Y. and Tal, J. (1997). Alternative models for antecedents and outcomes of work centrality and job satisfaction of high-tech personnel. *Human Relations*, 50(2): 1537-1562
- Mathieu, J.E. and Zajac, D.M.A. (1990) Review and a meta-analysis of the antecedents, correlates and consequences of organizational commitment. *Psychological Bulletin*, 108: 171-194 .
- Mayer, J.D., Salovey, P. and Caruso, D.R. (2000). Emotional intelligence as zeitgeist, as personality, and as a mental ability, pp. 92-117. In: *The Handbook of Emotional Intelligence: Theory, Development, Assessment and Application at Home, School, and in the Workplace*. R. Baron and J.D.A. Parker (Eds.). Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.
- Meyer, J. P., Paunonen, S. V., Gellatly, I. R., Goffin, R. D., & Jackson, D. N. (1989). Organizational commitment and job performance: It's the nature of commitment that counts. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74, 152-156
- Meyer, J.P. & Allen, N.J. (1991). A Three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1, 61-89.
- 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, 538-552.
- Meyer, J.P. & Allen, N.J. (1997). *Commitment in the Workplace: Theory, Research, and Application*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Meyer, J. and Allen, N. (1997). *Commitment in the Workplace*. SAGE Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA
- Meyer & Allen, (1985). *Commitment in the Workplace-Theory, Research & Application*, Sage Publications, London Walton, E. Richard, From control to commitment in the

- Workplace. *Harvard Business Review*, March-April. The Telegraph (Online)
- Mullins, L.T. (1999). *Management and Organizational Behavior 5th edition*. Financial Times Management, London
- Morrow, P. (1993). *The Theory and Measurement of Work Commitment*. CT: JAL, Greenwich
- Mowday, R., Porter, L. and Durbin, R. (1974). Unit performance, situational factors and employee attitudes in spatially separated work units. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 12, 231-248.
- Mowday, R., Steers, R., and Porter, L. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 14, 224-247.
- Mowday, R.T., Porter, L.W. and Steers, R.M. (1982). *Employee organization Linkages: The Psychology of Commitment, Absenteeism and Turnover*. Academic Press, New York.
- O'Reilly, III, C., and Chatman, J. (1986). Organizational Commitment and Psychological Attachment: The Effects of Compliance, Identification and Internalization on Prosocial Behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71, 3, 492-499.
- Perdue SV, Reardon RC, Peterson G.W. (2007). person-environment congruence, self-efficacy and environmental identity in relation to job satisfaction: a career decision theory perspective. *J. Employ. Couns.*, 44: 29-39.
- Porter, L.W.; Steers, R.M.; Mowday, R.T.; & Boulian, P.V. (1974).. Organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover among psychiatric technicians. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 59, 603-609.
- Reichers, Arnon. (1985). A review and reconceptualization of organizational commitment. *The Academy of Management Review*, 10, 3, 465-476.
- Salami, S.O. and Omole, O.A. (2005). Participation in decision making process, incentives and training as predictors of organizational commitment among industrial workers. *African Journal for the Psychological Study of Social Issues*, 8(2): 210-227.
- Salancik, G.R.; & Pfeffer, (1977). An examination of need satisfaction models of job attitudes. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 22, 427-456.
- Salanova, M., Agut, S., & Peiró, J.M. (2005). Linking organizational resources and Work engagement to employee performance and customer loyalty: The mediating role of service climate. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90, 1217-1227
- Salanova, M., Bresó, E. & Schaufeli, W.B. (2005). Hacia un modelo espiral de la autoeficacia en el estudio del burnout y Engagement (Towards a spiral model of self-efficacy in burnout and engagement research) *Ansiedad y Estrés*, 11, 215-231
- Salanova, M., & Schaufeli, W.B. (2008). A cross-national study of work engagement as a mediator between job resources and proactive behavior: A cross-national study. *International Journal of Human Resources Management*, 19, 226-231
- Schaufeli, W.B., Salanova, M., González-Romá, V., & Bakker, A. B. (2002). The measurement of Engagement and burnout: A confirmative analytic approach. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 3,
- Schaufeli, W.B., Martínez, I., Marques Pinto, A. Salanova, M. & Bakker, A.B. (2002). Burnout and engagement in university students: A cross national study. *Journal of Cross- Cultural Psychology*, 33, 464-48171-92
- Schaufeli, W.B., Bakker, A.B. & Salanova, M. (2006). The measurement of work engagement with a short questionnaire: A cross-national study. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 66, 701-716
- Schaufeli, W.B., Taris, T.W., & Bakker, A. (2006) Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde: On the

differences between work engagement and workaholism. In: R. Burke (Ed), *Work hours and work addiction* (pp. 193-252). Edward Elgar: Northhampton, UK

Schaufeli, W.B., Taris, T.W., & Van Rhenen, W. (2008). Workaholism, burnout and engagement: Three of a kind or three different kinds of employee well-being? *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 57, 173-203

Sheldon, Mary (1971). Investments and involvements as mechanisms producing commitment to the organization. *Administrative Science Quarterly*. 16; 143-150

Seijts, Gerard H. and Dan Crim (2006). The Ten C's of Employee Engagement. *Ivey Business Journal*. Retrieved 2006-11-09.

Sinclair R, Leo M, Wright C. (2005). Benefit system effects on employees' benefit knowledge, use, and organizational commitment. *J. Bus. Psychol.*, 20(1): 3-29.

Xanthopoulou, D., Bakker, A.B., Demerouti, E., & Schaufeli, W.B. (2009). Work engagement and financial returns: A diary study on the role of job and personal resources. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 82, 183-200.

Xanthopoulou, D., Bakker, A.B., Demerouti, E. & Schaufeli, W.B. (n.d). Work engagement and financial returns: A diary study on the role of job and personal resources. *Journal of Organizational and Occupational Psychology*

Wiedmer, S.M. ( 2006). *An Examination of Factors Affecting Employee Satisfaction*, Retrieved 13th July 2006 from <http://clearinghouse.missouriwestern.edu/manuscripts/51.asp>

Weiner, Y. (1982) Commitment in Organization: A Normative View. *Academy of Management Review*, 7, 418-428.