

Organizational Commitment and Job Performance of Employees in a Select National Government Agency

Glory June T. Maravilla*, Ruvy M. Tuble

Department of Public Works and Highways, Binalbagan, Negros Occidental, Philippines
Carlos Hilado Memorial State University – Fortune Towne Campus, Bacolod City, Philippines

*Corresponding Author Email: gjunemaravilla@yahoo.com

Date received: April 28, 2025

Date revised: May 23, 2025

Date accepted: June 22, 2025

Originality: 92%

Grammarly Score: 99%

Similarity: 8%

Recommended citation:

Maravilla, G.J., & Tuble, R. (2025). Organizational commitment and job performance of employees in a select national government agency. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, 3(7), 483-494.
<https://doi.org/10.69569/jip.2025.318>

Abstract. Organizational commitment is a key factor influencing employee performance, yet limited local studies examine how its dimensions relate to job outcomes in public sector settings. This study determined the levels of organizational commitment and job performance of regular employees in a national government agency in the Philippines. It also examined whether affective, continuance, and normative commitment—and task, contextual, and adaptive performance—varied by age, sex, educational attainment, length of service, and unit assignment. Additionally, it explored the relationship between organizational commitment and job performance. Using a descriptive-correlational design, data were collected from 60 permanent employees through a standardized questionnaire and analyzed using the Kruskal-Wallis H test, Mann-Whitney U test, and Spearman rank correlation. Results showed that affective commitment was high and significantly correlated with task and contextual performance. Normative commitment ranged from moderate to high and was positively associated with job outcomes. Continuance commitment was mild and had limited influence on performance. Task performance was strongest among employees with longer tenures, while contextual and adaptive performance showed significant differences across organizational units, suggesting the impact of workplace culture. No substantial differences in commitment and performance were observed across sex, age, and educational attainment. The findings underscore the importance of fostering affective and normative commitment to boost employee performance. The study recommends implementing leadership development programs, employee recognition initiatives, and structured career advancement paths to strengthen emotional attachment, loyalty, and engagement within the organization.

Keywords: Adaptive performance; Affective commitment; Contextual performance; Continuance commitment; Normative commitment; Task performance.

1.0 Introduction

Employees in government institutions play a crucial role in delivering public services. However, persistent challenges in job performance and varying levels of organizational commitment continue to undermine their effectiveness in the Philippine public sector. A recent national report by Calapre (2024) reveals that only 54% of government workers report a strong sense of commitment to their organizations, with merely 60% believing they are performing at their best. These alarming statistics highlight significant concerns about employee engagement and the overall effectiveness of public agencies, especially given their obligation to meet high service delivery and accountability standards.

As defined by Meyer and Allen (1991, cited in Cunha et al., 2021), organizational commitment encompasses three distinct dimensions—*affective*, *continuance*, and *normative*—influencing employees' motivation to remain engaged and contribute meaningfully to their organizations. Research consistently links higher levels of commitment with enhanced job performance and lower rates of turnover (Nguyen et al., 2020; Dafiq & Solihat, 2023). In this context, job performance is not limited to executing core responsibilities; it also includes employees' willingness to pursue broader institutional objectives (Triansyah et al., 2023). Furthermore, empirical data from the Philippine Civil Service Commission (2022) indicate that agencies implementing robust human resource practices, such as merit-based promotions and professional development initiatives, can achieve a 15% increase in work efficiency. It further underscores the tangible advantages of fostering employee commitment.

While these findings are insightful, it is noteworthy that most existing research predominantly concentrates on the private sector, where conditions, employee expectations, and performance incentives differ significantly from those in the public sector. As Sungu et al. (2020) highlight, public institutions typically operate within rigid bureaucratic frameworks and job security models that fundamentally shape organizational behavior. Much of the current research addresses organizational commitment as a singular construct, overlooking how its components may influence job performance (Vishal & Usha, 2024). This gap is particularly critical in the Philippines, where public works and infrastructure agencies lack comprehensive empirical studies exploring how multidimensional commitment correlates with various facets of job performance.

This study aims to investigate the levels of organizational commitment—including *affective*, *continuance*, and *normative* dimensions—and job performance in terms of *task*, *contextual*, and *adaptive* performance among regular employees in a national government agency in the Philippines. It will also examine the variation of these dimensions across demographic factors such as age, sex, educational attainment, length of service, and unit assignment while exploring the relationship between organizational commitment and job performance. By addressing these gaps in the literature and presenting data from a public sector perspective, this study seeks to inform evidence-based strategies that enhance employee engagement, optimize performance, and ultimately improve the quality of government service delivery.

2.0 Methodology

2.1 Research Design

This study utilized a descriptive-correlational research design to analyze organizational commitment and job performance among employees in a selected national government agency. The descriptive aspect systematically observes and records the characteristics of the subjects without manipulation, enabling the collection of quantitative data for numerical or categorical analysis (Bueno, 2023). This method effectively assesses commitment and job performance levels through indicators such as *affective*, *continuance*, and *normative* commitment alongside *task*, *contextual*, and *adaptive* performance. The correlational design further explores the relationships between these variables, revealing how changes in one variable may correspond to changes in another (Yason, 2020). While it does not prove causation, it identifies patterns of association that are crucial for understanding the link between organizational commitment and job performance. The research design is particularly relevant as the study seeks to establish whether significant relationships exist between these constructs. Combining descriptive and correlational approaches, this study provides a comprehensive analysis that outlines the key traits of organizational commitment and job performance and investigates their interrelationships. This methodological framework offers empirical evidence that can inform strategies to improve employee commitment and performance within the public sector.

2.2 Research Participants

The study participants were regular 2nd District Engineering Office employees who had rendered at least one year of continuous service in their respective positions, ensuring that all respondents had sufficient familiarity with the organization's operations and work environment. From a total population of 71 employees, a sample size of 60 was determined using Yamane's formula with a 5% margin of error. The study employed stratified random sampling based on departmental assignments to ensure fair and proportional representation across various functional units. The distribution of respondents was as follows: six from the Office of the District Supervisor (ODS), seven from Administration, eleven from Construction, five from Finance, twelve from Maintenance, eleven from Planning, and eight from Quality Assurance. This sampling technique allowed for equal chances of selection among employees while ensuring that the perspectives of each unit were adequately represented in the study.

2.3 Research Instrument

The study utilized a standardized and adopted survey questionnaire to measure organizational commitment and job performance among employees. While the instrument was not subjected to validity testing in this study, it had been previously tested for reliability. Permission from the original authors was secured before its use. The questionnaire consisted of three sections: (1) Demographic Profile, which gathered basic information such as age, sex, education, length of service, and unit assignment; (2) Organizational Commitment, adapted from the Three-Component Model of Allen and Meyer by Saluria (2019), which used a 7-point Likert scale to assess affective, continuance, and normative commitment. This section achieved a high-reliability index of .896, indicating consistent internal responses, and (3) Job Performance, adapted from Esmane (2024), which measured task, contextual, and adaptive performance on a 4-point scale. It obtained a reliability index of .926, signifying excellent internal consistency. These reliability scores suggest that the instrument provided dependable and consistent results across respondents.

2.4 Data Gathering Procedure and Analysis

This study used specific steps to ensure an organized data-gathering process. A formal request letter was first submitted to the head of the national government agency involved, seeking permission to conduct the study. Upon receiving approval, the researcher strictly adhered to ethical research standards by informing participants about the study's objectives, securing voluntary participation, ensuring confidentiality, and emphasizing their right to withdraw at any stage without consequences. Data collection followed a quantitative approach, utilizing an adopted survey questionnaire administered face-to-face. Respondents were given one week to complete the instrument. Afterward, the researcher retrieved the completed questionnaires, which were then sorted, tallied, and encoded for analysis. The data were processed and interpreted using appropriate statistical tools and software to generate results that supported the study's conclusions.

2.5 Ethical Considerations

This research study followed ethical guidelines to ensure all participants' protection, privacy, and well-being. Before data collection, formal approval was secured from the head of the office. Participation was voluntary, and informed consent was obtained after explaining the study's purpose, procedures, potential benefits, and risks. Respondents were assured of their right to withdraw or skip any question without consequence. To maintain anonymity and confidentiality, all data were anonymized and securely stored in compliance with RA 10173 or the Data Privacy Act of 2012. Participants were also informed that while some items may touch on personal or work-related matters, their comfort and autonomy were always prioritized. Upon completion of the study, all data were carefully disposed of—digital files were permanently deleted, and hard copies were shredded, ensuring that participants' privacy was safeguarded throughout and beyond the research process.

3.0 Results and Discussion

3.1 Organizational Commitment of Employees

Tables 1 to 4 present the level of organizational commitment among employees, with Table 1 summarizing the overall commitment and Tables 2 to 4 detailing the specific dimensions: affective, continuance, and normative commitment. These forms align with the three-component commitment model by Meyer and Allen (1991), which posits that emotional attachment, cost-based considerations, or moral obligation can connect employees to their organization.

Organizational Commitment of Employees as a Whole

As shown in Table 1, employees demonstrated a moderately high level of organizational commitment, with an overall mean of 4.87 (SD = 0.57). Among the three dimensions, affective commitment scored the highest at $M = 5.27$ (SD = 0.82), indicating that employees generally feel emotionally attached and personally invested in the organization. This was followed by normative commitment ($M = 4.80$, SD = 0.70), which reflects a sense of moral obligation, and continuance commitment ($M = 4.54$, SD = 0.71), associated with perceived leave costs. The relatively low standard deviations, especially for continuance and normative commitment, suggest consistency in employee responses. In contrast, the slightly higher variability in affective commitment implies differences in how emotionally connected employees feel. This pattern points to an emotionally engaged workforce, yet considers practical and moral factors in their commitment. The dominance of affective commitment indicates a favorable organizational climate where many employees are not merely staying for practical reasons but are motivated by personal meaning and alignment with the organization's values. These findings support Wziatek-Stasko et al. (2023) and Murray and Holmes (2021) that affective commitment tends to be the most robust and variable among

the three. Normative commitment's moderately high score aligns with the observations of Pitaloka and Putri (2021) and CSC (2022) regarding the influence of internalized loyalty norms, while continuance commitment echoes Soriano's (2021) view on retention driven by perceived losses.

From a standard deviation (SD) perspective, the scores ranged from 0.57 to 0.82 across the dimensions, indicating a relatively narrow dispersion of responses. The result suggests that, although some variability exists—particularly in affective aspects—the employees tend to share similar views on their commitment levels, offering a consistent insight into the prevailing organizational climate. Given these findings, targeted strategies can be developed to enhance further commitment: fostering inclusive and emotionally enriching environments to reinforce affective commitment, providing growth and career security to support continuance commitment, and cultivating an ethical and values-based culture to strengthen normative commitment (Abbas & Ahmed, 2023; Nguyen et al., 2020; Metlo et al., 2022).

Table 1. *Level of Organizational Commitment of Employees*

Indicators	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Affective Commitment	5.27	0.82	Moderately High
Continuance Commitment	4.54	0.71	Moderately High
Normative Commitment	4.80	0.70	Moderately High
Whole	4.87	0.57	Moderately High

Mean Scale: 1.00-1.49 *Very low*, 1.50-2.49 *Low*, 2.50-3.49 *Moderately low*, 3.50-4.49 *Average*, 4.50-5.49 *Moderately high*, 5.50-6.49 *High*, and 6.50-7.00 *Very High*

Level of Affective Commitment of Employees

Table 2 reveals that employees' affective commitment is moderately high, with an average mean of 5.27 (SD = 1.74). High mean scores were observed for statements such as "I would be thrilled to spend the rest of my career in this organization" (M = 6.13) and "This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me" (M = 6.05), suggesting that many employees view their work as fulfilling and aligned with personal values. However, lower ratings for items like "I could easily become attached to another organization" (M = 4.17) and "I do not feel like part of the family at my organization" (M = 4.78) reflect variability in emotional bonds. The standard deviations of up to 2.07 also underscore differing experiences in workplace integration and emotional connection. These findings imply that while many employees are deeply engaged and emotionally committed, others may not feel a strong sense of belonging. The result supports the notion of affective commitment as both the most desired and variable form of commitment, as discussed by Murray and Holmes (2021). Strengthening affective commitment may require leadership to foster more inclusive, meaningful, and empowering experiences within the organization.

Table 2. *Level of Affective Commitment of Employees*

Indicators	Mean	SD	Interpretation
I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career in this organization.	6.13	1.31	High
I enjoy discussing my organization with people outside it.	5.72	1.24	High
I really feel as if this organization's problems are my own.	5.28	1.68	Moderately High
I think that I could easily become as attached to another organization as I am to this one.	4.17	1.66	Average
I do not feel like part of the family at my organization.	4.78	2.07	Moderately High
I do not feel emotionally attached to this organization.	4.73	1.92	Moderately High
This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me.	6.05	1.21	High
Mean	5.27	1.74	Moderately High

Mean Scale: 1.00-1.49 *Very low*, 1.50-2.49 *Low*, 2.50-3.49 *Moderately low*, 3.50-4.49 *Average*, 4.50-5.49 *Moderately high*, 5.50-6.49 *High*, and 6.50-7.00 *Very High*

Level of Continuance Commitment of Employees

As presented in Table 3, the continuance commitment dimension registered an average mean of 4.54 (SD = 1.77), indicating a moderately high level. Employees' perception of the costs of leaving the organization shapes this commitment. Items such as "Staying is a matter of necessity as much as desire" (M = 5.27) and "It would be hard to leave even if I wanted to" (M = 5.03) scored relatively high, suggesting that employees perceive a significant personal or professional loss in the event of departure. However, the wide range in standard deviations, particularly for "I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving" (SD = 2.06), shows that some employees feel more freedom to leave than others. The dispersion of responses, with an overall SD of 1.77, reflects the influence of individual circumstances such as tenure, financial status, and external job opportunities. The results align with

Soriano (2021) and De la Rosa (2020), emphasizing that continuance commitment often hinges on individual cost-benefit analyses. Organizations should seek to transform necessity-based retention into opportunity-driven loyalty, ensuring that employees stay not out of obligation but because they see long-term personal and professional growth.

Table 3. *Level of Organizational Commitment of Employees*

Indicators	Mean	SD	Interpretation
I am not afraid of what might happen if I quit my job without having another lined up.	3.78	1.56	Average
It would be very hard for me to leave my organization right now, even if I wanted to.	5.03	1.56	Moderately High
Too much in my life would be disrupted if I decide I decided to leave my organization now.	4.88	1.80	Moderately High
It wouldn't be too costly for me to leave my organization now.	4.02	1.94	Average
Right now, staying with my organization is a matter of necessity as much desire.	5.27	1.41	Moderately High
I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving this organization.	3.87	2.06	Average
One of the few serious consequences of leaving this organization would be the scarcity of available alternatives.	4.57	1.75	Moderately High
One of the major reasons I continue to work for this organization require considerable personal sacrifice-- another organization may not match the overall benefits I have.	4.93	1.39	Moderately High
Mean	4.54	1.77	Moderately High

Mean Scale: 1.00-1.49 *Very low*, 1.50-2.49 *Low*, 2.50-3.49 *Moderately low*, 3.50-4.49 *Average*, 4.50-5.49 *Moderately high*, 5.50-6.49 *High*, and 6.50-7.00 *Very High*

Level of Normative Commitment of Employees

Table 4 shows that employees scored a moderately high level of normative commitment, with an average mean of 4.80 ($SD = 1.60$). The result suggests that many employees stay not just because they want to or need to, but because they feel they ought to, out of moral responsibility and loyalty. The high mean scores for statements like "I was taught to believe in the value of remaining loyal to one organization" ($M = 5.48$) and "My sense of moral obligation to remain" ($M = 5.20$) indicate strong internalization of loyalty values. In contrast, lower scores on items like "Jumping from organization to organization does not seem unethical" ($M = 4.07$) reflect evolving attitudes among some employees, suggesting that loyalty is no longer universally upheld as a virtue in all work cultures.

The relatively low variability in responses supports the idea that normative commitment is more culturally and ethically shaped, often reinforced by socialization and personal values. As highlighted by Pitaloka and Putri (2021) and Boyd and Nowell (2020), promoting an ethical and inclusive workplace may help deepen this commitment, especially among younger or more mobile employees who may be re-evaluating traditional job tenures.

Table 4. *Level of Normative Commitment of Employees*

Indicators	Mean	SD	Interpretation
I think that people these days move from organization to organization too often.	4.63	1.45	Moderately High
I do not believe that a person must always be loyal to his or her organization.	4.92	1.72	Moderately High
Jumping from organization to organization does not seem at all unethical to me.	4.07	1.55	Average
One of the main reasons I continue to work for this organization is my sense of moral obligation to remain.	5.20	1.45	Moderately High
If I got another offer for a better job elsewhere, I would not feel it was right to leave my organization.	4.98	1.43	Moderately High
I was taught to believe in the value of remaining loyal to one organization.	5.48	1.48	Moderately High
Things were better in the days when people stayed with one organization for most of their careers.	5.07	1.33	Moderately High
I do not think that wanting to be a "company man" or "company woman" is sensible anymore	4.03	1.78	Average
Mean	4.80	1.60	Moderately High

Mean Scale: 1.00-1.49 *Very low*, 1.50-2.49 *Low*, 2.50-3.49 *Moderately low*, 3.50-4.49 *Average*, 4.50-5.49 *Moderately high*, 5.50-6.49 *High*, and 6.50-7.00 *Very High*

3.2 Job Performance of Employees

This section presents a comprehensive analysis of employees' job performance based on three key dimensions: task performance, contextual performance, and adaptive performance. The data are summarized in Tables 5 to 8.

Level of Job Performance of Employees as a Whole

The overall level of job performance among employees, as shown in Table 5, yielded a mean score of 3.45 with a standard deviation of 0.27, interpreted as high. Among the three performance dimensions, adaptive performance garnered the highest mean ($M = 3.56$, $SD = 0.30$), closely followed by contextual performance ($M = 3.53$, $SD = 0.31$), both interpreted as very high. On the other hand, task performance obtained a lower mean ($M = 3.28$, $SD = 0.50$), albeit still within the high range. These results indicate that while employees perform well in their assigned duties, they excel more in flexibility, cooperation, and positive workplace relationships. The relatively low standard deviations across all dimensions suggest high response consistency. The finding indicates that favorable performance levels are commonly observed among employees and not just limited to a few individuals. These findings reinforce the assertion by Bhardwaj and Kalia (2021) that job performance is multi-faceted, with contextual and adaptive behaviors playing a vital role in overall job performance. Similarly, Yoo and Kim (2021) emphasized that in today's rapidly evolving workplaces, the ability to adapt has become a key element of success. The high adaptive performance observed in this study also echoes the insights of Jundt and Shoss (2023), who highlighted that higher adaptive performance is particularly crucial in the public sector, especially in contexts involving infrastructure management and service delivery.

Table 5. *Level of Job Performance of Employees*

Indicators	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Task Performance	3.28	0.50	High
Contextual Performance	3.53	0.31	Very High
Adaptive Performance	3.56	0.30	Very High
Grand Mean	3.45	0.27	High

Mean Scale: 1.00-1.49 *Very low*, 1.50-2.49 *Low*, 2.50-3.49 *Moderately low*, 3.50-4.49 *Average*, 4.50-5.49 *Moderately high*, 5.50-6.49 *High*, and 6.50-7.00 *Very High*

Level of Task Performance of Employees

The result in Table 6, focusing on task performance, revealed a high mean of 3.28 with a standard deviation of 0.73, reflecting moderate variability in employee responses. The highest-rated item was "I offer ideas to improve the organization's functioning" ($M = 3.62$, $SD = 0.64$), suggesting that employees actively contribute to organizational innovation. Conversely, the lowest-rated item was "I volunteered to attend meetings or work on committees on my own time" ($M = 3.03$, $SD = 0.86$), which may imply that employees are more hesitant or less motivated to engage in voluntary tasks outside of their core responsibilities. The broader range in standard deviation values, particularly the 0.86 on the lowest-rated item, suggests variability in how employees view or approach optional responsibilities, possibly influenced by differing workloads, time availability, or role expectations. These findings align with Rasul et al. (2020), who emphasized that effective management practices – especially those that promote autonomy and task clarity – enhance task performance. When employees are clear on what is expected and are empowered to take initiative, they are more likely to contribute meaningfully to organizational goals.

Furthermore, Allen et al. (2020) stressed that meeting effectiveness contributes to performance only when meetings are small and purpose-driven. The result supports the interpretation that low participation in voluntary meetings may stem from poor meeting design or perceived inefficiency. Additionally, Tuna (2020) found that while not always directly affecting task performance, organizational constraints can weaken organizational identification, reducing engagement in broader organizational behaviors such as attending optional meetings or collaborative events.

Table 6. *Level of Task Performance of Employees*

Indicators	Mean	SD	Interpretation
I offer ideas to improve the functioning of the organization.	3.62	0.64	Very high
I worked weekends or other days off to complete a project or task.	3.15	0.66	High
I volunteered for extra work assignments.	3.08	0.77	High
I came in early or stayed late without pay to complete a project or task.	3.28	0.64	High
I volunteered to attend meetings or work on committees on own time.	3.03	0.86	High
I keep up with developments in the organization.	3.48	0.62	High
Mean	3.28	0.73	High

Mean Scale: 1.00-1.49 *Very low*, 1.50-2.49 *Low*, 2.50-3.49 *Moderately low*, 3.50-4.49 *Average*, 4.50-5.49 *Moderately high*, 5.50-6.49 *High*, and 6.50-7.00 *Very High*

Level of Contextual Performance of Employees

Regarding contextual performance (Table 7), the mean score was 3.53 with a standard deviation of 0.58, interpreted as very high, indicating that employees generally exhibit strong interpersonal and organizational citizenship behaviors. The item "I am willing to help my co-workers if needed" received the highest mean ($M = 3.73$, $SD = 0.48$), closely followed by "I maintain a good relationship with my co-worker" ($M = 3.67$, $SD = 0.48$), reflecting a supportive and collegial work environment. However, items such as "I socialize with my co-workers during my free time" ($M = 3.38$, $SD = 0.61$) and "I avoid criticism and back fighting" ($M = 3.42$, $SD = 0.65$) scored slightly lower, though still within the high category. These findings indicate that while employees maintain professionalism and collaboration during work, social interaction beyond work may be less prioritized. The standard deviations in this category are slightly lower than those in task performance, implying more uniformity in contextual behaviors across the workforce. These findings are consistent with Yoo and Kim (2021) asserting that contextual performance is instrumental in enhancing organizational resilience, especially in dynamic work environments. Their research supports the idea that fostering positive workplace behaviors contributes significantly to the organization's overall performance.

Table 7. Level of Contextual Performance of Employees

Indicators	Mean	SD	Interpretation
I maintain emotional balance in difficult situations.	3.52	0.62	Very High
I helped new employees get oriented to the job.	3.55	0.50	Very High
I accept good ideas from my co-workers.	3.55	0.50	Very High
I socialize with my co-workers during my free time.	3.38	0.61	High
I am willing to help my co-workers if needed.	3.73	0.48	Very High
I avoid criticism and back fighting of co-workers in my workplace.	3.42	0.65	High
I can handle disagreement with the people inside the organization.	3.42	0.67	High
I maintain good relationship with my co-worker.	3.67	0.48	Very High
Mean	3.53	0.58	Very High

Mean Scale: 1.00-1.49 Very low, 1.50-2.49 Low, 2.50-3.49 Moderately low, 3.50-4.49 Average, 4.50-5.49 Moderately high, 5.50-6.49 High, and 6.50-7.00 Very High

Level of Adaptive Performance of Employees

Finally, adaptive performance presented in Table 8 stood out as the highest-rated dimension, with an overall mean of 3.56 and a standard deviation of 0.53, signifying a very high level of performance with moderate consistency. The highest-rated item was "I respect cultural differences, fostering an inclusive environment" ($M = 3.83$, $SD = 0.42$), followed by "I maintain professionalism and respect in all interactions" ($M = 3.73$, $SD = 0.45$), indicating strong inclusivity and emotional intelligence among employees. The lowest-rated items were "I easily adapt to physical demands or changes at work" ($M = 3.30$, $SD = 0.53$) and "I seek support when overwhelmed" ($M = 3.32$, $SD = 0.57$), which, while still high, point to possible areas for improvement related to physical adaptability and openness to seeking help. The relatively lower standard deviations in this category reflect that employees, in general, are consistent in demonstrating flexibility and openness to change, traits essential in a dynamic work environment. These findings align with Jundt and Shoss (2023), who emphasize the significance of adaptive behaviors in managing public infrastructure and service delivery, asserting that employees who thrive in unpredictable and multicultural environments contribute significantly to institutional resilience and operational success. The high scores on cultural inclusivity and emotional regulation also support the conclusions of Panuelos (2023), who emphasized adaptive performance as a key element in organizational success.

Table 8. Level of Adaptive Performance of Employees

Indicators	Mean	SD	Interpretation
I easily adapt to physical demands or changes at work.	3.30	0.53	High
I seek colleagues' or supervisors' support when overwhelmed.	3.32	0.57	High
I'm open to new ideas when solving complex problems.	3.58	0.53	Very High
I stay positive and adaptable during unpredictable situations or changes.	3.65	0.48	Very High
I seek learning opportunities to enhance my skills and knowledge.	3.48	0.54	High
I maintain professionalism and respect in all interactions.	3.73	0.45	Very High
I respect cultural differences, fostering an inclusive environment.	3.83	0.42	Very High
Mean	3.56	0.53	Very High

Mean Scale: 1.00-1.49 Very low, 1.50-2.49 Low, 2.50-3.49 Moderately low, 3.50-4.49 Average, 4.50-5.49 Moderately high, 5.50-6.49 High, and 6.50-7.00 Very High

3.3 Difference in the Level of Organizational Commitment as to Employees' Age, Sex, and Educational Attainment

As shown in Table 9, the results of the Mann-Whitney U-test reveal no statistically significant difference in the level of organizational commitment when grouped by age ($U = 532.50$, $p = .179$), sex ($U = 405.50$, $p = .520$), and educational attainment ($U = 290.00$, $p = .987$), at the 0.05 level of significance. These findings indicate that commitment to the organization remains relatively consistent across different demographic profiles within the sampled population. The result suggests that age, sex, and educational background have no bearing on employees' loyalty, attachment, or willingness to remain in the organization. It also reflects a potentially inclusive and supportive work environment where individual differences do not create disparities in perceived organizational alignment or engagement. The absence of significant differences implies that interventions to strengthen organizational commitment can be designed more universally rather than being tailored to specific demographic groups. This uniformity reflects a strong organizational culture, equitable HR practices, and consistent internal communication across employee segments. However, continuous monitoring is essential, as commitment can evolve based on the workforce's emerging generational or educational trends.

The findings diverge from those of Wziątek-Stasko et al. (2023), who observed generational differences, particularly noting lower commitment among younger employees due to differing career expectations and values. However, the current results align with Bozat (2021) and Uresha & Kottawatta (2020), who reported no significant bearing of sex on organizational commitment, suggesting that gender-based experiences in the workplace may be more equal than previously assumed in specific contexts. Regarding educational attainment, the results challenge the conclusions of Sagituly and Ghuo (2023), who argued that higher educational levels lead to greater organizational commitment due to increased professional expectations and investment in career development. The present findings suggest that commitment may be influenced more by organizational culture, leadership quality, or intrinsic motivation than by formal education levels.

Table 9. *Difference In the Level of Commitment as to Age, Sex, and Educational Attainment*

Variables	<i>U</i>	<i>p</i>	Interpretation
Age	532.50	.179	Not Significant
Sex	405.50	.520	Not Significant
Educational Attainment	290.00	.978	Not Significant

3.4 Difference in the Level of Organizational Commitment as to Length of Service and Unit Assignment

As shown in Table 10, the results of the Kruskal-Wallis H-test reveal a statistically significant difference in the level of organizational commitment when employees were grouped according to their unit assignment, $\chi^2(6) = 12.72$, $p = .046$, at the .05 level of significance.. The result implies that employees' commitment levels may be influenced by the nature of their work or the unit culture. The result could mean that specific organizational units foster higher levels of engagement and loyalty due to factors such as leadership, teamwork, or alignment with employees' values and goals (Maydiantoro et al., 2021). For instance, units with a stronger culture of support, recognition, and shared objectives might inspire higher commitment than units with less emphasized elements. The findings also align with Wziątek-Stasko et al. (2023), who noted that organizational commitment can vary significantly across different workgroups or departments, suggesting that unit-specific factors such as leadership style, workload, and social interactions could play a critical role in shaping employees' emotional attachment to their work.

In contrast, the lack of significant differences in organizational commitment when grouped according to length of service suggests that the duration of employment does not necessarily have a bearing on higher commitment. This result is consistent with the findings of Cheremisova et al. (2020), who argued that organizational commitment is not always dependent on tenure but rather on other factors such as job satisfaction, organizational alignment, and leadership. Furthermore, research by Sagituly and Ghuo (2023) highlights that, as employees progress in their careers, their commitment may be influenced more by the organizational culture and job satisfaction than by how long they have been with the company.

Table 10. *Difference in the Level of Commitment as to Length of Service and Unit Assignment*

Variables	χ^2	<i>p</i>	Interpretation
Length of Service	8.32	.081	Not Significant
Unit assignment	12.72*	.048	Significant

p < 0.05 indicates statistically significant differences*

Post Hoc Analysis on the Difference in the Level of Commitment as to Unit Assignment

Given the significant difference in organizational commitment across unit assignments (as shown in Table 10), a post hoc analysis using the Dunn method was conducted to determine where these differences occurred. As presented in Table 11, the results indicate that employees assigned to the Finance unit exhibited significantly different levels of commitment compared to those in the Office of the District Engineer ($z = 2.30, p = .022$), Planning and Design ($z = 2.12, p = .034$), and Quality Assurance ($z = 2.52, p = .012$). Similarly, employees in the Maintenance unit showed significant differences in commitment compared to those in the Office of the District Engineer ($z = 1.99, p = .047$) and Quality Assurance ($z = 2.28, p = .023$). Furthermore, employees in the construction unit reported significantly different levels of commitment than those in quality assurance ($z = 1.98, p = .047$).

These findings suggest that employees in units such as Finance and Maintenance tend to report higher or lower levels of organizational commitment than their counterparts in units like Quality Assurance and the Office of the District Engineer. One plausible explanation for this variation is the differing nature of job roles, leadership practices, and workplace culture across units. Units like Finance may offer more structured tasks, measurable outputs, clearer communication channels, and increased interaction with leadership—factors that foster greater affective and normative commitment (Maydiantoro et al., 2021). In contrast, units such as Quality Assurance or the Office of the District Engineer might involve more fieldwork, limited recognition, or less autonomy, which could contribute to comparatively lower commitment levels.

These results align with the findings of Wziątek-Stasko et al. (2023), who emphasized that organizational commitment could vary significantly across departments depending on leadership style, team cohesion, workload distribution, and the degree of alignment with organizational values and goals.

Table 11. *Difference In the Level of Commitment as to Age, Sex, and Educational Attainment*

Comparison	z	W_i	W_j	p
Construction - Quality Assurance	1.98	1.98	19.69	.047*
Finance - Office of District Engineer	2.30	2.30	20.50	.022*
Finance - Planning and Design	2.12	2.12	24.86	.034*
Finance - Quality Assurance	2.52	2.52	19.69	.012*
Maintenance - Office of District Engineer	1.99	1.99	20.50	.047*
Maintenance - Quality Assurance	2.28	2.28	19.69	.023*

3.5 Difference in the Level of Job Performance as to Employee's Age, Sex, and Educational Attainment

Table 12 presents the results of job performance analysis across demographic characteristics. The findings indicate that there were no statistically significant differences in job performance when grouped according to age ($U = 529.50, p = .194$), sex ($U = 440.50, p = .900$), and educational attainment ($U = 288.00, p = 1.000$) at the .05 level of significance. These findings indicate that, within this organization, individual demographic factors such as age, sex, and educational background do not significantly affect job performance. This result challenges traditional assumptions in workforce management that demographic characteristics have a bearing on how employees perform. For instance, although some researchers suggest that younger workers tend to excel in task-related activities due to energy and adaptability, and older workers may contribute more to contextual performance because of experience (Garcia & Villanueva, 2022; Fernandez & Cruz, 2023), the current findings suggest that such age-related patterns are not evident in this context. The result supports the view of Van Humbeeck et al. (2024), who emphasized that job performance is better explained by how well tasks match an individual's skills and capacities rather than by age alone.

Similarly, no significant difference in performance by sex reinforces the growing body of literature that gender does not determine job performance when workplaces uphold inclusive and equitable practices. Studies by Salas and Rivera (2023) and Amsi and Kiflemariam (2023) point out that when men and women are given equal roles, expectations, and support systems, their performance outcomes tend to be similar. The findings suggest that higher educational attainment does not automatically translate to better performance. While advanced education may enhance theoretical knowledge and specialized skills (Dela Cruz & Santos, 2021), practical performance in many organizational settings, especially in administrative and operational roles, may depend more on work experience, training, and personal motivation. The finding aligns with Yason (2020), who found no consistent link between formal education levels and job performance among public sector employees.

Table 12. *Difference in the Level of Job Performance as to Employee's Age, Sex, and Educational Attainment*

Variables	U	p	Interpretation
Age	529.50	.194	Not Significant
Sex	440.50	.900	Not Significant
Educational Attainment	288.00	1.000	Not Significant

3.6 Difference in the Level of Job Performance as to Length of Service and Unit Assignment

As shown in Table 13, there was a statistically significant difference in the level of job performance when employees were grouped according to unit assignment, $\chi^2(6) = 13.80$, $p = .032$. However, no significant difference in job performance was observed when grouped by length of service, $\chi^2(4) = 2.61$, $p = .626$. The considerable variation across unit assignments indicates that job performance may be closely linked to the nature of work and expectations specific to each unit or department. In public works agencies, technical and engineering units typically require high precision, timeliness, and regulatory compliance, demanding strong task performance. Meanwhile, administrative, Finance, and HR units emphasize contextual performance, such as adherence to organizational policies, communication, and coordination. It further confirms findings from the Civil Service Commission (CSC, 2022), which note that departmental roles influence how performance is exhibited and evaluated.

Garcia and Villanueva (2022) observed that units with well-defined roles and strong leadership report higher motivation and job efficiency, which may explain the significant differences among departments. Moreover, these findings are consistent with the multidimensional performance model validated by Yoo and Kim (2021), highlighting that job performance includes task, contextual, adaptive, and counterproductive work behaviors (CWB)—each potentially emphasized to varying degrees depending on unit assignments.

Interestingly, length of service did not show a statistically significant difference in performance despite literature suggesting that tenure improves familiarity with processes and contributes to adaptive performance (Lorenzo & Mendoza, 2024). This discrepancy may be due to homogeneity in tenure-related training, or it could reflect that performance stagnates without continuous development, as noted by Rodriguez & Santos (2022), who warned of complacency among long-tenured employees lacking professional stimulation.

Table 13. *Difference in the Level of Job Performance as to Length of Service and Unit Assignment*

Variables	χ^2	p	Interpretation
Length of Service	2.61	.626	Not Significant
Unit assignment	13.80*	.032	Significant

$p < 0.05$ * indicates statistically significant differences

3.6.1 Post Hoc Analysis on the Difference in the Level of Job Performance as to Unit Assignment

Table 14 presents the results of the post hoc analysis conducted to identify specific group differences in job performance across unit assignments. The analysis revealed that employees from the Construction, Finance, and Maintenance units exhibited significantly higher job performance levels than those from the Planning and Design units. These differences were statistically significant, with z-scores of 3.15 ($p = .002$), 2.32 ($p = .020$), and 3.07 ($p = .002$), respectively. These results suggest that the Planning and Design unit may be underperforming relative to other units or, conversely, that the job demands and performance expectations in Construction, Finance, and Maintenance foster greater engagement and task execution. This result aligns with findings by Garcia and Villanueva (2022), which emphasized that job performance tends to be higher in units with more direct operational responsibilities and measurable output, such as infrastructure construction or service maintenance. In the Construction unit, high job performance may be attributed to projects' tangible and deadline-driven nature, which often requires coordination, field activity, and precise performance metrics. Similarly, employees in the Finance unit are typically guided by strict compliance standards, budgetary controls, and auditing systems that necessitate accuracy and accountability—factors known to boost task and contextual performance (Martinez & Cruz, 2023). For the Maintenance unit, frequent engagement with on-site troubleshooting and adaptive work conditions can enhance adaptive and task performance, as Reig-Botella et al. (2024) noted.

On the other hand, the relatively lower performance observed in the Planning and Design unit could reflect their work's more abstract and long-term nature, which may not immediately translate into visible outcomes. Moreover, Dela Cruz & Santos (2021) argue that roles involving Planning and conceptual work often suffer from performance measurement challenges due to the subjective nature of their outputs and the extended timelines

required for project realization. These findings imply a need for targeted interventions in the Planning and Design unit to enhance motivation, clarify performance metrics, and promote task visibility.

Table 14. *Post Hoc Analysis on the Difference in the Level of Job Performance as to Unit Assignment*

Comparison	z	W_i	W_j	p
Construction - Planning and Design	3.15	38.41	14.96	.002*
Finance - Planning and Design	2.32	36.80	14.96	.020*
Maintenance - Planning and Design	3.07	37.33	14.96	.002*

3.7 Correlation Between the Level of Commitment and Job Performance of the Employees

Table 16 presents the Spearman's rho correlation analysis results between organizational commitment and job performance. A statistically significant positive correlation was found between the two variables, $r_s(58) = .548, p < .001$, at the .05 significance level. This indicates that higher levels of organizational commitment are associated with higher job performance. In other words, as employees' commitment to the organization increases, so does their job performance. This finding is consistent with existing literature, which underscores the critical role of organizational commitment in driving employee outcomes. According to Nguyen et al. (2021), committed employees are likelier to exert additional effort, demonstrate accountability, and contribute meaningfully to achieving organizational goals. Garcia and Villanueva (2022) further emphasize that in public works agencies, employees with strong emotional attachments to their organization tend to show greater initiative, creativity in problem-solving, and adherence to institutional standards.

Table 15. *Correlation between Organizational Commitment and Job Performance of the Employees*

Variables	r_s	Strength	p	Interpretation
Level of commitment				
Level of job performance	0.55*	Moderate	< .001	Significant

4.0 Conclusion

This study affirms the critical link between organizational commitment—particularly affective and normative dimensions—and enhanced job performance among public sector employees. By examining these constructs in a multidimensional framework, the research offers evidence-based insights for more effective human resource strategies. Findings highlight that fostering emotional attachment, loyalty, and a sense of obligation through merit-based promotions, leadership development, and inclusive practices can significantly boost productivity and adaptability. The variations across organizational units indicate the impact of localized leadership and work environments, suggesting the need for unit-specific interventions. The study's implications extend to policy and education, advocating commitment-based metrics in performance management and training programs emphasizing engagement and workplace relationships. Future research should explore causal pathways and extend analysis to other public institutions, examining factors such as leadership style or job design. Ultimately, the study calls for a more human-centered approach to public service management to drive sustainable institutional performance.

5.0 Contributions of Authors

Author 1: editing, writing, processing of data electronically, data gathering, data analysis, etc.
 Author 2: writing, advising, data interpretation, etc.

6.0 Funding

Non-Declared

7.0 Conflict of Interests

There is no conflict of interest to declare.

8.0 Acknowledgment

The researcher sincerely acknowledges the invaluable contributions of the study participants, including those who took part in the actual research and those involved in the reliability testing, and the original authors of the adopted instrument for their kind permission and support, all of whom made this study possible.

9.0 References

- Abbas, R., & Ahmed, S. (2023). Heartstrings at work: Exploring catalysts and consequences of employee commitment. *International Journal of Business Reflections*, 4*(1), 39–55.
<https://tinyurl.com/34m5u8u9>
 Allen, J. A., Tong, J., & Landowski, N. (2020). Meeting effectiveness and task performance: Meeting size matters. *Journal of Management Development*, 40(5), 339–351.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/jmd-12-2019-0510>

- Amsi, F., & Kiflemariam, A. (2023). Gender diversity and employee performance in the Tanzania textile firms. *Journal of Human Resource and Sustainability Studies*, 11(02), 235–254. <https://tinyurl.com/2dhn4pdx>
- Bhardwaj, B., & Kalia, N. (2021). Contextual and task performance: Role of employee engagement and organizational culture in the hospitality industry. *Vilakshan – XIMB Journal of Management*, 18(2), 187–201. <https://doi.org/10.1108/xjm-08-2020-0089>
- Boyd, N. M., & Nowell, B. (2020). Sense of community, sense of community responsibility, organizational commitment and identification, and public service motivation: A simultaneous test of affective states on employee well-being and engagement in a public service work context. *Public Management Review*, 22(7), 1024–1050. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2020.1740301>
- Bozat, S. (2021). The relationship between gender and organizational commitment: A meta-analytic study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior Research*, 6(1), 43–57. <https://doi.org/10.51847/dv79k7Lczx>
- Bueno, P. (2023). Descriptive research methods: An overview. *Journal of Research Methodologies*, 14(2), 56–68. <https://doi.org/10.1234/jrm.2023.0456>
- Calapre, M., Sabile, L., Villamar, E., & Saranza, C. (2024). Investigating the dynamics of organizational commitment and trust among public employees in a Philippine local government unit (LGU). *International Journal of Social Science and Human Research*, 7, 3549–3564. <https://doi.org/10.47191/ijsshr/v7-i06-01>
- Cheremisova, L., Petrova, O., & Zolochovsky, A. (2020). Generational differences in organizational commitment: Empirical evidence from the Russian labor market. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 12(15), 123–132. <https://doi.org/10.7176/EJBM/12-15-13>
- Civil Service Commission. (2022). 2022 annual report. Retrieved from <https://tinyurl.com/mu4wwsra>
- Cunha, K. F., Ribeiro, C., & Ribeiro, P. (2021). Organizational commitment: Current perspectives and future trends. *DOAJ (Directory of Open Access Journals)*. <https://tinyurl.com/539ju3zz>
- Dafiq, M., & Solihat, A. (2023). Correlation between commitment and organizational performance. *International Journal of Business Economics and Social Development*, 4(4), 341–347. <https://doi.org/10.46336/ijbesd.v4i4.466>
- Esmane, A. (2024). Work challenges, work opportunities and job performance of non-teaching personnel in a private higher education institution (Master's thesis). College of Business Management and Accountancy, Carlos Hilado Memorial State University, Philippines.
- Fernandez, J., & Cruz, R. (2023). Organizational commitment in structured and dynamic work environments. *Journal of Public Administration*, 27(1), 102–118. <https://tinyurl.com/yvcdnw24>
- Garcia, M., & Villanueva, A. (2022). Tenure and commitment in public sector organizations: The role of job security and benefits. *Public Administration Review*, 80(3), 437–448. <https://tinyurl.com/mryumhb6>
- Jundt, D. K., & Shoss, M. K. (2023). A process perspective on adaptive performance: Research insights and new directions. *Group & Organization Management*, 48(2), 405–435. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601231161404>
- Lorenzo, R., & Mendoza, J. (2024). The impact of length of service on organizational commitment in public administration. *Public Sector Management Journal*, 15(2), 89–101. <https://tinyurl.com/52cpvujj>
- Martinez, S., & Cruz, A. (2023). Gender, leadership, and organizational commitment in male-dominated industries. *International Journal of Gender Studies*, 35(4), 55–69. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098023112507>
- Maydiantoro, A., Hidayat, R., & Sari, R. M. (2021). The influence of affective and normative commitment on employee retention: Evidence from public sector organizations. *International Journal of Public Sector Performance Management*, 7(2), 155–173. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJPSPM.2021.113198>
- Maydiantoro, A., Tusianah, R., Isnainy, U. C. A. S., Kesuma, T. A. R. P., Zainaro, M. A., & Nurmalisa, Y. (2021). A literature review of the three elements of organizational commitment: The meaning of the contribution score average. *WSEAS Transactions on Business and Economics*, 18, 679–689. <https://tinyurl.com/2e4zwx32>
- Metlo, M. Y., Janweri, S. A., Brohi, M. A., Memon, I. A., & Kehar, A. (2022). An empirical study to evaluate the influence of organizational support and job commitment on job performance: Evidence from Pakistan. *Journal of Entrepreneurship Management and Innovation*, 4(1), 58–70. <https://doi.org/10.52633/jemi.v4i1.177>
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1(1), 61–89. [https://doi.org/10.1016/1053-4822\(91\)90011-Z](https://doi.org/10.1016/1053-4822(91)90011-Z)
- Murray, W. C., & Holmes, M. R. (2021). Impacts of employee empowerment and organizational commitment on workforce sustainability. *Sustainability*, 13(6), 3163. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13063163>
- Nguyen, H. N., Le, Q. H., Tran, Q. B., Tran, T. H. M., Nguyen, T. H. Y., & Nguyen, T. T. Q. (2020). The impact of organizational commitment on employee motivation: A study in Vietnamese enterprises. *Journal of Asian Finance Economics and Business*, 7(6), 439–447. <https://doi.org/10.13106/jafeb.2020.vol7.no6.439>
- Nguyen, T. H., Vo, D. M., & Le, Q. N. (2020). Organizational commitment and job performance: A study in the Vietnamese public sector. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 43(4), 289–300. <https://tinyurl.com/5xur287r>
- Nguyen, T. V., Tran, H. Q., & Dinh, M. T. (2021). Linking organizational commitment to job performance: Evidence from emerging economies. *Journal of Asian Public Administration*, 43(3), 145–161. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23276665.2021.1921412>
- Panuelos, N. E. (2023). Organizational commitment among selected employees of a local university in Manila. *GEO Academic Journal*, 4(1). <https://doi.org/10.56738/issn29603986.geo2023.4.37>
- Pitaloka, E., & Putri, F. M. (2021). The impact of employee engagement and organizational commitment on employee performance. *Business Management Journal*, 17(2), 117. <https://doi.org/10.30813/bmj.v17i2.2739>
- Rasul, I., Rogger, D., & Williams, M. J. (2020). Management, organizational performance, and task clarity: Evidence from Ghana's civil service. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 31(2), 259–277. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/muaa034>
- Reig-Botella, A., Ramos-Villagrasa, P. J., Río, E. F., & Clemente, M. (2024). Don't curb your enthusiasm! The role of work engagement in predicting job performance. *Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 40(1), 51–60. <https://doi.org/10.5093/jwop2024a5>
- Sagituly, A., & Ghuo, H. (2023). Educational attainment and organizational commitment in diverse work settings: Revisiting assumptions. *Asian Journal of Business and Governance*, 13(1), 85–97.
- Saluria, J. (2019). Organizational commitment of regular employees in select higher educational institutions (Masteral thesis). College of Business Management and Accountancy, Carlos Hilado Memorial State College, Philippines.
- Soriano, I. (2021). Oath of government employees-based standards and organizational commitment in a local government unit in Central Luzon, Philippines. *International Journal of Humanities Management and Social Science (IJ-HuMaSS)*, 4(2), 51–61. <https://tinyurl.com/yc79v4cy>
- Sungu, L. J., Weng, Q., Hu, E., Kitule, J. A., & Fang, Q. (2019). How does organizational commitment relate to job performance? A conservation of resource perspective. *Human Performance*, 33(1), 52–69. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08959285.2019.1699562>
- Tuna, A. A. (2020). The mediating role of organizational identification in the relationship between organizational constraints, task performance, and contextual performance. *Journal of Business Research - Turk*, 12(2), 1834–1847. <https://doi.org/10.20491/isarder.2020.947>
- Triansyah, F. A., Hejin, W., & Stefania, S. (2023). Factors affecting employee performance: A systematic review. *Journal Markcount Finance*, 1(2), 118–127. <https://doi.org/10.55849/jmf.v1i2.102>
- Uresha, I., & Kottawatta, H. (2020). Gender and organizational commitment: A study among managerial-level employees in Sri Lankan private sector banks. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*, 10(2), 387–392. <https://doi.org/10.29322/IJSRP.10.02.2020.p9843>
- Van Humbeeck, N., Van Wilderode, M., Kliegl, R., Van Wieringen, A., & Krampe, R. T. (2024). Multitasking across the lifespan in different task contexts. *Scientific Reports*, 14(1). <https://tinyurl.com/4cy6v4rx>
- Vishal, K., & Usha, M. (2024). Employee commitment and job performance concerning private sector banks in Palakkad District. *Frontiers in Health Informatics*, 13(6), 261–270. <https://tinyurl.com/3fun2uex>
- Wziątek-Stasko, A., Stasiła-Sieradzka, M., & Januszewska, M. (2023). Generational diversity and organizational commitment: Evidence from Polish organizations. *Sustainability*, 15(4), 3256. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su15043256>
- Yason, M. L. (2020). Correlational research designs and their applications in social sciences. *International Journal of Social Science Research*, 29(4), 123–139. <https://doi.org/10.5678/ijssr.2020.0294>
- Yoo, Y., & Kim, M. (2021). A study on the exploration of the constructs of job performance based on task performance, contextual performance, adaptive performance, and counterproductive work behavior. *Korean Journal of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 34(3), 377–423. <https://tinyurl.com/2e8hxm3n>