# Organizational Identification: How Perceived Organizational Prestige influences Employee Commitment in Nigeria

**Beatrice C. Ndibe[1], Prof. V.A. Onodugo[2], Dr. Kenneth Chukwujioke Agbim[3]**

[1 & 2]Department of Management, Faculty of Business Administration, University of Nigeria Enugu Campus
[3]Department of Entrepreneurial Studies, Veritas University, Abuja
Nigeria

***Abstract:*** *Employees are critical resource in the production of goods and services; and high employee turnover poses survival threat to the organization; hence, the need to enhance the psychological attachment of the employee with the organization vis-à-vis commitment. The study examined whether employees' perceived organizational prestige as a proxy of organizational identification has any relationship with organizational commitment. A survey research design was adopted. Using a multi-stage technique, the population was 3875 employees of 10 manufacturing firms selected from a sampling frame of 243 manufacturing firms registered with the Manufacturers Association of Nigeria (MAN) in South-East Nigeria. A sample size of 351 was first determined using the Godden 2004 sample size formula. Then Bowley's proportional allocation formula was used for the allocation of the sample size into strata. The instrument for data collection was a structured questionnaire, and its reliability was 0.79 ascertained using Spearman's rank correlation coefficient technique. Responses were presented in frequency tables and hypothesis tested using regression at 5% level of significance. The result showed a significant positive relationship between employees' perceived organizational prestige and organizational commitment (r = 0.896; F = 1287.994; t = 35.889; p< 0.05). It was concluded that perceived organizational prestige influences employee's commitment; and hence recommended that manufacturing organizations should pay more attention on developing, enhancing and maintaining those unique attributes perceived by employees to be linked with prestigious organizations.*

**Keywords—Organizational Identification; Employee Commitment; Perceived Organizational Prestige; Manufacturing and Nigeria**

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Organizational identification (OI) gained attention after its introduction by Ashforth and Mael in 1989 in their study on the relevance of social identity theory (Dávila & García, 2012). OI has significant implications on individuals, groups and organizations as it plays a critical role as a connector between the organization and its employees (Alharbi & Abdullah, 2016). It also has the potential to explain behaviours and attitudes of organizational members (Tipurić, Radić & Cindrić, 2019). Similarly, the effectiveness and functionality of any organization relies heavily on the human resources pool of such organization; and more importantly on the commitment of the employees (Dibua, Onyekwelu & Nwagbala, 2021). Being committed to an organization implies that the employee has: (i) feelings of solidarity with the organization; (ii) attitudinal and behavioral support for the organization; and (iii) perception of shared characteristics with other organizational members. But can this be said of those organizations within the manufacturing sector in Nigeria?

Globally, especially in the western countries, the manufacturing sector accounts for a major share of socio-economic activities that supports economic growth contributing as high as 35% to 40% annually (FinIntell, 2013). The sector plays key role in creating jobs, reducing poverty, stimulating production and socio-economic activities at both local and international levels. Besides its contribution in the gross domestic product (GDP), the sector since the industrial revolution of the 18th and 19th centuries, has remained relevant in creating opportunities for individuals to identify with and interact as social groups thereby creating a sense of belonging and improving employees' productivity (Addo, 2017; Behun, Gavurova, Tkacova & Kotaskova, 2018; Dickson, 2007; Eze & Ogiji, 2013). However, this assertion remains a mirage in Nigeria as the sector has constantly performed below expectation.

The Nigerian manufacturing sector contributed 9.4% of GDP on average between 2011 and 2019 (CBN, 2019, as cited in Edet, James, Effiong, Ishaku & Eduno, 2022). In like manner, the sector recorded a real GDP growth of 3.00% (year-on-year), lower than the second quarter of 2021 and lower than the preceding quarter by 0.48% and 2.89% points respectively (NBS, 2022).The poor performance of the Nigerian manufacturing sector has been attributed to so many nonhuman and behavioural factors undermining the critical row of the human element(Banjoko, Iwuji & Bagshaw, 2012; Oburota & Ifere, 2017; Okon & Osesie, 2017; Sola, Obamuyi, Adekunjo& Ogunleye, 2013; Tomola, Adebisi & Olawale, 2012). Apart from skills and abilities needed to be able to transform raw materials into products; the way and manner these skills are applied will very much depend on many attitude and behavioural factors. Hence, the objective of this paper is to ascertain the role that perceived organizational prestige plays in influencing employee's commitment in manufacturing organizations in South-East Nigeria. Specifically, the work interrogates the relationship between employees' perceived organizational prestige and organizational commitment. The

findings of this study will serve as contribution to the many existing solutions proffered by other studies in a bid to solving the enormous challenges facing the Nigerian manufacturing sector.

## 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

### 2.1 Organizational Identification

Organizational Identification is broadly defined as a cognitive connection between an individual and organization (Bhattacharya &Elsbach, 2002). It is a perception of oneness with or belongingness to an organization where an individual is a member (Jones & Volpe, 2010; Mael & Ashforth, 1992).It represents the degree to which a member of an organization defines himself with the same characteristics he believes defines his organization (Tipurić, Radić & Cindrić, 2019). Thus, organizational identification is a process of merging employees' personal interests, goals and objectives with the values and goals of the organization in such a way that the employees perceive themselves as part and parcel of the organization (Ghannam &Taamneh, 2017; Johnson, Johnson & Heimberg, 1999; Kpakol, Obiora & Jaja, 2016).

Identifying with the organization enables the employee to willingly accept the decisional outcomes of the organization as well as offer support geared towards the realization of the organization's goals and objectives (Chow & Chan, 2008; Mael & Ashforth, 1992; Hsu & Lin, 2008). Hence, the more an individual identifies with his organization, the more his attitudes and behaviour are influenced by the organization's actions (van Knippenberg & van Schie, 2000).Organizational identification is important to the organization because of the following positive effects on the employee: (i) feelings of solidarity with the organization; (ii) attitudinal and behavioral support for the organization; and (iii) perception of shared characteristics with other organizational members. As organizational members, employees expect that their individuals' goals and aspirations will be achieved through their membership in the organization. Where this is not so, the consequence is conflict in the workplace and negative attitude and behaviours (Shortell, n.d.; Simon, 2016; Wieviorka, 2013). Therefore, in order for organizations to optimize the benefits of organizational identification, it is imperative that organizations provide the opportunities that will enable employees solve their personal needs, which was the basis of their membership with the organization (Mael & Ashforth, 1992).

Most employees are attracted to organizations because there is an existing need begging for solution. Needs as explained by Abraham Maslow's theory are broadly classified into two: survival needs and psychological needs (Beebe & Masterson, 2015). The survival needs likened to the hygiene factor by Herzberg's two-factor theory prevent a feeling of dissatisfaction on the job, but does not give the desired job satisfaction (Lalwani & Lalwani, 2017; Tesavrita & Suryadi, 2012). Satisfying the psychological needs gives employees the needed job satisfaction. The psychological needs include the need for belongingness, esteem and self-actualization. As a matter of fact, employees feel satisfied and hence remain in employment if they have strong social, emotional and psychological attachment with their organizations; and strong psychological attachment improves employee's organizational identification. In addition, employee's organizational identification is improved if the employee's perceived organizational reputation is high (Ghannam &Taamneh, 2017). There is a consensus among scholars that psychological relationship between an employee and the organization is critical in organizational behaviour (Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Hogg & Terry, 2000; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002; van Knippenberg, van Dick & Tavares, 2007).

Organizational identification is a key mechanism that explains employees' motivation, which eventually leads to high level of performance (Miao, Eva, Newman & Schwarz, 2019). It is also positively related to employees' organizational commitment and negatively related to intention to leave the organization (Jones & Volpe, 2010). Alluding to this, Belmi and Bowers (2016), explained that individuals who felt devalued in the workplace show more willingness to misuse company's time and resources, cut corners and do things that deliberately hinders productivity. Hence, van Knippenberg *et al* (2007, p. 457), opined that "The magnitude of individuals' attachment to the organization and the evaluation they make of the relationship that the organization develops with them may exert an important influence on job-related attitudes and behaviour".

Organizations desiring to excel must understand those factors that motivate their employees, one of which is the opportunity to satisfy their psychological needs. As noted earlier, organizational identification is one of ways employees satisfy their psychological needs. For instance, the need to feel a sense of belonging can be satisfied through social group membership (Beebe & Masterson, 2015). Thus, organizations create the social environment for employees to satisfy their social needs. This is because a person's life does not begin and end with self, but develops over time through social and interpersonal interactions (Hurst, 2018; McIntyre, 2006). As a result, identification is the outcome of the knowledge that we see ourselves as others see us; and this gives the employee a sense of collective self (Mcleod, 2008; Yeung & Martin, 2003), which fulfills the need for sense of belonging (David, 2015).

### 2.2 Perceived Organizational Prestige (POP)

Perceived organizational prestige is one of the concepts used to explain organizational identification and its effect on behaviour. Employee's perceived organizational prestige may affect his/her sense of belongingness since a person's life does not begin and end with self, but develops over time through social and interpersonal interactions (Hurst, 2018; Mcintyre, 2006). Studies have shown that perceived organizational prestige significantly affects employees' behaviours. POP makes employees feel more committed and satisfied, thereby reducing the propensity to quit (Carmeli, Gilat & Waldman,

2007; Dibua, Onyekwelu & Nwagbala, 2021, Dutton, Dukerich & Harquail, 1994; Šulentić, Žnidar & Pavičić, 2017). Being an employee of a reputable organization (with flying statistics and performance) helps employees to develop self-awareness, self-distinctiveness, and self-esteem in their jobs. As noted by Smidts, van Riel and Pruyn (2001), workers are willing to identify with firms that stakeholders view in a positive light.

Perceived organizational prestige is defined as "the degree to which the institution is well regarded, in absolute and comparative terms by those within the organization" (Smith, 2012, p.9). It is what employees believe to be the widespread opinion about their organization and its reputation and prestige (Hasan & Hussain, 2015; Šulentić, Žnidar & Pavičić, 2017). It represents employees' own view of how outsiders' see their organization (Podnar, 2011). Albeit, scholars sometimes use the term interchangeably with "organizational image", suggesting that they have the same meaning (Dutton, Dukerich & Harquail, 1994; Smith, 2012); the two concepts are not the same.

Clarifying the assertion above, POP sometimes called "construed external image" (Dutton, et al., 1994) refers to the organizational reputation that employees believe outsiders hold of their organization, whereas organizational image or reputation is the image that the organizational outsiders actually hold about the organization (Smith, 2012; Podnar, 2011). POP summarizes an organization's member's beliefs about how the external people are likely to view the individual through his or her organizational affiliation (Podnar, 2011, p.1616). Being a member of a highly rated and performing organization helps individual members develop self-awareness, self-distinctiveness and self-esteem (Carmeli et al., 2007; Dutton et al, 1994; Šulentić, Žnidar & Pavičić, 2017). Hence, employees willingly identify with organizations that they believe are positively evaluated by outsiders and this invariably enhances employees' productivity (Carmeli & Freud, 2002; Hasan & Hussain, 2015).

POP is the perception of the importance of a firm by its stakeholders. Over the years, POP has metamorphosed into a great "influencer" of workers' behaviour on intent to remain and give their all, or quit and look for better alternatives (Šulentić, Žnidar & Pavičić, 2017). It also influences the behaviour of workers especially when it has to do with their commitment level to the organization (Roberts &Dowling, 2002). As organizational members, employees expect that their individual goals and aspirations will be achieved through their membership in the organization. Where this is not so, the consequence is conflict in the workplace and negative attitude and behaviours(Simon, 2016; Shortell, n.d.; Wieviorka, 2013). Therefore, in order for organizations to optimize the benefits of organizational identification, it is imperative that organizations provide the opportunities that will enable employees solve their personal needs, which was the basis of their membership with the organization (Mael & Ashforth, 1992).

## 2.3 Employees' Organizational Commitment

Organizational commitment is one of the many work behaviours that have received serious attention and hence studied by researchers as a result of its effect on organizational performance (Al Zefeiti & Mohamad, 2017; Dirani, 2009). Conceptually, organizational commitment is an important concept in both psychology and management literature. Colquitt, Lepine and Wesson (2011) define organizational commitment as the desire on the part of an employee to remain a member of the organization. It is also referred to as the state in which people sense loyalty with their respective organizations, and align themselves with organizational goals and value (Ćulbrik, Delić, Mitrović &Ćulbrik, 2018). Commitment is an attitude that reflects the extent to which an individual identifies with an organization, committed to its goal, and wishes to maintain membership in the organization (Robbins, 2006). It is an employees' psychological attachment towards their organizations; or the state in which people sense loyalty with their respective organizations (Chelliah, Sundarapandiyan & Vinoth, 2015; Ebeh, Njoku, Ikpeazu & Nwaina-Ana, 2017; Noraazian & Khalip, 2016). According to Radosavljevic, Cilerdzic and Dragic (2017) organizational commitment is a psychological state characterized by the relationship of employees to the organization, implying a decision to continue to work in the organization. It is an attitude that reflects the extent to which an individual identifies with an organization and wishes to maintain membership in the organization (Ebeh, et al. 2017).

In today's world of business where competition is critical to business survival, organizational commitment is very important because of its positive effect on employee's productivity and overall organizational performance; especially now that business organizations are confronted with new challenges as they strive to maintain efficiency and create committed workforce (Aziz *et al* 2021). Employees showing commitment is one of the visible positive effects of a motivated workforce (Zayas-Ortiz, Rosario, Marquez &Gruñeiro, 2015) and employees' perception about the organizational prestige is one of the ways of improving employee's motivation. Organizational commitment is a multi-dimensional construct; and as reflected in the model developed by Meyer and Allen (1997) employees experience organizational commitment in three simultaneous mindsets, namely: affective, continuance and normative commitment (Al Zefeiti & Mohammad, 2017; Dabir & Azarpira, 2017; Jaros, 2007; Radosavljevic, Cilerdzic & Dragic, 2017).

(i) **Affective commitment:** This refers to the employee's emotional attachment to the organization. It includes employees' long-term feelings towards their jobs. It is an affective desire on the part of the organization's employees to continue to work for the organization because of their strong attachment with the organization (Ebeh, *et al*, 2017).

(ii) **Continuance commitment:** This refers to perceived costsassociated with leaving the organization. When the

potential cost of leaving an organization is high on the employee, they are more committed to their organizations. Thus, they are committed not because they want to but because they have to (Al Zefeiti & Mohamad, 2017). The threat of losing attractive benefits is a potential factor to the employee. As a result, those employees who are highly placed in their organizations do not leave for fear of losing high amount of benefit if they quit their jobs. Similarly, where employees have limited or no alternative employment opportunities, they certainly remain with the organization not because they want to.

(iii) **Normative commitment:**
This is a situation where the employees feel obliged to remain in the organization (Radosavljevic, Cilerdzic & Dragic, 2017). Employees, who are in this type of commitment, choose to remain with their organization because they have moral justification to do so, not because they want to (Al Zefeiti & Mohamad, 2017). However, normative commitment can be developed by the employees when the organization invests adequately on them. These investments cause them to feel obliged to be committed to the organization.

Consequently, Meyer and Allen (1997) argued that employees with strong affective commitment remain with the organization because they want and desire to; whereas those identifying with the organization based on continuance commitment remain with the organization for material benefits perceived as cost of leaving; while those with strong normative commitment remain with the organization because they ought to do so for perceived obligation to remain (Al Zefeiti & Mohamad, 2017). However, for management to achieve a better understanding of employees' relationship with the organization, all the three forms of commitment should be considered simultaneously. Al Zefeiti and Mohamad (2017) further noted that effective communication is an essential component in achieving organizational commitment. This implies that both the employee and the organization should understand and value each other's goals and needs.

## 3. THEORETICAL FOUNDATION

This study hinges on the social identity theory (SIT) and self-categorization theory proposed by Henri Tajfel and John Turner in 1979. The thrust of the theory is that individuals' senses of who they are depend largely on the groups they belong (David, 2015). Also, it focuses on that part of an individual's self-concept derived from his knowledge of his membership in a social group (Sindic & Condor, 2014). Hence, individual members of a group view themselves as "collective self", and will behave like others in the group (Bothma et al, 2015) and by doing so derive a sense of belonging.

Similarly, self-categorization theory aims to understand and explain the processes by which people form cognitive representations of themselves and others in relation to different social groups (iresearchnet.com). It serves "the related purposes of providing a way to systematically classify others and to locate oneself in the social environment"

(Ravasi& van Rekom, 2003, p. 119). Its underlying argument is that individuals' behaviour, thoughts, emotions and attitudes are shaped by social categorization of themselves, where they see themselves in terms of group membership rather than particular individuals (Sindic & Condor, 2014; Trepte & Loy, 2017).

## 4. EMPIRICAL REVIEW

Podnar (2011) conducted an empirical study on perceived external prestige, organizational identification and organizational commitment. The study used a survey design and all measures assessed on a five-point (Likert) scale and hypotheses were tested hierarchical regression analysis. The study further employed multiple regression analysis using Stepwise method, which enters the variables according to their highest F-value. The results of the study show that perceived external prestige complements corporate identification and helps to explain organizational commitment. The study found a strong positive relationship between corporate identification and organizational commitment and group identification; but a negative relationship between group identification and organizational commitment.

Jones & Volpe (2010) conducted an empirical study on "organizational identification: extending our understanding of social identities through social networks". The aim was to explore how the strength and structure of an individual's social network both directly influences organizational identification as well as moderates the relation between social identity and organizational identification. The study used a survey data from undergraduate students at a Jesuit institution in the Northeastern United States. The study findings showed that the size of an individual's network as well as the interaction between relationship strength and prestige better explain organizational identification than do antecedents based solely on categorization and social comparison processes. The finding reemphasized the importance of "networks of relationship", a foundational process but much neglected premise of organizational identification and brought it back into the theory of organizational identification.

Similarly, Stinglhamber, Marique, Caesens, Desmette, Hansez, Hanin, and Bertrand (2015) conducted a study on Employees' Organizational Identification and Affective Organizational Commitment. The objective of the research was to identify the direction of causality between organizational identification and affective commitment. The study adopted a cross-lagged panel design with two measurement times. The findings of the study showed that (i) organizational identification is positively related to temporal change in affective organizational commitment; (ii) organizational identification partially mediates the influence of work experiences on affective organizational commitment; and (iii) affective organizational commitment totally mediates the relationship between organizational identification and turnover.

Van Knipperberg and Sleebos (2006) conducted a study on organizational identification versus organizational commitment: Self-definition, social exchange, and job attitudes. The objective of the study was to explore the differences between organizational identification and organizational commitment. Using a cross-section survey method, data were collected from 133 of faculty members of the Dutch University. The study proposed that identification is different from commitment in that identification reflects the self-definitional aspect of organizational membership, whereas commitment does not. The study further proposed that commitment is more contingent on social exchange processes that presume that individual and organization are separate entities psychologically, and more closely aligned with (other) job attitudes. The findings showed that identification is uniquely aligned (i.e., controlling for affective commitment) with the self-referential aspect of organizational membership, whereas commitment is uniquely related (i.e., controlling for identification) to perceived organizational support, job satisfaction, and turnover intentions. The study concluded that the core difference between identification and commitment lies in the implied relationship between individual and organization.

Dávila and García (2012) carried out a study on "Organizational Identification and Commitment: Correlates of Sense of Belonging and Affective Commitment" and the general objective was to analyze the overlap between organizational identification and commitment. The study focused on the analysis of the differences and similarities between sense of belonging and affective commitment. A total of 292 workers from the GSS Group (a company that specializes in contact centre services) completed survey instruments. The findings showed that "sense of belonging and affective commitment", are two different concepts; and they have different relationships with relation to precedent and subsequent variables. However, affective commitment seems to be more useful than sense of belonging to predict organizational citizenship behavior.

In their study, Kpakol, Obiora and Jaja (2016) examined the relationship between employees' participation and organizational identification in Nigerian manufacturing organizations and the mediating role of organizational culture in the relationship between employee participation and organizational identification. The research, which was a quasi-experimental one, adopted a cross-sectional survey design with a sample size of 205 out of 422 employees in selected manufacturing companies in Rivers State. Using five Likert scale ranking for the predictor criterion variables, the study found that employee participation correlates with organizational identification and the relationship is partially mediated by organizational culture.

## 5. METHOLODOGY

This study adopted a survey design. The data for this study were specifically obtained from primary source. The study population comprised of 3,875 employees of 10 registered member-organizations of the Manufacturers Association of Nigeria (MAN) in the south-east region of Nigeria. The 10 manufacturing firms were selected from a sampling frame of 243 firms (being all registered member-organizations of MAN in southeast Nigeria) using a multi-stage technique. A sample size of 351 was drawn using Godden (2004), while Bowley's proportional allocation formula was used for the allocation of the sample size into strata. Stratified sampling technique was used for the study. The instrument for data collection was a 5-point Likert scale structured questionnaire developed by the researcher. The instrument was validated through face and content validity, while reliability test was done using a test-retest method. The result of the reliability test shows an overall Spearman rank correlation coefficient of 0.79, indicating a high reliability of the instrument. A total of 351 copies of the questionnaire were administered to 133 senior staff and 218 junior staff of the selected manufacturing firms. Data were presented in frequency tables and corresponding values in percentages, while regression analysis using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 20 was adopted for the testing of the hypothesis. The decision rule for the study is to reject $H_0$ if p-value $< 0.05$.

## 6. DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

Out of the 351 distributed questionnaire, 320(91.17%) were returned, while 31(8.83%) were not returned and hence was not used.

In order to ascertain the relationship between employees' perceived organizational prestige and organizational commitment, five questions were asked. The responses received are presented in tables 1 to 5.

**Table 1: Responses on Perceived Organization's Reputation**

| Question | Options | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|---|---|---|
| Your organization is viewed as "highly reputable" by outsiders. | Strongly disagree | 8 | 2.50 |
| | Disagree | 15 | 4.69 |
| | Undecided | 18 | 5.63 |
| | Agree | 231 | 72.18 |
| | Strongly agree | 48 | 15.00 |
| Total of respondents | | 320 | 100 |

Source: Field survey, 2021

The result indicates that out of 320 respondents, insignificant fraction of 8(2.5%) strongly disagree that outsiders view their organization as a highly reputable organization. 15(4.69%) of the respondents disagree as well, while 5.63% were

indifferent. On the other hand, 231 respondents representing 72.18% of the total respondents agreed with the proposition that their organization is viewed as a highly reputable one,

while 48(15%) strong agree with that assertion. This implies that majority of the respondents believe that the external public have high regards for their organizations.

**Table 2: Perceived Organizational Prestige as a motivational tool for Employees**

| Question | Options | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|---|---|---|
| Is outsiders' view about your organization's status an important motivation to your involvement in the job? | Not at all important | 4 | 1.25 |
| | Slightly important | 7 | 2.19 |
| | Moderately important | 49 | 15.31 |
| | Very important | 209 | 65.31 |
| | Extremely important | 51 | 15.94 |
| Total of respondents | | 320 | 100 |

Source: Field survey, 2021

Table 2 shows that out of 320 respondents, 209(65.31%) of the respondents said that outsiders' view about their organization's status serves as a very important motivation for their involvement in the job. Similarly, 51(15.94%) said that outsiders' perception about their organization's status is extremely important to them and thus strongly impact on their involvement on the job. Whereas, only 4(1.25%) of the

respondents said that outsiders view about their organization does not matter to them; while 7(2.19%) of the respondents said it is slightly important. 49(15.3%) of the respondents said it is moderately important to them. This implies that employees' perception about outsiders' perceived opinion on the organizations' status is a strong motivating factor on employees' involvement on the job.

**Table 3: Employees' Perception on Commitment to their job**

| Questions | Options | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|---|---|---|
| How committed are you to your job? | Not at all committed | 5 | 1.56 |
| | Slightly committed | 7 | 2.19 |
| | Moderately committed | 10 | 3.13 |
| | Very committed | 153 | 47.81 |
| | Extremely committed | 145 | 45.31 |
| Total number of respondents | | 320 | 100 |

Source: Field survey, 2021

Table 3 shows that 5(1.56%) out of 320 respondents are not at all committed to their job. 7(2.19%) of the respondent are slightly committed, while 10(3.13%) are moderately committed. On the contrary, 153(47.81%) of the respondents

said they are very committed to their job, while 145(45.31%) feel they are extremely committed to their job. Summarily, over 85% of the total respondents are of the opinion that they are very committed to their job.

**Table 4: Effect of self-esteem on commitment to work**

| Questions | Options | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|---|---|---|
| Your commitment to your work is related to the self-esteem you derive from being an employee of the organization | Strongly disagree | 7 | 2.19 |
| | Disagree | 4 | 1.25 |
| | Undecided | 4 | 1.25 |
| | Agree | 170 | 53.13 |
| | Strongly agree | 135 | 42.19 |
| Total number of respondents | | 320 | 100 |

Source: Field survey, 2021

The result indicates that out of 320 respondents, 7(2.19%) of the respondents strongly disagree with the view that their commitment to their work is related to the self-esteem they derive from being an employee of the organization. Similarly, 4(1.25%) of the respondents disagree with the statement, whereas 4(1.25%) were not sure about the statement.

However, 170(53.75%) of the respondents agree that their commitment to work is related to the self-esteem they derive from being employees of the organization; while 135(42.19%) strongly agree with the statement. This implies that the higher the self-esteem that employees derive from their job; the more committed they would be.

**Table 5: Perception on organization's reputation and employees' dedication**

| Question | Options | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Not at all responsible | 4 | 1.25 |

| Does your perception about your organization's reputation in any way responsible for your level of dedication? | Somewhat responsible | 25 | 7.81 |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Mostly responsible | 101 | 31.56 |
| | Completely responsible | 190 | 59.38 |
| | | 320 | 100 |

Source: Field survey, 2021

Table 5 reveals that out of 320 respondents, only 4(1.25%) of the respondents said that their perception about the organization's reputation is not at all responsible for level of dedication; whereas over 95% of the respondents links their dedication to their perceived organizational reputation, although at various degrees. Specifically, 25(7.81%) of the respondents said that their perception about the prestige of their organization is somewhat responsible for their level of dedication; 101(31.59%) of the respondents said, it is mostly responsible; while 190(59.38%) said, it is completely responsible. This implies that if the employee does not feel that the organization has a high reputation; it translates to a negative effect on level of commitment, and vice-versa. Thus, low perceived organizational reputation correlates to low level of commitment, and high perceived organizational reputation correlates to high level of commitment.

**Test of Hypothesis**
$H_0$:    There is no relationship between employees' perceived organizational external prestige and organizational commitment

**Regression Result of Employees' perceived organizational prestige and commitment**

**a Model Summary[b]**

| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate | Durbin-Watson |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | .896[a] | .802 | .801 | .38273 | .246 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), Employees' perceived organizational prestige
b. Dependent Variable: Organizational commitment

**b ANOVA[a]**

| Model | | Sum of Squares | Df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Regression | 188.666 | 1 | 188.666 | 1287.994 | .000[b] |
| | Residual | 46.581 | 318 | .146 | | |
| | Total | 235.247 | 319 | | | |

a. Dependent Variable: Organizational commitment
b. Predictors: (Constant), Employees' perceived organizational prestige

**c Coefficients[a]**

| Model | | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | t | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | B | Std. Error | Beta | | |
| 1 | (Constant) | .199 | .045 | | 4.405 | .000 |
| | Employees' perceived organizational prestige | .967 | .027 | .896 | 35.889 | .000 |

a. Dependent Variable: Organizational commitment

R       = .896
$R^2$    = .802
F       = 1287.994
T       = 35.889
DW     = .246

**Interpretation:**
The regression sum of squares (188.666) is greater than the residual sum of squares (46.581), which indicates that more of the variation in the dependent variable is explained by the model. The significance value of the F statistics (0.000) is less than 0.05, which means that the variation explained by the model is not due to chance. The significance of the F value indicates that, overall, the model statistically significantly

predicts the outcome variable. In other words, it is a good fit for the data.

R, the correlation coefficient which has a value of 0.896, indicates that there is a positive relationship between employees' perceived organizational external prestige and organizational commitment. R square, the coefficient of determination, shows that 80.2% of the variation in organizational commitment is explained by the model.

With the linear regression model, the error of estimate is low with a value of .38273,The Durbin Watson statistics of 0.246, which is not more than 2 indicates there is no autocorrelation.

The employees' perceived organizational prestige coefficient of 0.896 indicates a positive significance between employees' perceived organizational prestige and organizational commitment, which is statistically significant (t = 35.889). Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis accordingly accepted. Thus, there is a significant positive relationship between employees' perceived organizational prestige and organizational commitment.

## 7. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

The findings of this study shows that there is a significant positive relationship between employees' perceived organizational prestige and organizational commitment (r=.896; F = 1287.994; t = 35.889; p< 0.05). Hence, it has contributed to existing literature on perceived organizational prestige, organizational commitment and organizational identification. Furthermore, the result corroborates the study by Podnar (2011), which found that perceived external prestige complements corporate identification and helps to explain organizational commitment. It further affirms (Sulentic &Znidar, 2017, Carmeli *et al.*, 2007; Dutton *et al*, 1994) that being a member of a highly rated and performing organization helps individual members develop self-awareness, self-distinctiveness and self-esteem. As a result, employees willingly identify with organizations that they believe are positively evaluated by outsiders and this invariably enhances employees' productivity (Hasan & Hussain, 2015; Carmeli & Freud, 2002). Therefore, the implication of the result is that employees who feel that their organizations are highly rated by outsiders show more commitment to their work. This is because they derive their own sense of high reputation in the society by being members of that organization; meaning that as along as their organizations' reputations remain high, their personal reputations will remain high as well. Further implication is that employees from time to time look out for those attributes that make outsiders' feel they are working for a prestigious organization. Hence, it is recommended that manufacturing organizations should pay more attention on developing, enhancing and maintaining those unique attributes perceived by employees to be linked with prestigious organizations as this will translate to more commitment on the job.

## 8. REFERENCES

Addo, E.O. (2017). The impact of manufacturing industries on Ghana's economy. *International Journal of Research Studies in Management,* 6(2), 73-94. doi:10.5861/ijrsm.2017.2003.

Al Zefeiti, S.M.B.,& Mohamad, N.A. (2017). The influence of organizational commitment on Omani public employees' work performance. *International Review of Management and Marketing,* 7(2), 151-160. www.econjournals.com

Alharbi, K.K. & Abdullah, A.R. (2016). Leadership styles as a source of employee organizational identification. *International Journal of Economics, Commerce and Management,* 4(12), 270-279. http://ijecm.co.uk/

Ashforth, B.E., & Mael, F. (1989). Social identity theory and the organization. *Academy of Management Review,* 14(1), 20-39. https://doi.org/10.5466/amr.1989.4278999

Aziz, H.M., Othman, B.J., Gardi, B., Ahmed, S.A., Sabir, B.Y., Ismael, N.B., Hamza, P.A., Sorguli, S., Ali, B.J., & Anwar, G. (2021). Employee Commitment: The relationship between employee commitment and job satisfaction. *Journal of Humanities and Education Development (JHED),* 3, 3, 54-66. https://dx.doi.org/10.22161/jhed.3.3.6

Banjoko, S.A., Iwuji, I.I. & Bagshaw, K. (2012). The performance of the Nigerian manufacturing sector: A 52-year analysis of growth and retrogression (1960-2012). *Journal of Asian Business Strategy,* 2(8), 177-191.

Beebe, S.A., & Masterson, J.T. (2015). *Communicating in small groups: Principles and practices*. Boston: Pearson Education.

Behun, M., Gavurova, B., Tkacova, A., &Kotaskova, A. (2018). The impact of th manufacturing industry on the economic cycle of European Union Countries. *Journal of Competitiveness*, 10(1), 23-39. doi:10.7441/joc.2018.01.02

Belmi, P., & Bowers, K. (2016). The meaning of demeaning: Social identity threats and deviant behaviour. Retrieved from https://ideas.darden.virginia.edu/2016/03/the-meaning-of-demeaning-social-identity-and-deviant-behavior/

Bhattacharya, C.B., &Elsbach, K.D. (2002). Us versus them: The roles of organizational identification and disidentification in Social marketing initiatives. *Journal of Public Policy Marketing, 21*(1), 26-36. doi:10.1509/jppm.21.1.26.17608

Bothma, F. C., Lloyd, S., &Khapova, S. N. (2015). Work identity: Clarifying the concept. In P. G. W. Jansen, & G. Roodt (Eds.), *Conceptualizing and measuring work identity* (pp. 23-52). Dordrecht: Springer.

Carmeli, A., & Freund, A. (2002). The relationship between work and workplace attitudes and perceived external prestige. *Corporate Reputation Review,* 5(1), 51-68.

Carmeli, A., Gilat, G., Waldman, D.A. (2007). The role of perceived organizational performance in organizational

identification, adjustment and job performance. *Journal of Management Studies,* 44(6), 972-992.

Chow, W.S., & Chan, L.S. (2008). Social network, social trust and shared goals in organizational knowledge sharing. *Information and Management, Administrative Science Quarterly,* 45(7), 458-465. http://Dx.Doi.Org/10.1016/J.IM.2008.06.007

Ćulibrk, J., Delić, M., Mitrović, S. & Ćulibrk, D. (2018). Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment and Job Involvement: The Mediating Role of Job Involvement. *Front Psycho.* 9(132). DOI: 10.3389/fpsyg.2018.00132

Dabir, A.R., & Azarpira, M. (2017). Organizational commitment and its impact on employees' individual interactions. *Int. J. Hum. Capital Urban Manage.,*2(1), 49-56. DOI: 10.22034/ijhcum.2017.02.01.005

David, L. (2015). Social identity theory (Tajfel, Turner) In *Learning Theories*. https://www.learning-theories.com/social-identity-theory-tajfel-turner.html

Dávila, M.C., & García, G.J. (2012). Organizational identification and commitment: Correlates of sense of belonging and affective commitment. *The Spanish Journal of Psychology*, 15(1), 244-255 http://dx.doi.org/10.5209/rev_SJOP.2012.v15.n1.37316

Dibua, C.E., Onyekwelu, N.P., & Nwagbala, C.S. (2021). Perceived prestige and organizational identification. *International Journal of Academic Management Science Research (IJAMSR)*, 5(6), 46-52, www.ijeais.org/ijamsr

Dickson, D.A. (2007). The recent trends and patterns in Nigeria's industrial development. *Council for the Development of Social Science Research in Africa,* 32(2), 139-155.

Dirani, K.M. (2009). Measuring the learning organization culture, organizational commitment and job satisfaction in the Lebanese Banking Sector. *Human Resource Development International*, 12, 189-208. https://doi.org/10.1080/13678860902764118

Dutton, J.E., Dukerich, J. & Harquail, C.V. (June, 1994): Organizational images and member identification. Administrative Science Quarterly, 39, 239–263.

Ebeh, R.E., Njoku, E.C., Ikpeazu, O.C., & Nwiana-Ana, L.B. (2017). Organisational commitment and job involvement among casual workers: the role of organisational justice. *Global Journal of Human Resource Management,* 5(4), 17-32. Published by European Centre for Research Training and Development UK (www.eajournals.org), ISSN 2053-5686(Print), ISSN 2053-5694(Online)

Edet, E.E., James, T.H., Effiong, C.E., Ishaku, R.N., & Eduno, E.B. (2022). Electricity Supply and Manufacturing Sector Output in Nigeria. *Energy Economics Letters*, 9, 44-54. DOI: 10.55493/5049.v9i1.4570

Eze, O.R., & Ogiji, F.O. (2013). Impact of fiscal policy on the manufacturing sector output in Nigeria: An error correction analysis. *International Journal of Business and Management Review (IJBMR),* 1(3), 35-55.

FinIntell (2013). Sectoral analysis of Nigeria economy. Retrieved from http://www.myfinancialintelligence.com/banking-and-finance/sectoral-analysis-nigeria's-economy

Ghannam, A.A., & Taamneh, M.M. (2017). The impact of organizational identification on organizational commitment among governmental employees in Jordan. *International Review of Management and Business Research,* 6 (3), 1026-1034.

Hasan, M. & Hussain, M. (2015). Role of perceived prestige and organizational justice in organizational identification. *European Online Journal of Natural and Social Sciences*, 4(3), 611-625. http://www.european-science.com

Hogg, M.A., & Terry, D. J. (2000). Social identity and self-categorization processes in organizational contexts. *Academy of Management Review*, 25(1), 121–140. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/259266

Hsu, C.L., & Lin, J.C.C. (2008). Acceptance of blog usage: The roles of technology acceptance, social influence and knowledge sharing motivation. *Information & Management,* 45(1), 65-74. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.im.2007.11.001

Hurst, M. (2018). *George Herbert Mead: The Self "Me" and "I".* Retrieved from https://study.com/academy/lesson/george-herbert-mead-the-self-me-i.html

Jaros, S. (2007). Meyer and Allen model of organizational commitment: Measurement issues. *The ICFAI Journal of Organizational Behavior, 6*(4), 7-26.

Jatinder, P.S. (2016). Factors that influences human behaviour at workplace: an overview. *SOPAAN-II, 1*(1), 12-17.

Johnson, W.L.J., Johnson, A.M., & Heimberg, F. (1999). A Primary and Secondary Order Component Analysis of the Organizational Identification Questionnaire. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 5*(1), 159-170.

Jones, C., & Volpe, E.H. (2010). Organizational identification: Extending our understanding of social identities through Social Networks. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour, 32*(3), 413-434. doi:10.1002/job.694

Kpakol, A.O., Obiora, N.J., & Jaja, S.A. (2016). Employee participation and organizational identification: implications of the mediating effect of organizational culture. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 8(11), 32-44. https://iiste.org/Journals/index.php/EJBM/article/view/29775

Lalwani, S. & Lalwani, S.J. (2017). Relevance of Herzberg's hygiene theory in today's context: An analysis of motivators and hygiene factors in present scenario in Indian context. *Singaporean Journal of Business Economics and Management Studies. 5*(7), 19-25. www.singaporeanjbem.com

Mael, F., & Ashforth, B. (1992a). Alumni and their alma mater: A partial test of the reformulated model of organizational identification. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour. 13*, 103-123. DOI:10.1002/job.4030130202

Mael, F., & Ashforth, B. (1992b). Loyal from one day: Biodata organizational identification, and turnover among newcomers. *Personnel Psychology*, 48, 103-123.

McIntyre, L. (2006). *The practical skeptic: Core concepts in sociology* (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw Hill. ISBN 0-07-288524-6.

Mcleod, S. (2008). *Social identity theory*. Retrieved from https:/www.simplypsychology.org/social-identity-theory.html

Meyer, J.P., & Allen, N. (1997). *Commitment in the workplace: Theory, research and application.* Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Miao, G., Eva, N., Newman, A., & Schwarz, G. (2019). Public service motivation and performance: The role of organizational identification. *Public Money & Management, 39*(2), 77-85. doi: 10.1080/09540962.2018.1556004

Michener, H. A., DeLamater, J. D., & Myers, D. J. (2004). *Social Psychology (5th ed).* Australia: Thompson Wadsworth.

NBS (2022). *Nigerian Gross Domestic Product Report Q2, 2022*. Abuja: National Bureau of Statistics.

Quick, D.L. & Nelson, J.C. (1997), Organisational Behavior: Foundations, Realities, and Challenges, (New York: West Publishing Company), pp. 83-84.

Noraazian & Khalip (2016). A three-component conceptualizational of organizational commitment. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences, 6*(12), 16-23. doi:10.6007/IJARBSS/v6-i12/2464.

Oburota, C.S., & Ifere, E.O. (2017). Manufacturing subsector and economic growth in Nigeria. *British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade*, *17*(3), 1-9. doi:10.9734/BJEMT/2017/29352.

Okon, E.O., & Osesie, S.W. (2017). Hazards of manufacturing sector and economic growth in Nigeria. *IJSSHE-International Journal of Social Sciences, Humanities and Education, 1*(1), 1-16.

Pickens, J. (2005). Chapter 3: Attitudes and perceptions. Retrieved from http://healthadmin.jbpub.com/borkowski/chapter3.pdf

Podnar, K. (2011). Perceived external prestige, organizational identification and organizational commitment: An empirical examination. *Teorija in Praksa*, *48*(6), 1611-1627. Retrieved from http://dk.fdv.uni-lj.si/db/pdfs/TiP2011_6_Podnar.pdf

Radosavljevic, Z., Cilerdzic, V., & Dragic, M. (2017). Employee organizational commitment. *Faculty of Business Economics and Entrepreneurship International Review*, 1-2, 18-26. doi:10.5937/intrev1702018R

Ravasi, D., & van Rekom, J. (2003). Key issues in organizational identity and identification theory. *Corporate Reputation Review, 6*(2), 118-132. doi:10.1057/palgrave.crr.1540194

Rhoades, L., & Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived organizational support: A review of the literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(4), 698-714.

Robbins, S. (2006). Organizational Behaviour. *Translation* (10ᵗʰed.). Jakarta: Index.

Roberts, P.W., & Dowling, G.R. (2002). Corporate reputation and sustained superior financial performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, *23*, 1077–109

Shortell, T. (n.d.) *Weber's Theory of Social Class.* Retrieved from www.brooklynsoc.org/courses/43.1/weber.html

Simon, R.M. (2016). The conflict paradigm in sociology and the study of social inequality: Paradox and Possibility. *Theory in Action, 9*(1), 1-31.

Sindic, D., & Condor, S. (2014). Social identity theory and self categorization theory. In: Nesbitt-Larking, P. … et al (Eds.), *The Palgrave Handbook of Global Political Psychology* (pp. 39-54). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Smidts, A., Van Riel, C.B.M., & Pruyn, A.T.H. (2001). The impact of employee communication and perceived external prestige on organizational identification. *Academy of Management Journal*, *49*(5), 1051-1062.

Smith, C.L. (2012). The perception of organizational prestige and employee engagement. MSC thesis submitted to the Department of Psychology, Colorado State University.

Sola, O., Obamuyi, T.M., Adekunjo, F.O., & Ogunleye, E.O. (2013). Manufacturing performance in Nigeria: Implication for sustainable development. *Asian Economic and Financial Review, 3*(9), 1195-1213.

Stinglhamber, F., Marique, G., Caesens, G., Desmette, D., Hansez, I., Hanin, D., & Bertrand, F. (2015). Employees' organizational identification and affective organizational commitment: An integrative approach. *PloS one*, *10*(4), e0123955. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0123955

Sulentic, T. S., Znidar, K., & Pavicic, J. (2017). The key determinants of perceived external prestige (PEP) – qualitative research approach. *Management, 22*(1), 49-84.

Tesavrita. C., &Suryadi, D. (2012). Identification of Herzberg's Motivator-Hygiene Factors for SME's Workers: Case Study of SME in Bandung, Indonesia. *Procedia Economics and Finance, 4*, 299-303. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2212-5671(12)00344-9

Tipurić, D., Radić, M., Cindrić, L. (2019). Organizational Identification: A Bibliometric Analysis and Mapping the Field, In: Tipurić, Darko Hruška, Domagoj (Ed.): 7th International OFEL Conference on Governance, Management and Entrepreneurship: Embracing Diversity in Organisations. April 5th - 6th, 2019, Dubrovnik, Croatia, Governance Research and Development Centre (CIRU), Zagreb, pp. 442-452

Tomola, M.O., Adedisi, T.E., & Olawale, F.K. (2012). Bank lending, economic growth and the performance of the Manufacturing Sector in Nigeria. *European Scientific Journal,* *8*(3),19-34. http://dx.doi.org/10.19044/esj.2012.v8n3p%25p

Trepte, S., & Loy, L.S. (2017). Social identity theory and self-categorization theory. In P. Rössler, C.A. Hoffner & L. van Zoonen (Eds.), *The International Encyclopedia of*

*Media Effects*. NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., doi:10.1002/9781118783764.wbieme0088

van Knippenberg, D., & van Schie, E. C. M. (2000). Foci and correlates of organizational identification. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, *73*, 137–147

van Knippenberg, D., van Dick, R., & Tavares, S. (2007). Social identity and social exchange: Identification support and withdrawal from the job. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 37*(3), 457-477. Retrieved from https://core.ac.uk/downlad/pdf/43320608.pdf

van Knippenberg, D., & Sleebos, E. (2006). Organizational identification versus organizational commitment: Self-definition, social exchange, and job attitudes. Journal of Organizational Behaviour, *27*(5), 585–605.

Wieviorka, M. (2013). Social conflict. *Current Sociology*, *61*(5–6), 696-713. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011392113499487

Williams, Y. (n.d). *What is perception in psychology? – Definition and theory. 2003-2018. Chapter 3, Lesson 7.* Retrieved from https://study.com/academy/lesson/what-is-perception-in-psychology-definition-theory-quiz.html

Yeung, K., & Martin, J.L. (2003). The looking glass self: An empirical test and elaboration. *Social Forces, 81*(3), 843-879. DOI: 10.1353/sof.2003.0048

Zayas-Ortiz, M., Rosario, E., Marquez, E., & Gruñeiro, P.C. (2015), Relationship between organizational commitments and organizational citizenship behaviour in a sample of private banking employees. *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy, 35*(1/2), 91-106. DOI:10.1108/IJSSP-02-2014-0010

**International Journal of Academic Management Science Research (IJAMSR)**
**ISSN: 2643-900X**
**Vol. 6 Issue 11, November - 2022, Pages: 93-103**

**103**