



Impact of Leader-Member Exchange and Job Satisfaction on Employees' Organisational Commitment in Public Organization in Nigeria

ZAKARI JIBRIN, AIDELOKHAI I. DENIS,
NMADU TIMOTHY, USMAN MUSA, ABU IDRIS
Ibrahim Badamasi Babangida University, Lapai, Nigeria.

Abstract. This study investigates the effects of leader-member exchange, job satisfaction and motivation on organizational commitment in public service with major focus on National Examinations Council Offices in Nigerian North-Central States of Niger, Benue and Nasarawa. This study strengthened the understanding of three important variables that affect organizational commitment—Leader-Member Exchange, job satisfaction, and motivation among personnel at the National Examinations Council. A total of 4011 and a sample of 400 randomly selected responses were collected and analyzed to assess the impact of these factors on organizational commitment. The validity of the research instrument was confirmed using Pearson Product Moment Correlation, while internal consistency was demonstrated with Cronbach's alpha values ranging from 0.592 to 0.743, indicating reliability. The mean score for LMX was 2.87, suggesting a generally low level of leader-member exchange among NECO personnel. However, specific indicators, such as "confidence in leader" and "characterization of working relationship," scored above 4, indicating some positive interactions between leaders and followers. Job satisfaction yielded a mean score of 3.43, suggesting moderate satisfaction, with high satisfaction levels for items related to role importance, but low scores for recognition and health support. Motivation results showed that intrinsic motivation, particularly "consistent promotion" (mean = 4.94), was highly valued, and extrinsic motivation was strongly influenced by "good pay" and "loyalty to employees." However, statistical analysis using the F-test yielded significance values of 0.000 for each variable (LMX, job satisfaction, and motivation), all below the alpha level of 0.05, indicating that each variable has a significant positive effect on organizational commitment. These findings

highlight the importance of positive leader-member relationships, meaningful job roles, and both intrinsic and extrinsic motivation in fostering strong organizational commitment.

Keywords: Leader-Member Exchange, Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment, Federal Agency.

1. Introduction

Effective leadership and job satisfaction are critical factors driving organizational commitment. The relationship between the quality of leadership and overall organizational performance is intricately linked to the level of socio-economic development in any given country. Consequently, the effectiveness of an organization's leaders has a direct impact on job satisfaction and, in turn, on organizational performance (Robbins and Judge, 2017). Ologbenla (2007) describes leadership as the ability to effectively guide a team, organization, or nation. Osaghae (2010) outlines several characteristics and expectations of effective leadership, including altruism, patriotism, moral integrity, a sense of historical purpose, an understanding of developmental challenges and strategies to address them, as well as courage, boldness, and determination. According to Robbins and Judge (2017), job satisfaction is defined as a positive emotion toward one's job, stemming from an assessment of its features. Kreitner and Kinicki (2012) further emphasize that job satisfaction reflects the degree to which an individual enjoys their career.

1.1 Statement of the Problem

The increasing low level of organizational commitment and outcomes has necessitated efforts by Nigerian public and private sectors organizations to achieve efficiency which

haven't gone unnoticed. Public and private organization managers have dedicated substantial amount of available resources to pursue goals as it relates to employees' commitment which is pivotal to the attainment of increased organizational performance. The low level of organizational commitment indicates that there are other factors that cause low organizational commitment. Various researches have shown a positive relationship between leadership, motivation, job satisfaction, organizational commitment and desired outcome, one of such researches was conducted by Budi Santoso, Asbari, Siswanto, & Fahmi, (2021) who found a positive relationship between organizational commitment and positive outcomes such as high performance, low employee turnover and low absence rates. Of course, this is very beneficial to the organization and can facilitate the organization goals attainment.

The role of organizational leaders is not just simply ordering his subordinates, but the establishment and sustenance of a good relationship between the superiors and subordinate. Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) to optimize employees' performance in order to achieve the predetermined targets. It is on this background that this, study assesses the effect of leader-member-exchange, job satisfaction and motivation on organizational commitment in Nigeria public sector with a key focus on the National Examinations Council (NECO) in Nigeria's North-central States of Niger, Benue and Nasarawa.

1.2 Objectives of the Study

This study seeks to find out how leader-member exchange has affected employees' organizational commitment; identify the effects of motivation on employees' organizational commitment; and know the effects of job satisfaction on employees' commitment to the organization.

To this end, the pertinent question requiring answers include: How has leader-member exchange affected employees' commitment to the organization? What are the effects of motivation on employees' commitment to the organization? What are the effects of job satisfaction on employees' commitment to the organization in National Examinations Council (NECO) in Nigeria's North-Central States of Niger, Benue and Nasarawa.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Organizational Commitment

Organizational commitment is a crucial concept in organizational behavior and management literature, as noted by Ishak *et al.* (2022), because it helps explain variations in employee attitudes and behaviors. This ongoing acknowledgment of organizational commitment stems from its reputation as a fundamental driver of organizational success. Generally, organizational commitment can be understood as the degree to which individuals are psychologically connected to their workplaces (Mowday *et al.*, 1982). Due to its complex nature, organizational commitment is often conceptualized as a multidimensional construct comprising three components: affective, continuance, and normative commitment (Meyer and Allen, 1991).

Affective organizational commitment refers to an employee's emotional attachment to their organization; those with higher levels of affective commitment choose to remain with the organization out of desire (Meyer and Allen, 1991). In contrast, continuance organizational commitment reflects an employee's perceived need to stay with the organization due to the costs associated with leaving (Meyer and Allen, 1991; Meyer and Herscovitch, 2001). Lastly, normative organizational commitment relates to an employee's sense of obligation to remain with the organization (Meyer and Allen, 1991). Employees may experience varying degrees of these three components of commitment simultaneously (Allen and Meyer, 1990).

2.2 Leader-Member Exchange (LMX)

The Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) theory focuses on the quality of relationships between leaders and their team members, operating on the principle of reciprocity (Farooq and Tripathi, 2021). This theory offers a distinctive perspective for scholars to explore leadership and its impact on various organizational stakeholders. LMX theory posits that leaders do not engage with all subordinates in the same way; rather, they develop unique relationships with each individual (Graen and Uhl-Bien, 1995). The dyadic exchanges between leaders and followers can be viewed on a continuum from low-quality (transactional) to high-quality (transformational) relationships (Kuvaaset *al.*, 2012).

High-quality LMX relationships are typically marked by trust, loyalty, and respect. In these

relationships, exchanges often encompass both tangible and intangible resources beyond what is outlined in formal job descriptions (Dansereau *et al.*, 1975; Liden and Graen, 1980). Conversely, low-quality LMX relationships are characterized by a lack of respect, minimal loyalty, and mistrust (Dechawatanapaisal, 2021), with exchanges limited to those stipulated in the employment contract (Dansereau *et al.*, 1975). Existing literature indicates that each unique LMX relationship generates different responses, attitudes, and performance behaviors from followers (Ilies *et al.*, 2007).

2.3 Job Satisfaction (JS)

Job satisfaction has been defined in diverse ways across centuries, reflecting its multidimensional nature. Early conceptualizations include Hoppock's (1936) definition, derived from Smith's (1776) postulations, which viewed JS as a combination of psychological, physiological, and environmental factors that influence employees' contentment with their jobs. Hackman and Oldham (1979) further described JS as a cluster of learned positive and negative dispositions shaped by workplace experiences, interpersonal evaluations, and job characteristics. In contrast, Smith, Kendall, and Hulin (1969) offered a one-dimensional perspective, describing JS simply as a worker's feelings about the job. Locke (1976) expanded this by defining JS as a pleasurable emotional state resulting from evaluating one's job experiences, while Spector (1985) framed it as the extent to which individuals like or dislike their jobs. These perspectives align with Herzberg *et al.*'s (1968) distinction between intrinsic and extrinsic motivators that foster satisfaction or dissatisfaction.

Contemporary scholars continue to highlight the complexity of JS. Alshallah (2004) defines it as an emotional response to current job conditions, whereas Moorhead and Griffin (2013) describe it as the degree of fulfillment derived from work. Similarly, Luthans (2006) views JS as an outcome of employees' perceptions of how well their job meets valued needs, emphasizing the role of management in shaping satisfaction. The lack of consensus across definitions has made JS difficult to conceptualize and measure (Langer, Feeney, and Lee, 2019). Gibson *et al.* (2012) identify five key dimensions of JS—work itself, salary, promotion opportunities, supervision, and co-workers—highlighting the multiple facets that shape employees' overall satisfaction.

3. Theoretical Framework

The theory adopted by this study is the Abraham Maslow Hierarchy of Needs.

3.1 Abraham Maslow Hierarchy of Needs

Maslow's hierarchy of needs was adopted for this study and is designed as a pyramid to show that fulfilling people's lower levels of needs helps them move up the pyramid. The pyramid starts at the base with physiological needs. Moving up the pyramid, people have safety needs, the need to feel a sense of love and belonging, and esteem needs. The top of the pyramid consists of self-actualization – the last category of needs. An organization can help fulfill its employees' physiological needs by providing facilities like a photocopier and benefits like health support, salary, and monetary and non-monetary benefits.

Once the physiological needs of employees are fulfilled, they seek safety needs from the job. It can be provided by helping them feel safe at the workplace. A secure and positive work environment will help organizations achieve this. A manager's and co-workers' appreciation can help employees feel a sense of love and belonging – the next level in the hierarchy of needs.

To feel esteemed, the employee must believe that their actions contribute to the company's success and feel like their career is growing. Achieving the goal of self-actualization requires employees to feel they have maximized their efforts. It helps them feel motivated and empowered, finally resulting in job satisfaction.

3.2 Relevance of Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs Theory to this Study

Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs serves as a foundational framework for understanding job satisfaction within organizations. The theory posits that fulfilling employees' basic physiological needs, such as competitive salaries and health benefits, is essential for creating a stable work environment. By addressing these foundational needs, organizations enable employees to seek safety needs, which include a secure working environment.

Furthermore, fostering a sense of love and belonging through recognition and appreciation

from management and peers cultivates emotional connections within the workplace. This, in turn, enhances employees' esteem needs, as they feel valued for their contributions and perceive opportunities for career growth. Ultimately, achieving self-actualization where employees feel they have maximized their potential leads to heightened motivation and empowerment, significantly contributing to overall job satisfaction. By strategically addressing each level of Maslow's hierarchy, organizations can create a more engaged and satisfied workforce, which is crucial for both individual and organizational success.

4. Empirical Review of Related Studies

Depta and Handrio (2024) analyzed leader-member exchange toward organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and job performance. The aim of the research was to examine relationship between leader-member exchange (LMX), organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and job performance with moderating mechanism of virtual work. The study was an explanatory quantitative approach to explain the effects of LMX toward organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and job performance during pandemic specific in the context of Islamic college. The study had a total of 108 respondents that consisted of both educational staff and lecturers from various faculties including Faculty of Business and Economics, Law, Medicine, Industrial Engineering, Psychology and Socio-Culture, Islamic Religious Science, Civil Engineering and Planning, Mathematics and Nature. The study was conducted in one of well-known private Islamic higher education in Yogyakarta. The result of the study explained that LMX had a positive significant effect on organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and job performance. However, the authors found that virtual work was only able to moderate the effect of LMX on organizational commitment and was unable to moderate the relationship of LMX, job satisfaction, and job performance.

Also, Teguh, Hazriyanto, Moch, Ratna, and Siti (2024) carried out abibliometric review of job satisfaction and organizational commitment in businesses area literatures. The purpose of the study was to analyze the relationship between leader member exchange (LMX) on organizational citizenship behavior (OCB), organizational commitment on organizational citizenship behavior (OCB), leader member exchange (LMX) on performance, organizational commitment on performance and OCB on performance. This study used a

quantitative method and the respondents to this study were 370 SMEs owners in Jabotabek who were selected using a simple random sampling method. Research data was obtained by distributing questionnaires online through social media. The questionnaire was designed using a Likert scale from 1 to 7. Data analysis used a structural equation model (SEM) with the data processing tool Smart PLS 3.0 software. The stages of testing the data are validity, reliability and hypothesis testing. The independent and dependent variables in this study are LMX, OCB, Organizational Commitment and performance. The results of this study indicate that leader member exchange (LMX) has a positive and significant effect on organizational citizenship behavior (OCB), organizational commitment has a positive and significant effect on organizational citizenship behavior (OCB), Leader member exchange (LMX) has a positive and significant effect on performance, Organizational commitment has a positive and significant effect on performance, OCB has a positive and significant effect on performance.

Additionally, Aris (2024) investigated organizational commitment influenced by motivation and training with job satisfaction and performance as mediator. The study seeks to analyze organizational commitment, which is influenced by motivation and training, with job satisfaction and performance as mediation. Data was developed using a Likert scale. The study's population was 210 employees. Using Morgan tables, data was obtained for 156 respondents, including 20 people who were intended to test the validity and reliability of the measuring instrument. Quantitative methods with multilevel linear regression were used. The IBM SPSS 24 statistical application was used for statistical calculations on the three substructures in the measurements. Findings showed that employee job satisfaction is influenced by motivation and training. Employee performance can be influenced by motivation and training. And that the indirect effect on the organizational commitment variable is influenced by motivation both through job satisfaction and performance, and organizational commitment is not influenced by training through performance. Even so, performance can be a mediating variable between motivation and organizational commitment. The study concludes that, the influence of organizational commitment can be directly influenced by motivation, performance and job satisfaction but is not influenced by the training received. The study recommended that more focus is needed on increasing job

satisfaction and performance so that good relationships can be established between employees and the company, which ultimately increases organizational commitment to employees to prevent employee turnover.

More so, Hui Wang (2023) conducted a survey on Leader-Member Exchange and Employee Job Performance: Review and Prospect. The study systematically compares domestic and international research on the relationship between leader-member exchange and employee performance between 2013 and 2022; the results of these research pointed out that the existing studies mainly conducted the relationship between leader-member exchange and employee job performance from two perspectives of myopicism and ultravisim that employees are economic or social people; and accordingly summarized the influence mechanism of leader-member exchange on the relationship between employee job performance from three aspects: individual characteristics, organizational characteristics, and cultural characteristics; conclusion, this paper supports the deficiencies of the existing research and puts forward the future prospects. The study recommended a need to conducted studies around the impact of leader-employee relationships on employee contextual performance in different management scenarios. Examine how employee performance and behavior differ compared to employees who have high quality leadership member relationships, examine the effect of leader-membership on leader performance.

Finally, Zulkifli (2022) examined extrinsic motivation and organizational commitment: a literature review. The study contended that increasing employee commitment to work is one of the most important points for the company. Without organizational commitment from an employee, the employee will tend to work less than optimally. The study aims to find the answers to the research question as to whether extrinsic motivation influence organizational commitment. The results of the study proved that extrinsic motivation influence organizational commitment. The results of the study also have implications for policymakers, that employee must be given support and also increasing the employee extrinsic motivation such as providing fair promotion, reward, and also providing a good income. The limitations of the study are that the variables used as independent variables to test commitments are still few. In the future, it will be expected to increase variables and conduct research empirically.

5. Research Methodology

The study employed both cluster sampling and simple random sampling techniques. Cluster sampling was appropriate because the organization's 2,350 staff members are distributed across various state offices. After identifying these clusters, a simple random sampling technique was applied to select 307 respondents. The sample size was calculated using Yamane's (1973) formula: $n = N / (1 + N d^2)$, where n is the sample size, N is the population (2,350), and d represents the margin of error at a 95% confidence level. Questionnaires were administered to the respondents, and responses were rated using a five-point scale: Very High/Strongly Agree (5), High/Agree (4), Moderate (3), Low/Disagree (2), and Very Low/Strongly Disagree (1). Higher scores indicated stronger and higher-quality responses, while lower scores reflected weaker levels of the variables measured.

To ensure the soundness of the research instrument, validity was assessed using the Pearson Product Moment Correlation, while reliability testing was conducted to confirm the consistency of the data. Multiple Regression analysis was used to examine the individual effects of Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) and Job Satisfaction (JS), while Spearman Correlation Analysis was employed to determine the relationships among Organizational Commitment, LMX, and JS within the selected Nigerian Federal Agency.

6. Results

Validity Test of LMX, Job Satisfaction of Personnel from a Nigerian Federal Agency

In this study, the validity assessment was conducted using the Pearson Product Moment Correlation to determine the validity of the research instrument employed. The study establishes a decision-making criterion for the validity test: if the coefficient value between the questions or statements is equal to or exceeds 0.01 ($r > 0.01$), the research questionnaire is considered valid. The validity test for the Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) variable includes 12 statement items, while the Job Satisfaction variable consists of 13 statement items.

The results of the validity test are presented in Tables 1 and 2, which indicate that the validity test outcomes for the LMX and Job Satisfaction variables show a corrected item-total correlation value exceeding the r table. Consequently, the indicators or questionnaires

utilized for each variable are validated for use as measuring instruments.

Table 1: Validity Test of LMX of Personnel from a Nigerian Federal Agency

Variable	Statement variables	r _{count}
LMX1	Do you know where you stand with your leader (follower) . . .[and] do you usually know how satisfied your leader (follower) is with what you do?	1
LMX2	How well does your leader (follower) understand your job problems and needs?	0.268
LMX3	How well does your leader (follower) recognize your potential?	0.346
LMX4	Regardless of how much formal authority your leader (follower) has built into his or her position, what are the chances that your leader (follower) would use his or her power to help you solve problems in your work?	0.058
LMX5	Again, regardless of the amount of formal authority your leader (follower) has, what are the chances that he or she would “bail you out” at his or her expense?	0.04
LMX6	I have enough confidence in my leader (follower) that I would defend and justify his or her decision if he or she were not present to do so	0.668
LMX7	How would you characterize your working relationship with your leader (follower)?	0.46
LMX8	Do you often have new and innovative ideas as a leader (follower)	0.03
LMX9	Do you often have a fresh approach to problems as a leader (follower)	0.081
LMX10	Does the organization grant access to study further	0.211
LMX11	Does the organization sponsor employee for further studies	0.292
LMX12	Are you empowered as a leader (follower) to take decisions?	0.325

Source: Field Survey, 2025

Table 2: Validity Test of Personnel Job Satisfaction from a Nigerian Federal Agency

Job Satisfaction (JS)	JS Items	Job satisfaction r _{count}
JS1	Do you feel your efforts as leader (follower) is recognized	0.03
JS2	Do you agree that the working conditions are suitable	0.062
JS3	Is the working environment safe and secured	0.11
JS4	Are you given the necessary tools to support your work?	0.86
JS5	Do you find your role in the organization important?	0.068
JS6	Does the organization offer health support to its leaders (followers)?	0.52
JS7	Do you have a work schedule?	0.209
JS8	Do you have skills to undertake the schedule?	0.191
JS9	Do you feel your schedule is important to the actualization of the organization’s goals?	0.129
JS10	Do you have the autonomy to make decisions in your department or unit?	0.364
JS11	Do you give feedback?	0.381
JS12	On a scale of 1-5, how excited are you usually to go to work?	0.777
JS13	You’re doing a fantastic job! But, are you happy with what you do?	0.109

Source: Field Survey, 2025

Reliability Test of LMX and Job Satisfaction of Personnel from a Nigerian Federal Agency

The purpose of reliability testing is to assess the consistency of the collected data, which is measured using the Spearman-Brown formula via the SPSS application. The decision-making criterion for the reliability test states that if the Cronbach's alpha value is greater than or equal to 0.60, then the research instrument is deemed reliable (Riwukore, 2010:139). The results of the reliability test for this study are shown in Table 3, confirming that all variables used (LMX and job satisfaction) are reliable.

Table 3: Reliability Test of LMX, Job Satisfaction of Personnel from a Nigerian Federal Agency

Variable	Cronbach’s Alpha	Total item
Leader member exchange	0.592	12
Job satisfaction	0.616	13

Source: Field Survey, 2025

Reliability Test of Organizational Commitment of Personnel from a Nigerian Federal Agency

The reliability test results indicate that the variables used to assess organizational commitment were reliable, with a Cronbach’s alpha value exceeding 0.6 (refer to Table 4). Furthermore, organizational commitment was evaluated using the modified Meyer and Allen (1997) scale, which includes affective, continuance, and normative commitment. Among the personnel, 71.60% expressed a willingness to continue working at the agency, reflecting varying levels of commitment. The highest level identified was normative commitment (moral and ethical obligation) at 34.50%, while continuance commitment (commitment based on financial benefits) was the lowest at 10.70%.

Table 4: Reliability Test of Organizational Commitment of Personnel from a Nigerian Federal Agency

Variable	Response	Frequency (%)	Mean	(SD)	Reliability test
Do you feel the need to leave the organization	Yes	81(26.40)	1.76	0.474	0.645
	No	220(71.60)			
	Undecided	6(2.00)			
If not, what could be your reason?	Emotional attachment (Affective)	68(22.10)	1.96	0.835	
	“I feel a strong sense of belonging to my organization”				
	Moral and ethical duty (Normative)	106(34.50)			
	“It would be very hard for me to leave my organization right now”				
	Monetary benefits (Continuance)	33(10.70)			
	“I feel a sense of obligation to remain with my current employer”				
	Undisclosed	13(4.20)			

Source: Field Survey, 2025

An Analysis of the Effects of Leader Member Exchange on Organizational Commitment from Personnel of a Nigerian Federal Agency

The result of the leader member exchange (LMX) that was obtained from the personnel of the agency was targeted at knowing the confidence level of the employee (both follower and supervisor) and focusing on the interactions and relationships between leaders and their followers. The result shows a higher agreement with LMX 2 (How well does your leader (follower) understand your job problems and needs?), LMX 3 (How well does your leader (follower) recognize your potential?), LMX 4 (What are the chances that your leader (follower) would use his or her power to help you solve problems in your work?), LMX 6 (I have enough confidence in my leader (follower) that I would defend and justify his or her decision if he or she were not present to do so), LMX 7 (How would you characterize your working relationship with your leader (follower)?) and LMX 9 (Do you often have a fresh approach to problems as a leader (follower)) with a mean score greater than 3.00 (see table 5).

On the other hand, most personnel feel they do not know where they stand with their leader or follower, or whether their leader or follower can bail them out at their expense (LMX1 and LMX 5) with a mean score of 1.05 and 1.09, respectively. On the average (moderate), LMX 8 (Do you often have new and innovative ideas as a leader (follower)), LMX 10 (Does the organization grant access to study further), LMX 11 (Does the organization sponsor employee for further studies), and LMX 12 (Are you empowered as a leader (follower) to take decisions?) recorded a mean score of 2.

Table 5: An Analysis of the Effects of Leader Member Exchange on Organizational Commitment from Personnel of a Nigerian Federal Agency

LMX	LMX Items	Frequency (%)		Mean (SD)			
		Not at all/ Strongly disagree 1	A little/ Disagree 2	Moderately/ Neutral 3	Mostly/ Agree 4	Fully/ Strongly agree 5	
LMX1	Are you aware of your standing with your leader (or follower)? Do you typically understand your leader's (or follower's) level of satisfaction with your performance?	293 (95.40)	14 (4.60)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	1.05 (0.21)
LMX2	To what extent does your leader (or follower) comprehend your job-related challenges and requirements?	61 (19.90)	51 (16.60)	15 (4.90)	180 (58.60)	0 (0.00)	3.02 (1.25)
LMX3	To what extent does your leader (or follower) acknowledge your potential?	0 (0.00)	14 (4.6)	59 (19.20)	218 (71.00)	16 (5.20)	3.77 (0.61)
LMX4	Irrespective of the formal authority vested in your leader (or follower), what are the likelihoods that they would utilize their power to assist you in resolving work-related issues?	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	300 (97.70)	7 (2.30)	0 (0.00)	3.02 (0.15)
LMX5	Regardless of the formal authority held by your leader (or follower), what are the odds that they would "bail you out" at their own expense?	285 (92.80)	15 (4.90)	7 (2.30)	0 (0.00)	284 (92.50)	1.09 (0.36)

LMX6	I have sufficient confidence in my leader (or follower) that I would defend and justify their decisions in their absence.	15 (4.9)	8 (2.60)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	284 (92.50)	4.73 (0.97)
LMX7	How would you describe your working relationship with your leader (or follower)?	8 (2.60)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	299 (97.40)	4.90 (0.64)
LMX8	Do you often have new and innovative ideas as a leader (follower)	24 (7.8)	276 (89.90)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	7 (2.30)	2.00 (0.53)
LMX9	Do you often have a fresh approach to problems as a leader (follower)	0 (0.00)	83 (27.00)	22 (7.20)	0 (0.00)	202 (65.80)	4.05 (1.35)
LMX10	Does the organization grant access to study further		244 (79.50)	23 (7.40)	0 (0.00)	40 (13.00)	2.47 (1.02)
LMX11	Does the organization sponsor employee for further studies	0 (0.00)	236 (76.90)	63(20.50)	0 (0.00)	8 (2.60)	2.28 (0.60)
LMX12	Are you empowered as a leader (follower) to take decisions?	0 (0.00)	268 (87.30)	39 (12.70)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	2.13 (0.33)
		Mean Total		2.87			

Source: Field Survey, 2025

An Analysis of the Effects of Job Satisfaction on Organizational Commitment from Personnel of a Nigerian Federal Agency

The analysis of job satisfaction among personnel in a Nigerian federal agency reveals crucial insights regarding their organizational commitment. A significant finding highlights that while a majority perceive their roles as important, with a mean score of 4.54, there is notable dissatisfaction regarding recognition of efforts, as 56% feel their contributions are acknowledged only minimally (mean score = 2.63). This underlines the need for improved recognition strategies to enhance employee motivation and commitment.

Working conditions are deemed moderately suitable by 83.1% of respondents (mean score = 2.96), indicating that while generally acceptable, further enhancements could positively impact job satisfaction and commitment levels. Additionally, safety perceptions show that 59.3% feel moderately secure, suggesting a focus on improving workplace safety could foster greater employee comfort.

The provision of necessary tools for work reflects a relatively positive outlook, with a high mean score of 3.87, although just over half report feeling adequately equipped. Conversely, health support is a critical area of concern, with 90.6% indicating dissatisfaction, which is detrimental to overall job satisfaction and commitment.

Although many employees express satisfaction with their work schedules (mean score = 4.03), a significant 82.7% feel a lack of autonomy, as evidenced by a low mean score of 2.31. This disconnect suggests that empowering employees with decision-making authority could enhance their engagement and commitment.

Finally, levels of excitement and happiness at work are moderate, with mean scores indicating a need for improved workplace culture and engagement initiatives. Addressing these areas, including recognition, health support, and employee empowerment, is essential for fostering a more committed and motivated workforce, ultimately enhancing organizational effectiveness and success.

Table 6: Impact of Job Satisfaction on Organisational Commitment from Personnel of a Nigerian Federal Agency

Job Satisfaction (JS)	JS Items	Frequency (%)					Mean (SD)
		Not at all	A little	Moderately	Mostly	Fully	
		1	2	3	4	5	
JS1	Do you feel your efforts as leader (follower) is recognized	13 (4.20)	172 (56.00)	59 (19.20)	43 (14.00)	20 (6.50)	2.63 (0.99)
JS2	Do you agree that the working conditions are suitable	0 (0.00)	34 (11.10)	255 (83.10)	13 (4.20)	5 (1.60)	2.96 (0.46)
JS3	Is the working environment safe and secured	0 (0.00)	7 (2.30)	182 (59.30)	115 (37.50)	3 (1.00)	3.37 (0.54)
JS4	Are you given the necessary tools to support your work?	0 (0.00)	6 (2.00)	156 (50.80)	16 (5.20)	129 (42.00)	3.87 (0.99)
JS5	Do you find your role in the organization important?	0 (0.00)	7 (2.30)	6 (2.00)	108 (35.20)	186 (60.80)	4.54 (0.65)

JS6	Does the organization offer health support to its leaders (followers)?	7 (2.3)	278 (90.60)	7 (2.30)	5 (1.60)	10 (3.30)	2.13 (0.62)
JS7	Do you have a work schedule?	0 (0.00)	15 (4.90)	82 (26.70)	90 (29.30)	120 (39.10)	4.03 (0.93)
JS8	Do you have skills to undertake the schedule?	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	190 (61.90)	37 (12.10)	80 (26.10)	3.64 (0.86)
JS9	Do you feel your schedule is important to the actualization of the organization's goals?	0 (0.00)	15 (4.90)	23 (7.50)	70 (22.80)	199 (64.80)	4.48 (0.83)
JS10	Do you have the autonomy to make decisions in your department or unit?	0 (0.00)	254 (82.70)	30 (9.80)	5 (1.60)	18 (5.90)	2.31 (0.77)
JS11	Do you give feedback?	0 (0.00)	23 (7.50)	122 (39.70)	60 (19.50)	102 (33.20)	3.79 (0.99)
JS12	On a scale of 1-5, how excited are you usually to go to work?	5 (1.62)	162 (52.80)	110 (35.80)	17 (5.5)	13 (4.20)	2.58 (1.37)
JS13	You're doing a fantastic job! But, are you happy with what you do?	0 (0.00)	29 (9.40)	210 (68.40)	30 (9.80)	38 (12.40)	3.25 (0.79)

Source: Field Survey, 2025

Multiple Regression Analysis to determine the individual effect (prediction) of LMX and JS from Personnel of a Nigerian Federal Agency

A multiple regression was conducted to examine the effect of LMX and job satisfaction on organizational commitment. The model was significant, $F(194) = 3.662, p < 0.001$, explaining 32% of the variance in organizational commitment (adjusted $R^2 = 0.321$).

Among the LMX items, LMX2 and LMX10 had a weak negative significant predictor ($B = -0.214, p < 0.01$) and ($B = -0.148, p < 0.05$) respectively, whereas all other LMX items recorded no significant prediction on organizational commitment ($p > 0.05$). In Job satisfaction items, JS11 ($B = 0.442, p < 0.00$), JS4 ($B = 0.384, p < 0.009$), JS10 ($B = -0.374, p < 0.001$) and JS7 ($B = 0.366, p < 0.00$) were the strongest predictors with a significant prediction ($p < 0.05$), with JS 10 having a negative strong prediction. However, JS6 ($B = 0.279, p < 0.025$) and JS12 ($B = 0.181, p < 0.047$) had a weak prediction with significance level. All the remaining items had no significant prediction on organizational commitment ($p > 0.05$).

Table 7: Multiple Regression Analysis to determine the individual effect (prediction) of LMX and JS from Personnel of a Nigerian Federal Agency

Variable	Variable Items	Standardized coefficients B	p-value
LMX 1	Are you aware of your standing with your leader (or follower)? Do you typically understand your leader's (or follower's) level of satisfaction with your performance?	0.165	0.137
LMX 2	To what extent does your leader (or follower) comprehend your job-related challenges and requirements?	-0.214	0.011
LMX 3	The extent your leader (or follower) acknowledges your potential?	0.063	0.59
LMX 4	Irrespective of the formal authority vested in your leader (or follower), what are the likelihoods that they would utilize their power to assist you in resolving work-related issues?	-0.002	0.977
LMX 5	Regardless of the formal authority held by your leader (or follower), what are the odds that they would "bail you out" at their own expense?	-0.244	0.149
LMX 6	I have sufficient confidence in my leader (or follower) that I would defend and justify their decisions in their absence.	-0.16	0.153
LMX 7	How would you describe your working relationship with your leader (or follower)?	0.107	0.347
LMX 8	Do you often have new and innovative ideas as a leader (follower)	-0.003	0.984
LMX 9	Do you often have a fresh approach to problems as a leader (follower)	-0.098	0.278
LMX 10	Does the organization grant access to study further	-0.148	0.052
LMX 11	Does the organization sponsor employee for further studies	-0.049	0.499
LMX 12	Are you empowered as a leader (follower) to take decisions?	0.035	0.717
JS 1	Do you feel your efforts as leader (follower) is recognized	-0.063	0.406
JS 2	Do you agree that the working conditions are suitable	0.113	0.103
JS 3	Is the working environment safe and secured	-0.205	0.088
JS 4	Are you given the necessary tools to support your work?	0.384	0.009
JS 5	Do you find your role in the organization important?	0.139	0.068
JS 6	Does the organization offer health support to its leaders (followers)?	0.279	0.025
JS 7	Do you have a work schedule?	0.366	0
JS 8	Do you have skills to undertake the schedule?	-0.139	0.123
JS 9	Do you feel your schedule is important to the actualization of the organization's goals?	-0.177	0.088
JS 10	Is there decision-making autonomy in your department or unit?	-0.374	0.001
JS 11	Do you give feedback?	0.442	0

JS 12	On a scale of 1-5, how excited are you usually to go to work?	0.181	0.047
JS 13	You're doing a fantastic job! But, are you happy with what you do?	0.032	0.699

Source: Field Survey, 2025. Keys: LMX- Leader member exchange JS- Job satisfaction

Correlation Analysis to determine the relationship between Organizational Commitment, LMX and JS Spearman correlation was used to determine the correlation between organizational commitment and LMX or job satisfaction. All LMX items were not significantly related to organizational commitment ($p > 0.05$), implying that these items do not meaningfully correlate to organizational commitment. On the other hand, JS1 ($r = 0.351, p < 0.001$), JS5 ($r = 0.129, p < 0.056$), JS7 ($r = 0.291, p < 0.001$), JS11 ($r = 0.201, p < 0.003$) showed a weak but statistically significant positive relationship with OC. This suggests that employees who agreed with JS item 1 tended to report slightly higher OC. However, JS9 ($r = -0.322, p < 0.001$) was weakly and negatively related to OC, and the correlation was significant.

Table 8: Spearman Correlation Analysis to determine the relationship between Organizational Commitment, LMX and JS of a Nigerian Federal Agency

Variables	Variable Items	Correlation coefficients (Spearman's rho)	p-value
LMX 1	Are you aware of your standing with your leader (or follower)? Do you typically understand your leader's (or follower's) level of satisfaction with your performance?	0.028	0.681
LMX 2	To what extent does your leader (or follower) comprehend your job-related challenges and requirements?	-0.022	0.74
LMX 3	To what extent does your leader (or follower) acknowledge your potential?	-0.045	0.74
LMX 4	Irrespective of the formal authority vested in your leader (or follower), what are the likelihoods that they would utilize their power to assist you in resolving work-related issues?	0.019	0.774
LMX 5	Regardless of the formal authority held by your leader (or follower), what are the odds that they would "bail you out" at their own expense?	0.008	0.901
LMX 6	I have sufficient confidence in my leader (or follower) that I would defend and justify their decisions in their absence.	-0.014	0.838
LMX 7	How would you describe your working relationship with your leader (or follower)?	0.026	0.705
LMX 8	Do you often have new and innovative ideas as a leader (follower)	0.048	0.475
LMX 9	Do you often have a fresh approach to problems as a leader (follower)	0.019	0.776
LMX 10	Does the organization grant access to study further	-0.021	0.757
LMX 11	Does the organization sponsor employee for further studies	-0.023	0.736
LMX 12	Are you empowered as a leader (follower) to take decisions?	0.021	0.757

Source: Field Survey; 2025

Table 9: Spearman Correlation Analysis to determine the relationship between Organizational Commitment, and JS of a Nigerian Federal Agency

Variables	Variable Items	Correlation coefficients (Spearman's rho)	p-value
JS 1	Do you feel your efforts as leader (follower) is recognized	0.351	0.001
JS 2	Do you agree that the working conditions are suitable	0.126	0.061
JS 3	Is the working environment safe and secured	-0.044	0.514
JS 4	Are you given the necessary tools to support your work?	0.035	0.61
JS 5	Do you find your role in the organization important?	0.129	0.056
JS 6	Does the organization offer health support to its leaders (followers)?	-0.004	0.95
JS 7	Do you have a work schedule?	0.291	0.001
JS 8	Do you have skills to undertake the schedule?	0.037	0.584
JS 9	Do you feel your schedule is important to the actualization of the organization's goals?	-0.322	0.001
JS 10	Is there autonomy to make decisions in your department or unit?	-0.102	0.133
JS 11	Do you give feedback?	0.201	0.003
JS 12	On a scale of 1-5, how excited are you usually to go to work?	0.071	0.294
JS 13	You're doing a fantastic job! But, are you happy with what you do?	-0.011	0.875

Source: Field Survey, 2025; Keys: JS- Job satisfaction

7. Discussion

The results indicate that LMX quality within the agency is generally moderate to high in areas involving leaders' understanding of employee needs, recognition of potential, and willingness to support workers. These findings align with Graen and Uhl-Bien (1995) and Liden *et al.* (2006), who demonstrate that supportive LMX relationships improve employees' attitudes and

perceptions of leadership effectiveness. However, the study reveals significant gaps in trust and clarity, as employees reported low confidence in knowing where they stand with their leaders (LMX1, LMX5). This contrasts with previous studies where LMX clarity is often positively associated with organizational outcomes. The weak predictive power of most LMX items on organizational commitment in this study diverges from earlier findings (e.g.,

Epitropaki and Martin, 2005), which often documented strong LMX–OC relationships. This suggests that in hierarchical or bureaucratic government settings, LMX may not operate as strongly as in private or decentralized organizations.

Job satisfaction demonstrated stronger relationships with organizational commitment, with significant predictors including task importance (JS11), work recognition (JS4), schedule satisfaction (JS7), and access to essential work tools (JS10). These patterns are consistent with Locke’s (1976) theory that job satisfaction stems from evaluating job experiences as fulfilling and meaningful. The strong predictive effect of JS11 echoes findings by Meyer and Allen (1997), who note that employees who find their tasks meaningful tend to show higher affective commitment. The negative effect observed in JS10 and JS9 suggests dissatisfaction related to specific job conditions or support systems, reinforcing assertions made by Dugguh and Dennis (2014) that unmet job expectations weaken commitment. The finding that health support programs are deeply insufficient, and autonomy is low, is consistent with studies highlighting the challenges of employee empowerment in public-sector institutions (Balfour and Wechsler, 1996). Overall, the results indicate that job satisfaction factors—particularly recognition, adequate tools, safety, and empowerment are more influential than LMX in predicting OC in this agency.

Item-level analysis using regression and correlation shows JS items carry more weight, meaning improvements in job conditions directly shape employee commitment. This aligns with previous Nigerian public-sector research indicating that job satisfaction is a more consistent predictor of commitment than leadership dynamics (Adeniji *et al.*, 2019). The weak correlations between LMX items and OC suggest that while employees acknowledge certain positive leader–follower interactions, these interactions do not translate into deeper organizational attachment—likely due to structural constraints such as limited autonomy, unclear communication, and bureaucratic rigidity.

8. Conclusion and Recommendations

This study concludes that although employees report moderately positive interactions with their leaders, LMX alone does not significantly predict organizational commitment within the Nigerian Federal Agency examined. Instead,

job satisfaction emerges as the dominant predictor of commitment, with factors such as recognition, meaningful work, adequate tools, safety, and work schedules playing central roles. Dissatisfaction in areas like autonomy and health support negatively affects commitment, underscoring the need for structural and policy improvements. The findings highlight that in hierarchical public-sector environments, organizational commitment is shaped more by job conditions than by interpersonal leadership relationships.

To strengthen commitment, the agency must invest in recognition programs, employee empowerment, improved health and safety provisions, and clearer leader–employee communication pathways. Enhancing these job satisfaction dimensions is likely to yield a more motivated, committed, and productive workforce.

References

- Adeniji, A. A., Salau, O. P., & Awe, K. (2019). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment: Evidence from the Nigerian public sector. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 42(6), 457–469.
- Allen, N.J. and Meyer, J.P. (1990), “Organisational socialization tactics: A longitudinal analysis of links to newcomers’ commitment and role orientation”, *Academy of Management Journal*, 33(4), 847-858
- Alshallah, S. (2014). *Job Satisfaction and Motivation: How Do We Inspire Employees?* Radiol Manage. 2004 March-April; 26(2):47-51.
- Aris, B (2024) Organizational Commitment Influenced by Motivation and Training with Job Satisfaction and Performance as Mediator. *Journal.literasisains.id*. Vol. 3 No. 1(16-32)
- Balfour, D. L., & Wechsler, B. (1996). Organizational commitment: Antecedents and outcomes in public organizations. *Public Productivity & Management Review*, 19(3), 256–277.
- Breevaart K, Bakker A B, Demerouti E, (2017) Leader-Member Exchange, Work Engagement, and Job Performance. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 30 (7): 754 – 770.
- Dansereau, F., Jr., Graen, G. and Haga, W.J. (1975), “A vertical dyad linkage approach to leadership within formal organisations: A longitudinal investigation of the role making

- process”, *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, Vol. 13 No. 1, pp. 46-78.
- Dechawatanapaisal, D. (2021), “Effects of leader-member exchange ambivalence on work attitudes: A moderated mediation model”, *Journal of Management Development*, Vol. 40 No. 1, pp. 35-51, doi: 10.1108/JMD-07-2020-0233.
- Depta., B. H. & Handrio, A. P. (2023). Analysis of Leader-Member Exchange Toward Organizational Commitment, Job Satisfaction, Job Performance: Is Virtual Work Moderating? *Journal of Business and management Review*. 2723-1097.
- Dugguh, S. I., & Dennis, A. (2014). Job satisfaction theories: Traceability to employee performance in organizations. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management*, 16(5), 11–18.
- Epitropaki, O., & Martin, R. (2005). The moderating role of individual differences in the relation between transformational/transactional leadership and organizational identification. *Leadership Quarterly*, 16(4), 569–589.
- Fahlevi, M. (2020). Exchange (LMX) and Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) to Indonesian Lecturers’ Performance. *Systematic Reviews in Pharmacy*, 11(9).
- Farooq, R. and Tripathi, N. (2021), “Moderating role of power distance in the relationship between leader-leader exchange (LLX) and knowledge sharing: is feedback-seeking behavior a missing link?”, *VINE Journal of Information and Knowledge Management Systems*, Vol. ahead-of-print No. ahead-of-print, doi: 10.1108/VJIKMS-08-2021-0154.
- Gibson, J.L., Ivancevich, J.M., Donnelly, J.H., Konopaske, R. (2012), *Organizations: Behavior, Structure and Processes*. 14thEd. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Graen, G. B., & Uhl-Bien, M. (1995). Relationship-based approach to leadership: Development of Leader–Member Exchange (LMX) theory over 25 years. *Leadership Quarterly*, 6(2), 219–247.
- Graen, G.B. and Uhl-Bien, M. (1995), “Relationship-based approach to leadership: development of leader-member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years: applying a multi-level multidomain perspective”, *The Leadership Quarterly*, 6(2). 219-247.
- Hackman, J. R., & Oldman, G. R. (1979). *Work Redesign*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Herzberg, & Frederick. (1968). *Herzberg’s Motivation-Hygiene Theory and Job Satisfaction in the Malaysian Retail Sector: The Mediating Effect of Love Money*. Sunway University Malaysia: Teck Hang Tan and Amna Waheed
- Hoppock, R. (1936). *Age and Job Satisfaction*. Psychological Monographs, 47(2), 115–118.
- Hui Wang (2023) Leader-Member Exchange and Employee Job Performance: *Review and Prospect*. *BCP Business & Management*. Vol. 39
- Ishak, N.M., Naqshbandi, M.M., Zahidul Islam M. D. & Haji Sumardi, W. A. (2022). The role of organisational commitment and leader-member exchange in knowledge application during the COVID-19 pandemic. <https://www.emerald.com/insight/2059-5891.htm>
- Kreitner, R., & Kinicki, A. (2012). *Organizational Behavior*. New York: McGraw-Hill
- Kuvaas, B., Buch, R., Dysvik, A. and Haerem, T. (2012), “Economic and social leader–member exchange relationships and follower performance”, *The Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 23 No. 5, pp. 756-765.
- Langer, J., Feeney, M. K., & Lee, S. E. (2019). Employee Fit and Job Satisfaction in Bureaucratic and Entrepreneurial Work Environments. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 39, 135-155. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0734371X17693056>
- Liden, R. C., Sparrowe, R. T., & Wayne, S. J. (2006). Leader–Member Exchange theory: The past and potential for the future. In J. Greenberg (Ed.), *Organizational Behavior: The State of the Science* (pp. 73–119). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Locke, E. A. (1976). The Nature and Causes of Job Satisfaction. *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*. Chicago: Rand McNally, 45, 1297-1349.
- Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology* (pp. 1297–1349). Rand McNally.

- Luthans, F. (2006), *Perilaku Organisasi*. 10th ed. Yogyakarta: Andi. *Human Resource Development International*
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1997). *Commitment in the workplace: Theory, research, and application*. SAGE Publications.
- Meyer, J.P. and Allen, N.J. (1991), “A three-component conceptualization of organisational commitment”, *Human Resource Management Review*, 1(1), 61-89.
- Meyer, J.P. and Herscovitch, L. (2001), “Commitment in the workplace: Toward a general model”, *Human Resource Management Review*, 11(3), 299-326.
- Moorhead, G., Griffin, R.W. (2013), *Perilaku Organisasi: Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusiadan Organisasi*. Jakarta: Salemba Empat.
- Mowday, R., Porter, L. and Steers, R. (1982), “Employee – organization linkages the psychology of commitment”, *Absenteeism, and Turnover*, Academic Press, New York, NY.
- Nugroho, B. S., Hakim, L., Irawan, B., Sugeng Sholehuddin, M., Ibrahim, T., Ridlwan, M.& Ologbenla., D.K. (2007). Leadership, Governance and Corruption in Nigeria. *Journal of Organizational Commitment Towards Indonesian School Performance. System Review Pharm*, 11(9), 962-971.
- Osaghae E.E (2010). The Limits of Charismatic Authority and the Challenges of Leadership in Nigeria. *Journal of Contemporary African Studies*. 29(2). 407-422.
- Sa’adah, N., & Rijanti, T. (2022). The Role of Knowledge Sharing, Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) on Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Employee Performance: An Empirical Study on Public Health Center of Pati 1, Pati 2 and Trangkil in Central Java. *International Journal of Social and Management Studies*, 3(1), 112–131.
- Smith, P. C., Kendall, L. M., & Hulin, C. L. (1969). *The Measurement of Satisfaction in Work and Retirement*. Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.
- Spector, P. E. (1985). Measurement of Human Service Staff Satisfaction: Development of the Job Satisfaction Survey. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 13, 693–713. doi:10.1007/bf00929796
- Teguh I.S, Hazriyanto, Moch A. H, Ratna K.P, & Siti. A. (2024). The Role of Leader Member Exchange (LMX), Organization Citizenship Behavior (OCB) on Organizational Commitment and Performance: An Empirical Study on Indonesian SMEs. *Jurnal Office: Jurnal Pemikiran Ilmiah dan Pendidikan Administrasi Perkantoran* Vol. 8(2)
- Wahyuningrat, W., & Rusmawan, T. (2022). The Role of Perceived Organizational Support (POS), Emotional Intelligence (EI) and Organizational Commitment (OC) on Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) of Government Staff. *Journal of Industrial Engineering & Management Research*, 3(6), 175-184.
- Zulkifli. M.E.S (2022) Extrinsic Motivation and Organizational Commitment: A Literature. *International Journal of Business Technology and Organizational Behavior (IJBTOB)*